

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 September 1984

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

Mr. G.T. Whitten

Members:

Mr E.S. Ashenden
 Mr H. Becker
 The Hon. Peter Duncan
 The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy
 Mr. R.J. Gregory
 Mr K.H. Plunkett

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I recognise the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy) as the lead speaker for the Opposition, and the member for Florey (Mr Gregory) as the lead speaker for the Government. All questions will be directed to the Minister, not to officers; however, the Minister may refer any questions to his officers for an answer or a supplementary answer. All questions must relate to the debate. They must not be policy statements, and this is not a second reading debate or a grievance debate. At a later stage the Minister, the member for Florey, the Deputy Leader and I should work out an allocation of time for the votes, because of the necessity to change officers. Officers can leave when a certain matter has been dealt with.

There must be a quorum of four at all times; if there is not a quorum, the sittings of the Committee will be suspended until a quorum is formed. Standing Orders allow members who are not members of the Committee to ask questions, but in extreme circumstances only. However, I will certainly not encourage questions from those members, and they will ask questions only with the authority of the Deputy Leader or the member for Florey. I intend to allow only three questions from each member: the questioning will alternate from side to side. I do not say that the Deputy Leader, for instance, if he is questioning must ask at least three questions but, if he does, members on the other side may ask three questions, and the questioning will then revert back, perhaps to the Deputy Leader. That does not mean that other members of the Committee have priority over the Deputy Leader or any other person.

I intend to allow the Deputy Leader to make a short statement for about 10 minutes, certainly not longer than 15 minutes, and I will allow the Minister to also make a short statement prior to questioning. I declare the Committee open.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Several matters of public interest under this portfolio will be canvassed. It is appropriate that I indicate those matters to the Committee. Workers compensation is in everyone's mind at present, and we will pursue that matter. The obligation of employers regarding health and safety is certainly forward in the Government's thinking and in that of the whole community, and we will pursue that also. A number of other matters are perhaps of less pressing urgency but they will be explored with the Minister. Also, we will seek finer details of the Budget lines. There is no great profit in my outlining these matters at present; they will emerge as the questioning proceeds.

We will seek information about the Government's employment schemes. Unemployment levels are of concern to us all, certainly to the Opposition, and I believe to the Government, although it does not appear that the answer

to that problem is apparent from what has transpired in South Australia. I will say no more except that we approach this Committee in a spirit of co-operation and common sense. We do not seek to stir the Minister or his officers: we want to seek information. Obviously, members on this side do not agree with some of the Government's initiatives. There is no doubt about that, but we will seek information from the Minister although we will not seek to initiate confrontation.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am delighted to hear that the Opposition is approaching the Estimates Committees in the manner described by the Deputy Leader. In my view, Estimates Committees are not the arena for grandstanding by members on either side: they enable members to solicit information, as is the practice in the Senate and the House of Representatives in Canberra.

I believe that, if the Opposition does not grandstand but sets about its task of obtaining information, we will be able to provide that information. My Department, as well as setting out the information in the Budget papers in great details, has set out other information, and I am happy to tell the Deputy Leader that the Government and I will be delighted to give that information. Of course there are areas where there is disagreement regarding policy, as one can imagine, arising from differing philosophical points of view.

If the Opposition is going down a certain path to gain information required by it and the people of this State, the Government ought to be in a position to give that information, and I will be delighted to do so. If I am unable to answer any question in relation to the matters raised I have officers present who will be able to assist in this matter.

Labour, \$46 542 000

Witness:

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Chief Secretary and Minister of Emergency Services.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr Hedley R. Bachmann, Director, Department of Labour.
 Mr Philip Bentley, Deputy Director, Department of Labour.

Mr Brian Bartlett, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Labour.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We will refer to the Programme Estimates. It is clear from the statement of expenditure that that is where we have to go. Asterisks indicate that that is the document we are talking about. We had a few hassles last year.

The CHAIRMAN: There will be no hassles this year; I assure you of that. I ask the Deputy Leader to ask his questions in relation to expenditure.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Page 5 of the yellow book, under 'Agency Overview', states:

To provide an equitable and cost effective system for the rehabilitation and compensation of persons suffering a work-caused injury or disease.

While we approach this Committee in a spirit of co-operation, we disagree fairly vehemently with some of the proposals that the Government is promoting in the area of workers compensation. These questions will be directed to the Minister in terms of where the Government is going in relation to workers compensation.

I draw the Minister's attention to the Cooney Report commissioned by the Victorian Government; it is a fairly recent report concerning workers compensation with a series of recommendations that appear to run counter to the direction that the Minister appears to be taking in South Australia. The Cooney Report recommends a continuation of the multi-insurer system. I take it that inherent in the Government's proposals is that the multi-insurer system for workers compensation is out. I observe that the recommendations are fairly similar to the policy developed by the Liberal Party. I also refer to recent statements of the Chairman of the Business Council of Australia. The Chairman, Sir Arvi Parbo, in a recent journal from the Society of Senior Executives (of course, we know he has fairly intimate connections with South Australia in some of the developments currently taking place), stated:

Typical was the argument voiced recently by the President of the Business Council of Australia and leading industrialist, Sir Arvi Parbo. Sir Arvi said that high workers compensation costs had helped erode Australia's international competitiveness. He argued that protection had to be provided for workers but changes were needed to cut the cost of insurance. Workers compensation claims as percentages of wages doubled from 1971-72 to 1981-82.

This rapid increase in workers compensation premiums is an added cost burden to employers and a further erosion of our international competitive position with its consequent economic effect on economic growth and employment opportunity,' Sir Arvi Parbo said. But at the same time Sir Arvi would not back the move on State monopolies on this form of insurance. He said, 'Employers should have the choice of State insurance offices, private insurers and self insurance, because he did not believe that State monopolies were cost effective.

With that background of the recent findings of the Cooney Committee in Victoria and the comments of a number of people, including the Chairman of the Business Council of Australia, what does the Minister see as integral to the scheme which he is promoting and which he has mooted in terms of change in respect of the multi-insurer or single insurer?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Before I reply to the Leader's question, I indicate to you, Mr Chairman, in respect of your comments about timing, that Mr Wotton advised me earlier this morning that 4 o'clock would be the approximate changeover time.

The CHAIRMAN: That will present no problems at all, because Standing Orders have been changed from last year to provide that a changeover can occur at any time, provided notification in writing is made to the Chairman.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The question of workers compensation is serious. Indeed, it would not matter greatly what system one tried to introduce because, having concluded that the present system is not suitable for this day and age (I will develop why it is not suitable in a moment), one would experience great difficulty. The Deputy Leader would be aware that (whatever the Government, employers or employees believed) those involved would find great difficulty in coming to terms with any change. Although the great majority of people involved have concluded that the current system of workers compensation is not satisfactory, it would be most difficult to get agreement on the type of change. I find that no-one in the community, except perhaps lawyers, is satisfied with the present system of workers compensation. Whether one refers to employers or employees or anyone else with an interest in the area, they all criticise the system. I refer the Deputy Leader to the last statement of policy that I have seen in regard to the Opposition's view on the method of correcting the present scheme; that is, to reduce dramatically the benefits afforded to employees who are unfortunate enough to have an accident at work. That philosophy is far from the Labor Party's philosophy, because we want to hold the benefits as they are and take away the

legal and other apparatus that is a burden and an extra cost on the system that we presently enjoy.

The Deputy Leader mentioned the Cooney Report. I have not seen that report. I understand there is a copy in the office of the Department of Labour and Industry, but it has not been drawn to my attention. If the report indicates that we should continue with a conglomeration of insurance companies concerning this field rather than a single channel operation, I can only say that from the latest information given to me it is apparent that the Victorian Government is not taking much notice of that recommendation—if that is what the Cooney Report recommends.

Only a couple of weeks ago an officer of my Department looked at the Victorian system. I understand that the Victorian Government will introduce legislation in this area before its current term is completed. Victoria will introduce a single channel instrumentality to control workers compensation—irrespective of the Cooney Report. That is the information I have received, but it has not been confirmed by Mr Cain. That information was given to me by one of my officers who went to Victoria to see what was happening in relation to workers compensation. South Australia is not the only State considering a change in philosophy from the present system to a single channel system.

I think it is important to note that the Government has done everything possible at the moment in regard to consultation and consensus in relation to this matter. Following the Government's return to office I began discussing this matter quite conscientiously. Most of those discussions were based on the Byrne inquiry. We are fortunate to have Mr Bob Gregory, a member of that inquiry, present today as a member of this Committee. He may like to elaborate on the findings of the inquiry later. I travelled to New Zealand to establish in my mind whether the single channel system is the correct way to go. Since then, I think I have been very successful in my attempt to create public debate about this matter, and that was my intention.

I have spoken to many conferences about workers compensation over the past 12 months. In fact, there are workers compensation seminars every day, the major seminar having been the New Directions Conference in May this year, which was attended by over 500 people. Certain people who attended that conference had quite a deliberative point of view, and in some ways I believe were quite reckless in the way they attacked speakers who supported a change in the apparatus. I will not mention any names, but that fact was recognised by the person who is leading the debate for the other side from a Victorian base and who is a representative of the Insurance Council of Australia. In his own words this person admitted that his side lost that round of the fight at the New Directions Conference. I was present at the conference for the two days, and as an observer I would concur with that statement. That person is totally opposed to a single channel system and he has been employed by the Insurance Council of Australia to debate this matter and to use all the powers at his disposal to prevent State Labor Governments from considering changing the current system.

Since that conference it has been necessary to have the matter proceed further. There have been very amiable discussions between the trade union movement and employers. While at this stage neither side (if I can call them that) has reached a final conclusion about what they would like to see happen, there is certainly the best public debate about this matter occurring since my time in Government.

Those discussions are continuing. It was also necessary to bring Professor Eisen back to Adelaide for a month to put together for us a scheme which, when it is finally put together—and it is not at this stage—will be put out for a consensus view. I am not stupid enough to believe that,

merely because the Government has a policy in an area, it is possible to sell that policy. So I have adopted a policy on this and other matters of an industrial nature that this will have a total consensus throughout the community. In the meantime, trade unions and the employers are still discussing their respective roles.

If I can hazard a guess—and that is about as high as I would like to put it at this stage—the majority of those people who have been involved in those debates (and I am not referring to the total organisation, either, but to those people who have been involved directly with Professor Eisen and in discussions with the Trades and Labor Council and the employers' organisation) are commencing to change their minds, to say the least; I place it no higher than that.

The important point for the Committee to understand is that there will be total consensus on this matter. It will be a decision of the South Australian people to whether or not this change is feasible. I expect a very great debate continuing in opposition to this matter. I have seen this sort of system attempted on a national level before, or something very similar to this, and everyone with a self-interest came out in opposition to it. I expect that once the Government has its new policy and scheme in operation, at that stage all the critics will come to the forefront.

It is important for the Committee to know that already a counter-attack is being made by the insurance companies. They have brought to Australia—and I understand that the gentleman is speaking here next week as well—a man called Taylor, whom I do not know. He is leading a major seminar in Victoria, and I understand that he is to speak at a luncheon here within the next couple of weeks. The purpose of bringing Mr Taylor here clearly is to put a counter-argument to that put by Professor Eisen, Sir Owen Woodhouse and those people who put their points of view at the New Directions Conference in May. I reiterate that this philosophy and policy will come about only after we have reached a consensus and that that will be down the track a few months yet.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I take it from what the Minister said in answer to that question that a single insurer is an integral part of the scheme—that was the thrust of the question—and there is no way that there will be any variation from that, in which case there certainly will not be a consensus in relation to people who do not believe that that is the right track to go. The Minister suggested in his remarks that the Liberal Party's major thrust was a big reduction in benefits to injured workers. That is not correct. There was some adjustment to benefits, but the major thrust of the Liberal Party's policy was to restructure the apparatus, to use the Minister's words, and to streamline it fairly drastically but without going as far as the Government appears to be going in relation to some of these fundamental decisions.

I refute that the major thrust of the Liberal Party's policy was to reduce benefits to workers. That certainly was not the major thrust. The major savings certainly were not a result of that. The Minister also mentioned that the Victorian Government had rejected the recommendations of the Cooney Committee, which indicates to me that it appears to have a closed mind in this matter. The Government is wasting its time and money in commissioning a report if it neglects the report. That highlights that a number of views are being held in relation to the best way of restructuring workers compensation. The authoritative committee that was commissioned by the Victorian Government has come up with a series of recommendations which, I suggest, coincide in large measure with what the Liberal Party in South Australia is promoting.

Is the door closed under the Government's scheme to self insurers? I made that point to the Chairman of the Business

Council of Australia, Sir Arvi Parbo, who reiterated the findings of the Cooney Committee and what the Liberals in South Australia are saying. I take it that self insurers are to be absorbed into this general scheme. It is an all or nothing scheme. Certainly, that is the Byrne recommendation. However, I understand that the Minister has increased the number of people who can become self insurers, so obviously he believes that there is some merit in self insuring. That would build in an immediate incentive to promote safety in the work place. The track record of self insurers would seem to indicate that. Is there any place for self insurers in the scheme, or does the Government envisage a modified scheme?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There is a lobby amongst the self insurers to retain their present position, and I will deal with that later. The Deputy Leader made the point that I have increased the number of self insurers. That is largely true, but at the same time I have reduced the list of the number of people who indicated an interest in self insurance and who have not taken it up.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You mean that you scrubbed some off.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I certainly did not believe that there should be an option for an unspecified period if the option was not taken up. That is a reasonable basis on which to make that decision.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There are more self insurers now than when you first came to government.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There are a few more: I believe there are about 45 or 46—not many more. One could describe those who have the right to self insure as very safe bets, for want of better words. Those people are able to carry any difficulties that may arise. A very strong argument is being put forward by self insurers that, if the Government is successful in implementing the philosophies that I have just explained (and I will not repeat them), they want to retain their present position. The door is not closed to them. One of the final considerations is an assessment of whether or not those people should or should not come in, and to the best of my knowledge they have been told that. No final decision has been made.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The other area that appears to be an integral part of any strategy to accommodate workers compensation and to effect savings is the question of common law claims. Last year I asked the Minister questions in that regard, but I noted with some interest that one of the resolutions carried at the ALP Conference indicated that the conference asserted and dictated that the right to pursue damages claims of common law for negligence should be preserved. Is that a negotiable item in the Minister's scheme or in the scheme the Government finally adopts, or will common law claims be dispensed with? One of the members of the Byrne Committee (not the member for Florey) indicated that the recommendation was a package, that it would have to be an all or nothing exercise to achieve any real modification of the effects of workers compensation in South Australia. One of the areas where the Liberal Party is suggesting fairly severe modifications is in regard to grants for common law claims, because there is no doubt that the number of those claims has escalated, and this has been a fairly fruitful field for lawyers. Is that still negotiable or does the Minister believe that common law claims may be omitted? If they are omitted, it will certainly wreck the Byrne scheme.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There is a body of people in the community who argue with great strength that one needs to permit the common law to exist in any scheme whereby a worker faces the possibility of being injured at work. There is another body of people in the community who argue that that is not necessary and that there are better schemes, such

as pension schemes and the like, that can accommodate an injured employee in a different way—hence the Byrne recommendations. It is also true that the last conference of the Labor Party declared a policy for the Australian Labor Party that although it is interested in seeing worthwhile changes to the Workers Compensation Act at this stage the retention of the common law is a necessity—that stands.

What I intend to do in this regard—and I think this is a reasonable way of approaching the matter—is put together two packages, one including the common law and one excluding it, and to let people make up their minds which is the better proposition. In my view, one can give a much better service, and better remuneration, to injured employees by way of the proposals set out in the Byrne Report. Those conditions, which apply in Canada, New Zealand and in other parts of the world work through a system of pensions rather than through the common law. My worry about the common law is that it is a lottery. In many instances people are not treated equally in a common law situation, because that situation depends largely on how good is a person's lawyer, and how sympathetic a judge might be on a particular day. One can cite examples of similar accidents involving a common law negligence claim where people have been given different settlements. My aim is to make those benefits similar for comparable accidents so that each person is treated the same. The best method of arriving at a final conclusion in relation to this matter is to put two packages together, one containing the common law and one not containing the common law, and the total perception of both of these schemes can be assessed by the people directly involved. I keep making what I think is a very valid point: the two arteries of the blood stream in this matter are the employees and employers—they are the people who will make up their minds about this matter.

Mr GREGORY: On page 7 under the heading 'Industrial Relations—Conditions of Employment' in 1983-84, 37.3 people were employed. Proposed employment for 1984-85 is 43.1 people. On page 8 under the sub-heading 'Conditions of employment'—recurrent expenditure in 1983-84 was about \$2.4 million. For 1984-85 a proposed expenditure of just over \$3.4 million is shown, an increase of about \$1 million. Will the Minister explain how that money is to be spent and what benefits the State will gain from it?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I make the total \$963 000, and I do not know to what the honourable member is relating his figures. The staff increase for 1984-85 is due to reallocation of resources of 3.7 people. A similar reduction occurs in the programme maintenance. There will be an additional two full-time equivalents to handle the high case load in the worker rehabilitation advisory unit. The monetary increase in 1984-85 is accounted for by salary increases, \$198 000; allocation of accommodation, \$91 000; building workers long service leave claims, \$566 000; and long service building industry in computing other costs, \$108 000. That is a total of \$963 000.

Mr GREGORY: Under the subheading 'Regulation of Dangerous Goods and Substances' there is a proposed expenditure increase of just over \$100 000. Will the Minister explain how that money will be spent?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That amount relates to asbestos monitoring. There is an increase in staff, partly due to the two staff in the asbestos monitoring unit who were transferred from the Public Buildings Department in 1984. The major increases are salary increases and transferred staff, \$57 000; and accommodation and services, \$40 000, a total of \$97 000.

Mr GREGORY: On page 10 under the heading 'Employment and Employee Incentive Schemes' it shows that in 1983-84 the proposed expenditure was \$43.5 million, actual expenditure was \$38.5 million, and the proposed expenditure

for 1984-85 is \$39.7 million. Will the Minister explain why there was difficulty in spending about \$5 million last year and whether the proposed expenditure will be spent this year?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There is a fairly long answer to this question. Staffing levels within this programme: under specific employment schemes, for instance, the proposed figure for 1983-84 was 8.6, the actual figure was 7.5, and the figure proposed for 1984-85 is 7.5. The staffing level under the Job Creation Scheme (Commonwealth) proposed for 1983-84 was 7, actual was 10.1 and the proposed figure for 1984-85 is 16. The staffing level under other employment schemes for 1983-84 was one, the actual for that year was one and the proposed for 1984-85 is 4. This gives a total proposed figure for this programme for 1983-84 of 16.6 and an actual figure of 18.6, the major increase being in the Job Creation Scheme for staff within the Commonwealth/State Secretariat and through new initiatives to be taken within the special employment initiatives that I will deal with in a moment.

The proposed expenditure for specific employment projects in 1983-84 was \$401 000, the actual figure was \$331 000, and the proposed figure for 1984-85 is \$348 000. The proposed figure in relation to the wage pause for 1983-84 was \$15.438 million, the actual figure for 1983-84 was \$13.983 million, and the proposed figure for 1984-85 is \$1.461 million. The amount proposed for CEP local roads in 1983-84 was \$5.944 million and the actual figure for 1983-84 was \$4.198 million.

Concerning CEP country water, the 1983-84 proposed figure was \$1.752 million and the actual was \$1.076 million. Concerning CEP 'other', the 1983-84 proposed figure was \$14.013 million and the actual was \$16.329 million. So, the proposed total for 1984-85 of \$31.528 million covers CEP local roads, CEP country water and CEP 'other'. Concerning State Government, the 1983-84 proposed figure was \$5.7 million and the actual was \$2.008 million. The proposed 1984-85 figure is \$5.692 million. Concerning 'Departmental expenditure on job creation scheme staff and operating', for 1983-84 the proposed figure was \$0.243 million and the actual was \$0.414 million. The proposed expenditure for 1984-85 is \$0.622 million. For 'Other schemes—staff and operating', the proposed 1983-84 figure was \$0.03 million and the actual was \$0.028 million. The proposed 1984-85 figure is \$0.135 million. Therefore, the total of the subprogramme proposed expenditure for 1983-84 was \$43.521 million. The actual figure for 1983-84 was \$38.367 million and the proposed figure for 1984-85 is \$39.786 million. The actual revenue under this programme for 1983-84 was \$0.038 million and the proposed 1984-85 figure is \$0.043 million.

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister advise the Committee of the Government's programme in relation to introducing its new workers compensation scheme? Will it be referred to IRAC before being brought before Parliament for its consideration?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The member would well know that sometimes there is great difficulty when one is attempting to move from one set of circumstances to another. To answer the question in the most honest way I can and to not leave anyone in any doubt, I point out that it would be very difficult to put a time on this programme. I am looking at providing all the necessary negotiations and consultations to fit in with what the Government is trying to do. I have said on other occasions and repeat that it is mandatory that all industrial-type legislation goes to IRAC. This will go to IRAC; I can definitely say that. I am not in a position to give a definite answer in relation to when the legislation will be brought into the House.

As I said earlier, there will be two proposals. One will contain the common law and one will not, and will contain

costings, benefits and all those things. Nothing will be hidden. I hope that by February or March we will be in a position to circulate it to everyone who wants to read it. Everyone who has an interest in this field should be given an opportunity to study it. Taking into account the ordinary time element after the circulation of something of that magnitude, I am hopeful to be in a position to bring the legislation before Parliament in the July-August session next year.

Mr ASHENDEN: Page 122 of the Auditor-General's Report, under the heading 'Claims Admitted', states:

The value of claims admitted for workers compensation increased by \$3.2 million to \$14.8 million, principally on account of higher weekly benefits payable and increased common law settlements.

What arrangements will be made by the Government concerning its own employees under the new scheme?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: They will be in the scheme the same as everyone else. That is how it operates everywhere.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You will not be in a position to self insure?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: As I said to the Deputy Leader, I have not made up my mind about self insurers at this moment. I am still debating in my own mind whether it is of more benefit to have them in than out.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: More benefit for costing?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Of course it is—if that is the only conclusion one has to make, so far as putting it all into the pool. I do not intend to consider the position so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr ASHENDEN: So, they will not be in self insurance?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No.

Mr ASHENDEN: Concerning the CEP programme, I have had discussions with officers and elected members of the Tea Tree Gully council and, as you will probably be aware, that council has certainly used the CEP programme for a number of schemes. Is the Minister aware that difficulties are presently being experienced by that council, and I gather by other bodies, in regard to obtaining employees to work in the schemes? The reason for this, it was put to me, was that one of the aims of the programme is to provide employment to those who have been unemployed for some time. The council put to me that what is happening is that it has been able to use a number of persons that fit this category in the CEP programme within Tea Tree Gully but that it is now having difficulty getting new employees (previously unemployed) and those that it has used in previous schemes are now ineligible to work in the latest scheme because of the work they have done in previous schemes. Evidently this is a very real problem to the Tea Tree Gully council and other bodies and organisations. Is the Minister considering changing the scheme so that these difficulties are removed? What ways is the Government looking at to overcome these problems?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: First, the honourable member refers to the fact that Tea Tree Gully council has been one of the better organisations in getting schemes together quickly and making use of the available funds. I have not yet seen a scheme which was proposed by that council and which was not a worthwhile scheme. I refer to the position applying as far back as the State Unemployment Scheme when I remember opening the council's new machinery shed, headquarters, lunch room and depot, which were all built to an excellent standard. The council has continued to do that and I congratulate it on that work. The difficulty raised by the honourable member is that the council has a problem of replacing labour in respect of new schemes because, under the guidelines, it is unable to continue employing people who have worked for two or three months and who by that

stage have been trained and are suitable employees for the council.

Mr ASHENDEN: The council would like to use them again but it cannot.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: As the member knows, the scheme is for unemployed and disadvantaged people: that is the sole purpose of the scheme. The guidelines are very specific about who shall be employed under the benefits of the Commonwealth Employment Programme. One must be out of work for three months before one can apply, and the guidelines are specific that, where a council, a community or someone with an opportunity of having an initial scheme is then granted a second scheme, the people working on the first scheme are not qualified to continue to work on the second scheme. Certainly, I know all the hazards that that can cause but, if one can get away from that situation, one is not homing in on the people the scheme is designed to assist, that is, disadvantaged or unemployed persons. Hence, the guidelines have to be strictly adhered to. Perhaps Mr Bentley would like to add to what I have said about occurrences in respect of the unit. Perhaps he can elaborate on whether or not there is much difficulty in finding labour at the moment.

Mr Bentley: Under the Community Employment Programme so far 43 per cent of people who have obtained employment were unemployed for nine months or more. Other disadvantaged groups are also recognised in that context. There is a minor amendment concerning a person rolling on to another project, but that occurs only if, for example, an electrician took two months to wire a building and the council had another project requiring another electrician. He could roll on to that project, but anyone working for more than three months under the project cannot have his job renewed. The philosophy behind that position is that with limited resources one should open up the opportunity for as many people as possible to get some short-term employment so that they are in a higher pecking order in the search for permanent jobs.

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Government consider an amendment to the guidelines? I accept everything that the Minister has said. There is no doubt that the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully has been forward in utilising the CEP schemes. I know of the real problems applying and that the council is not trying to short-circuit the system. It uses the CES and is doing everything correctly. The council has had schemes agreed to and has had funds made available but it is now having extreme difficulty in instigating or completing some schemes. People who are unemployed and who fit the criteria are being disadvantaged in that the work cannot start until the council gets more workers and in circumstances where there is a genuine case perhaps there could be an amendment to the guidelines so that people who have been previously unemployed and who are still unemployed could be re-employed on a second scheme.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: A major difficulty is that it is not the State Government that determines the guidelines: they are Commonwealth guidelines and there are varying views about them. Each State has its own view and, as a consequence, there have been some rather difficult periods in trying to get some sort of unity between the States in respect of the guidelines. That guideline is hard and fast and I cannot give any assurance. In any case, the State Government cannot change it. I am not sure of the exact circumstances raised by the honourable member but, if the council is having problems, I will send someone out in the next couple of days to ascertain what they are and see whether we can overcome the problems in that way.

Mr GREGORY: I refer to page 21 of the Programme Estimates in respect of workers compensation and silicosis. Proposed expenditure in 1983-84 was \$72 000 and the actual

expenditure was \$6 000. In 1984-85 proposed expenditure is \$42 000. One can draw some conclusions from those figures that, first, there is no agreement about claims for silicosis and, secondly, safety measures have reduced the incidence of silicosis or that few people work in an industry where people contact silicosis. Will the Minister comment on those assumptions?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: They are reasonable assumptions. One of the difficulties that we have and have always had in respect of silicosis is that one is never sure how many claims will come in. There is little doubt that over the past few years the safety precautions taken in the industry have to a large extent reduced the number of new persons coming in contact with silicosis. Although I have not checked individual claims, I suggest that the majority of claims (they were not very high last year) involve people who worked in quarries for many years when there were no protections of the kind that presently exist. Claims in 1983-84 were much less than expected and in 1984-85 we estimate—it is totally an estimation; it is no more than that—claims will be \$42 000. One does not and can never know what will be the position in regard to silicosis.

Mr GREGORY: Is there not a silicosis fund?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes.

Mr GREGORY: What moneys are held there in reserve?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Quite a deal is held in the fund. Total assets amount to \$2 747 000. Money invested in Commonwealth stock amount to \$357 000. There is an investment in the Electricity Trust amounting to \$590 000; an investment in the South Australian Government Financing Authority of \$1.2 million; and an investment in the Local Government Financing Authority of \$600 000. That amounts to \$2 740 000 in total.

Mr GREGORY: There are ample funds to meet expenses?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: One would think so.

Mr GREGORY: I refer to page 22 of the yellow book where there is reference to the rehabilitation of workers who have suffered compensable injuries. I note that there is a significant increase in the funds allocated and in the number of employees proposed to use the fund. Has this occurred as a result of increased demand for the services of the rehabilitation unit or is it because the Government is making a conscious effort to provide more people in the unit to attract those workers who require the services of the unit?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Government has made a conscious effort to encourage people to act swiftly and not delay their activities in regard to rehabilitation. If we adopt that as a policy, it is incumbent on us to have the necessary staff to deal with those people as they come forward. I think it would be true to say that there has been greater activity in this area over the past year or so. I am not blaming anyone for this; I am simply saying that we have been able to speed up the process somewhat. We have also been able to give attention to country areas, something which has not occurred in the past. Extra staff is required as a result of the additional liability. Generally, the unit is picking up and is now more active than it was—and I am grateful for that. As a consequence, more people who need rehabilitation are making contact with the unit.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question follows that of the member for Todd in relation to employment schemes. I refer to 'Agency overview' on page 5 of the yellow book. Under the heading 'Strategies', it is noted:

Effective job creation projects are being administered using both Commonwealth and State Government funds.

I refer to the use of State Government funds. Last year I think \$5.7 million was to be expended from State funds on employment schemes. Page 34 of the Premier and Treasurer's Financial Statement indicates that only \$2 million of State funds was spent in this area in 1983-84 and that \$3.7 million

was held in reserve. This year \$5.7 million has been allocated from State funds for employment schemes. That money is made up of \$2 million in the Minister's line and \$3.7 million which was not spent last year. Can the Minister confirm that my reading is correct and that only \$2 million of what was budgeted last year was spent?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is a possibility that the \$5.7 million allocated this year may be spent, depending on decisions made further down the line. There is also a possibility of other money being spent brought forward from next year's budget, which has not yet been framed. The Premier refers to an extra \$3.25 million from next year's budget. That is strange, because the preliminary work on that budget has not yet been done. The Minister seems to be indicating that what I have said is correct: that only \$2 million from State funds was spent last year.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: To an extent, the honourable member is correct. I will ask Mr Bentley to elaborate later. There is always a need to over-commit in a particular financial year so that jobs are coming up off the ground all the time. If that was not done, there would be a break in the flow of proposals coming forward. The honourable member said that only \$2 million was spent last year and, in fact, that is correct. All of the \$5.7 million allocated last year was committed but not spent. That money will be spent in this period, and I suppose that some of the programmes to which it has been committed have already been picked up. There is a difference between what was actually spent and what was committed last year. The actual figure of \$2 million was spent. This happens not only with State funds but also with Federal funds. The system is that one over-commits so that proposals are coming forward all the time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier states that the funds were held in reserve.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is held in reserve. That money is committed and is available as soon as projects come off the ground. In the Financial Statement, the Premier states:

The allocation for the Labour portfolio is now presented in the Estimates of Payments in programme format and encompasses the total allocation for purposes previously covered by the Department of Labour and the Minister of Labour—Miscellaneous.

The creation of additional employment opportunities is the Government's highest priority. In 1984-85, \$5.7 million will be spent from State funds on job creation projects compared with \$2 million last year.

That is the figure, and that is how it has to be put down. The Premier continues:

The State's contribution for this purpose will be comprised of \$2 million allocated under Minister of Labour—Miscellaneous and \$3.7 million that has been held in reserve. Further, if later in the year we find it necessary to provide additional State funds to maintain the momentum of the Community Employment Programme we will bring forward up to \$3.25 million of funds which would otherwise be provided in 1985-86.

I am sure the honourable member will understand that, if I did not have that sort of guarantee, all I would receive in this budget for job creation would be \$2 million. The \$3.7 million which appears in the yellow book is actual money that has been committed.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Do you expect to under-spend over the next two years? The idea that you had \$5.7 million last year and \$5.7 million this year is not the case.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That will be the case. I want to be in a position to have spent it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: You won't unless you dip into the next year.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That money has been set aside. It is not really going into —

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: \$3.7 million was not spent.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It was committed to be spent and will be spent.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was committed at the start of the year, and it was not spent. It was held in reserve.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No, but that \$3.7 million is committed to projects.

Mr Bentley: The committee that was responsible for administering this programme had a dilemma on its hands. Most of the projects took nine to 12 months, but by the time the programme got under way it was not possible to finish those projects within the financial year. Therefore, one was left with a decision whether the money that was committed should be forwarded to those Government agencies that had the projects under way for the duration of their commitment, which would take them over the full financial year. The problem if one does that is that one loses the checks and controls to ensure that the money was properly spent for that which was approved. So the strategy adopted was that only 25 per cent of the money was given in advance up front; then reimbursements occurred during the course of the project. In fact, \$6.5 million worth of commitments were made against the \$5.7 million line, but only \$2 million had been forwarded. That was to maintain some strict auditing and accounting controls.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Budget papers (at the same reference) state that the wage pause programme—I think that this information cropped up in the employment statement that the Premier tabled in the House—that the Government inherited from the former Federal Government was \$17.54 million, in round figures and that that enabled the employment of 2 400 people. There is not much indication as to the duration—it talks about maybe up to nine months. Then it talks about the CEP programme, the present Federal Government scheme, of \$21.74 million and refers to the State's \$5.7 million, but nowhere can I find out how many people were employed as a result of the CEP part of the total equation. I am really seeking a bit more information on the total number of these temporary jobs that were provided during 1983-84 under all the programmes.

Some reference has been made to 7 000 jobs—that is the figure that is bandied around fairly loosely—but the Budget papers indicate that 2 400 people were employed through the wage pause programme. I cannot find what the contribution of the CEP fund's \$21.74 million provided in temporary jobs. We know that the State funds in last year's budget committed \$6.5 million, although only \$2 million was spent. I want to know how many people got temporary employment during 1983-84 as a result of all the programmes.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The number of people who were employed at the end of June, was 3 100, actually physically working, but there were other—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Who have been in and out?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is useful. I would also like the total number of people who during 1983-84 were taken off the dole.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: And put into jobs? We will get that for you. It is somewhere in excess of 6 000.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The figure of 7 000 has been bandied around in Government circles as the number of people who were given work—it is only temporary work; 3 100 people were actually in employment at the end of the financial year under all the schemes?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would like to know the total number of people who have been in and out or are currently there, who at the start of the financial year may not have been in employment, but have had some experience as a result of all the programmes during the year.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That can be done. The Deputy Leader said that it was only temporary employment. By their very nature, the schemes are only temporary. Nobody has ever attempted to suggest that job creation programmes are the answer to unemployment; they are not. They are just part of the answer in a downturn economy to give people an opportunity, and in some cases their first opportunity, to find employment. The feedback and knowledge that we have is that in many cases—not always, of course—that affords the opportunity to some worker who may have been out of work for some time and who had been applying for work, having been discarded by employers because he or she had not worked for a long period and/or, alternatively, in other circumstances had not had any work experience at all.

I am not able to quote those figures either. It would take a lot of work to pursue them, but we are programming this and trying to re-assess our position. I am so concerned about the ongoing state of this matter and about whether we are handling it correctly that a seminar was held at the Secretariat on Friday last week in which those concerned reassessed themselves, criticised and tried to establish whether or not they could do better and in what circumstances. There are people whom we know, but we do not know how many, have been afforded the opportunity of finding full-time employment, in my view mostly because they had the opportunity of having some work experience under job creation schemes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be grateful if the Minister could get as accurate figures as can be obtained in relation to that matter. It would be very difficult to verify, I know, and figures, unfortunately, in this area can be interpreted in different ways, but I think that as part of any real analysis of the effectiveness of these job creation schemes—and when we talk about job creation we are talking about creating work, not temporary work—it would be useful if some appreciation could be gained of the number of people who have found full-time work as a result of their experience under one of these Government schemes. We would like to assess the cost benefit of this exercise. It has been put out by the Premier (the Budget papers state this) that \$93 million has been spent on 'job creation' schemes, of which \$63 million is the taxpayers' contribution—people blithely talk about Government contributions, but they are the contributions of the rest of the workforce, the taxpayers.

The other \$30 million is a contribution from local government or other sponsors. If one is assessing the long-term benefit, other than the benefit from work experience, I would think that it would be fairly essential for one to obtain figures in relation to the number of people who found full time work as a result of training and experience gained under these schemes. How many people have been involved in these schemes, and how many people found full time work in 1983-84 as a result of training and experience gained under these schemes? My description of those people as being temporary workers might be accurate.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I can give figures in relation to the first matter, but I am not sure that we are in a position at this stage to produce accurate figures in relation to the number of people who found full time employment. That is a feedback situation, rather than a matter of keeping tabs. It is very difficult to keep tabs on people after they have undertaken the scheme. Labor Market Research will carry out a total assessment of these job creation schemes, and in my view we will all learn something from that reassess-

ment. The findings will be public property, and we will all be in a better position to assess the causes and effects.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask that the information the Minister has undertaken to obtain be presented in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* at a later stage.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If one wants to debate this subject (and I know that debate is not appropriate), one must know the cost benefit, because the schemes are supported by hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds. That inhibits the Government's ability to encourage the private sector to create permanent jobs by a reduction

of taxes and the like. I note that the Government proposes to increase the allocation for the Home Assistance Scheme from \$500 000 to \$800 000. How is that money being spent? As that sum represents a large amount of taxpayers' funds in straightened financial circumstances, will the Minister give details of the schemes and the projects that will be funded?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have a great deal of information on this matter. It is of a statistical nature, and I seek leave to insert it in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR
HOME ASSISTANCE SCHEME
SUMMARY OF APPROVALS 1983-84

Local Government Authority	Approval			Local government contribution	Person week work	No. of persons to be employed
	Support	Home improvements	Total			
	\$	\$	\$	\$		
C.C. Payneham	5 309	15 652	20 961	16 850	63	5
C.C. Unley		7 450	7 450	10 200	26	1
C.C. Port Adelaide		28 318	28 318	10 000	104	4
C.T. St Peters	6 610	16 886	23 496	9 250	78	3
C.C. West Torrens		23 425	23 425	8 187	78	3
C.C. Elizabeth		18 794	18 794	17 400	64	4
C.C. Woodville	28 000	46 928	74 928	19 600	239	17
C.C. Mitcham		17 928	17 195	5 015	60	2
C.C. Tea Tree Gully	4 818	—	4 818	11 166	16	2
C.T. Thebarton		8 821	8 821	5 750	30	5
C.C. Port Lincoln		11 470	11 470	8 173	36	2
D.C. Kanyaka-Quorn		5 731	5 731	1 800	20	1
D.C. Eudunda	3 174	5 731	8 905	1 800	30	3
C.C. Port Pirie		8 443	8 443	3 900	26	2
D.C. Tumby Bay		8 092	8 092	4 000	24	3
D.C. Snowtown		3 903	3 903	1 000		
D.C. Murray Bridge	16 686	23 905	40 591	21 500	124	10
D.C. Barossa		2 170	2 170	1 460	8	1
D.C. Murat Bay		10 020	10 020	6 840	40	4
C.T. Peterborough		7 200	7 200	1 000	24	1
D.C. Elliston		2 700	2 700	1 113	10	2
C.C. Kensington and Norwood	8 280	8 420	16 700	13 300	64	4
C.T. Renmark		4 000	4 000	2 000	10	1
D.C. Stirling	8 900	17 200	26 100	10 950	78	3
Total Grants	81 777	302 454	384 231	192 254	1 265	83

Local Government Authority	Approval			Local Govt Contrib.	Person Week Work	No. of Persons to be Employed			No. of Projects/ Visits as Claimed to 18.8.84	
	Support	Home Improvements	Total			Total	Male	Female	Support	Home Improve.
	\$	\$	\$	\$						
C.C. Payneham	5 309	15 652	20 961	16 850	63	5	4	1	Not Stated	38
C.C. Unley		7 450	7 450	10 200	26	1	1	—	—	83
C.C. Port Adelaide		28 318	28 318	10 000	104	4	4	—	—	—
C.T. St Peters	6 610	16 886	23 496	9 250	78	3	1	2	92	96
C.C. West Torrens		23 425	23 425	8 187	78	3	3	—	—	—

Local Government Authority	Approval			Local Govt Contrib.	Person Week Work	No. of Persons to be Employed			No. of Projects/Visits as Claimed to 18.8.84	
	Support	Home Improvements	Total			Total	Male	Female	Support	Home Improve.
	\$	\$	\$			\$				
C.C. Elizabeth		18 794	18 794	17 400	64	4	3	1	—	—
C.C. Woodville	28 000	46 928	74 928	19 600	239	17	10	7	—	—
C.C. Mitcham		17 928	17 195	5 015	60	2	2	—	—	—
C.C. Tea Tree Gully	4 818	—	4 818	11 166	16	2	—	2	22	—
C.T. Thebarton		8 821	8 821	5 750	30	5	5	—	—	—
C.C. Port Lincoln		11 470	11 470	8 173	36	2	2	—	—	30
D.C. Kanyaka-Quorn		5 731	5 731	1 800	20	1	1	—	—	19
D.C. Eudunda									Not Stated	
	3 174	5 731	8 905	1 800	30	3	2	1		33
C.C. Port Pirie		8 443	8 443	3 900	26	2	2	—	—	64
D.C. Tumby Bay		8 092	8 092	4 000	24	3	3	—	—	22
D.C. Snowtown		3 903	3 903	1 000	—	—	—	—	—	—
D.C. Murray Bridge	16 686	23 905	40 591	21 500	124	10	8	2	—	—
D.C. Barossa		2 170	2 170	1 460	8	1	1	—	—	20
D.C. Murat Bay		10 020	10 020	6 840	40	4	4	—	—	—
C.T. Peterborough		7 200	7 200	1 000	24	1	1	—	—	—
D.C. Elliston		2 700	2 700	1 113	10	2	2	—	—	7
C.C. Kensington and Norwood	8 280	8 420	16 700	13 300	64	4	2	2	29	6
C.T. Renmark		4 000	4 000	2 000	10	1	1	—	—	—
D.C. Stirling	8 900	17 200	26 100	10 950	78	3	1	2	—	—
Total Grants	81 777	302 454	384 231	192 254	1 265	83	63	20		

The Hon. J.D. Wright: This scheme has proved to be one of the most popular schemes. Some people do not take full benefit of other schemes, but many councils have been interested in this scheme. Mr Bentley informs me that many fresh applications and applications for continuation of projects have been received. The scheme is well accepted in the community.

Mr PLUNKETT: How many inspectors are appointed to inspect shearers accommodation and investigate complaints?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: South Australia has only ever had one shearers accommodation inspector, who investigates complaints and provides advice regarding prosecution for breaches of the legislation. I see all his reports, and I have not seen anyone who is as busy as that man. He is very active, travelling over all of South Australia. He acts on complaints and on his own volition, virtually running his own programme. Although South Australia is a large State for one person to cover, I suggest that this inspector does the job as well as anyone could possibly do it, and I commend him for his work.

Mr PLUNKETT: The job was very demanding when the inspector was first employed, and I presume that he has got on top of the job over the years. How many complaints have been received regarding shearers' accommodation?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I do not have those figures, but I could provide details. There are two methods by which the inspector operates: first, by complaint, normally through the Australian Workers Union from one of the organisers, the secretary, or someone else; secondly, the inspector travels around the State after dividing it into sections, visiting as many sheds as possible, both in shearing season and at other times. The best time for the inspector to view a shed is in shearing season so that he can see how people fit into the accommodation.

However, that is not possible because, if the inspector waited for shearing time, he would not get around to them all. Therefore, he continually visits station properties and,

where necessary, places an order on those properties to comply with the accommodation requirements. He gives people a certain amount of time to arrange for contractors to do such work. The honourable member made an interesting point when he said that when this person was first appointed—which was back in about 1973—there was a vast amount of work to be done. There continues to be a vast amount of work to be done, because the Act changes from time to time. There were some amendments to that Act last year. The inspector has the sole responsibility of ensuring that this accommodation is up to scratch. I do not see this occupation as one that will run down due to the effluxion of time, as there will always be a need to have a person serving in that capacity.

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister obtain those figures for me, because they are of interest to my constituents? I turn now to the question of prosecutions. I presume that the Minister does not have these figures with him, so I would appreciate his providing them to me at a later date.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will be happy to provide the honourable member with all of that information in a similar way to that about which I was given guidance a few moments ago—by ordinary response to a question. If a question is raised by a committee member its members are entitled to the information asked for. I have a list of prosecutions here that I will provide to the honourable member because I do not wish to waste the committee's time reading it out.

Mr BECKER: How many persons are employed in administering the Commonwealth Employment Programme and related schemes? On page 3 of the introduction to the Minister's Department in the yellow book it states that staff numbers at the end of June 1983 were 290.2 public servants 4.7 weekly-paid employees, and 21 others, a total of 315.9 positions. At the end of June 1984 there were 342.3 positions excluding 12 persons employed under the CEP scheme and 47 apprentices. The proposed number as at June 1985 is 360 employees. Is there a component in that increase for

the CEP programme because at page 9 of the yellow book under the heading 'Employment and employee incentive schemes', it shows a proposed staff figure for 1984-85 of 27.5 proposed staff and a staff in 1983-84 of 18.6 people. Are the 12 CEP persons included in that figure? The whole thing seems a little bit tight. At page 123 of his report the Auditor-General states:

An amount of \$217 000 representing one per cent of total project grants provided under the Community Employment Programme was allocated to offset State Government expenditure on salaries and operating expenses relative to the programme. Total salaries and administrative expenses of the Job Creation Unit, \$441 000, were met from Consolidated Account. The transactions are reflected in the Departmental Statements of Recurrent Receipts and Payments.

How is this whole thing administered, how many people are employed in this department, and how many will be employed in the current year?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am not quite sure what the honourable member's questions were.

Mr BECKER: How many people are employed in job recreation work, because I notice an increase in the number in your Department?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The State contribution to the Job Creation Unit as at the end of June this year was 16 people. This is complemented by 17 Commonwealth employees. So far we are the only State that has been able to operate peacefully and continually under a joint secretariat. Queensland may just be reaching that stage after a couple of years of agonising about this matter. However, we have had this combination right from the beginning and that has helped us tremendously to work more successfully. There are 33 people there, all told.

Mr BECKER: Will there be an increase in that number next year?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There is none proposed. There is no intention to increase that number nor, as I understand it, is there any need to increase it. I think that the present staff is able to work with the necessary quality and speed to deal with the programmes coming forward.

Mr BECKER: My next question relates to the administration of the Job Creation Scheme. Amounts have been paid to SGIC to provide workers compensation in relation to this scheme. At page 445 of his Report the Auditor-General, when referring to the State Government Insurance Commission, under the heading 'Workers Compensation—Managed Funds', states:

Arrangements have been made with the South Australian Department of Labour's Job Creation and Community Employment Programmes for the administration of workers compensation claims. At 30 June amounts of \$1 101 360 and \$590 152 were held.

Are they the sums that have been paid to SGIC to cover workers under the various schemes; how many claims have been made, and what are the amounts of those claims?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am not in a position to say how many claims have been made, but I will get that figure for the member. The system under which this scheme operates is that money is paid to SGIC, which gets interest on that money, and the Job Creation Scheme then buys its way out of that scheme. The only money that comes out of the Job Creation Fund is the cost of meeting all of the workers compensation claims against it—it is a burning cost scheme.

Mr BECKER: Therefore, the SGIC is not taking much of a risk.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is taking no risk.

Mr BECKER: I like the idea of the Job Creation Programme, what it has done and the fact that it has provided work experience for people. Has the Minister had an opportunity to discuss with his Federal counterpart the providing

of an opportunity for some workers to transfer from one job to another?

One could be three months on the dole and then get a job under a Job Creation Programme in one's local area and work for nine months. Then, if one is unable to obtain any employment one has to go back on the dole for three months before one can go back to a Job Creation Programme. This means that workers are taking about a 25 per cent cut in pay. It seems that there is no continuity, and some of these people are looking for permanency.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: This is a difficult area. The member for Todd brought up the problems experienced by the Tea Tree Gully council. The member for Hanson may have been absent when I answered that. The guidelines are specific: there is no continuity of employment unless one fits into the three-month category. The case cited previously concerned an electrician working at an instrumentality with only two months work, with a new scheme starting with the same employer. In those circumstances there is some legitimacy that he can continue in employment. But, if one has had one's full three months, the new scheme and its new employees must involve those people for which the scheme was designed in the first place; that is, the people who have been unemployed for a minimum of three months—disadvantaged people.

The problems it causes at administrative and officer level have been discussed from time to time, particularly where one sponsor goes directly to a new job. It simply means that they must dismiss all the people who are working for them, go to the CES and pick up more people. While I have some sympathy with what is occurring, my first sympathy lies with those people who have been out of work. I am sure that the honourable member would agree. He asked whether I have had consultations and discussions with the Hon. Ralph Willis. The answer is 'Yes', and we have tried to evolve methods to overcome this difficulty. While the philosophy of the scheme is as it is, it is almost impractical to do much about it.

Mr GREGORY: Page 26 of the yellow book indicates a significant increase in expenditure on safety of lifts, elevators and similar machinery, yet there is no proposed increase in the number of personnel who carry out inspections. Will the Minister explain how the extra money is being spent?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Concerning 'Safety of lifts, elevators and similar machinery' the proposed 1983-84 salary figure was \$178 000 and the actual was \$180 000. The estimate for 1984-85 is \$188 000. Concerning accommodation and services, there was no amount in 1983-84 and in 1984-85 it is proposed at \$18 000. Under 'Other Expenditure' the proposed 1983-84 figure was \$20 000 and the actual was \$22 000. The estimated 1984-85 figure is \$29 000. The major difference includes previously unallocated costs—I do not know where they were before—and rates and taxes at regional offices.

Mr GREGORY: On page 25 of the yellow book under the heading 'Safety of Commercial and Industrial Premises', the proposed expenditure is significant, with an increase of nearly three persons in the employment area. Will the Minister indicate what work it is proposed that the additional people will do and explain the increased expenditure?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will ask Mr Bachmann to answer that question as it comes down to clerical staff, which I am not familiar with.

Mr Bachmann: There has been a reallocation of the costings for staff within the Regional Services Branch, mainly in the clerical area, where they are engaged on work that involves a number of subprogrammes. The extra approximately three people is brought about by such reallocation. There would be a corresponding reduction in one of the other programmes in regional services, and that would give

a balanced figure, but total staff in that area have not changed.

Mr GREGORY: Page 28 of the yellow book shows a significant increase in expenditure on air pollutants (dust, smoke, asbestos, etc.). Will the Minister explain this?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The increase to which the member is referring is totally and solely to do with the transfer of the Asbestos Unit from PBD to the Department of Labour.

Mr GREGORY: The Asbestos Unit will then come under the occupational safety and health inspectors?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes.

[Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2 p.m.]

Mr ASHENDEN: In asking further questions of the Deputy Premier about the CEP, I understand that the funds are Federal but obviously there is State involvement in respect of administration. Has the State Government a set of priorities for projects involved in the scheme? Does it consider work on roads to be more important than work on recreation facilities or on the extension of buildings? Are any criteria used or feasibility studies undertaken to determine which projects are agreed and which are not agreed?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is important to point out to the member that there is a Secretariat that looks at, and makes recommendations about, schemes selected from the many advanced. The objective of the programme is to confine them within the guidelines which, as I explained earlier, are set by the Commonwealth.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You added one condition.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes. The States are able to make a contribution to the guidelines, but they are really under the control of the Federal Minister and, therefore, Federal Cabinet. I relate to the member where the objectives lie, as follows:

The objective of the CEP programme is to create additional employment opportunities for unemployed persons through the funding of labour and extensive projects of social and economic benefit to the community. Specially agreed guidelines between the State and the Commonwealth provide that CEP is to be directed at those unemployed persons who are particularly disadvantaged in the labour market and who are consequently least likely to obtain benefit from improved economic activity; those suffering from social and other disadvantages; equal access is provided for men and women to employment opportunities.

One of the major difficulties in South Australia has been to accommodate schemes that have given equal opportunity to women, irrespective of age. If the whole programme had been left to the proposers of schemes I am afraid that we would have been running at about a 20 per cent maximum in finding employment for an equal percentage of females in comparison to males. Because of certain initiatives by the Secretariat and by the policy committee we have been able to lift the percentage of females. On Monday Cabinet endorsed recommendations from the committee on CEP schemes that were in the main designated for female labour. We hope that based on that requirement we will be able to get over 40 per cent in the next few months as these schemes come on stream. The directive further provides:

In some instances this may necessitate special measures to ensure that women receive an equal share.

That provision has been an absolute necessity, and I will cite an example. As a result of staff ceilings the Department of Labour was short of inspectors and decided to go to the Equal Opportunities Board to obtain agreement from the Board that the Department could create certain positions for a period of nine months during which the Department employed 12 women specifically on inspectorial work. After a training period they went out into the field and did a satisfactory job. I imagine that in the future some of those people could be considered as prospective inspectors within

the Department when vacancies occur. The guidelines further state:

Funds are also earmarked for roads expenditure. Positions under CEP should provide persons with work experience and/or training which will assist participants in obtaining employment.

That is one of the major areas where the committee makes recommendations to the Government, after taking both of those areas into consideration; that is, work experience and/or training. If we have a proposal where a great component of that programme will give individuals employed under the programme training and work experience, then that is an important factor in determining a recommendation. As I said earlier, another point is that schemes are always given a higher priority where there is a possibility of ongoing employment. For example, I refer to the West Beach Trust complex that was opened last Sunday week by the Premier. The Trust had some low cost units erected. I think those units to an ordinary family would cost about \$34 a night and each unit can accommodate about six or seven people; it has been impossible up to the present for anyone to get self-contained units at such a tariff. The Trust has made those units available on the West Beach frontage to low wage or disadvantaged people who can now have a decent holiday in this fantastic location adjacent to two golf courses and the beach frontage with almost everything provided. Not only is that an important direction for the project to go but it also creates further employment through the need for people to run that facility. I am not sure how many full-time jobs were created, but at least three to five people will be employed running that facility. The guidelines further state:

Projects should relate to the provision of facilities and services of public and of community benefit.

For example, I suppose this last year this would have involved 25 or 30 projects (one loses count), but on Saturday night I was in Port Augusta opening a community project for the benefit of people at Stirling North. About 300 people attended the function to see the new dance hall, bar and sports room being opened. That project will employ one full-time person—one more person who did not have a job previously and who is now employed. The guidelines continue:

Further priority consideration will also be given to projects in areas of high unemployment.

That has been one of the major difficulties to come to terms with. While one can have that as a citation of what one is trying to do, we have found within the programme itself that it has been difficult to encourage some communities and instrumentalities such as councils to put up programmes that are suitable in helping disadvantaged people.

We have tried to the best of our ability to make recommendations to Cabinet on the basis that money should be allocated into a particular area in relation to the percentage of unemployment in that area. I received a good deal of criticism about Burnside council, which was one of the first proposals under the scheme. Burnside council did its homework very quickly, and, from memory, I think it was one of the first councils to be given a fairly large sum for certain job creation projects in its area. It was put to me by certain people, who shall remain nameless, that Burnside should not be a high priority area in relation to disadvantaged or unemployed people. My answer was that in the overall spectrum in a 12-month period the ambition of the Secretariat and the Government is to ensure that the amount of money per capita, per person who is unemployed in a particular area should be allocated.

If we stick rigidly to that sort of programming, it should come out fairly equal in the end. I know of no better way of trying to alleviate unemployment and to help the disadvantaged than to try to keep a strict check on where the

programmes are going and allocate money accordingly. I think the honourable member should be satisfied about the philosophy, the precautions and the way in which the programme is divided up as evenly as possible in relation to unemployed and disadvantaged people.

Mr ASHENDEN: I assume from the Minister's answer that preference is given to the building of recreational facilities rather than roads. My original question related more to the type of projects to which priority is given rather than the geographical areas. My next question relates to possible overruns. When approval is given to a project obviously the council or body concerned does its homework to the best of its ability. However, there is always the possibility that a project will ultimately cost more than the funding provided. In that situation are additional funds made available and, if so, is it Federal funding or State funding which picks up the overrun? Who audits the cost of projects to ensure that there has not been any lack of care and to ensure that funds are spent correctly?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Australian Auditor-General audits the programmes. Each individual scheme is maintained separately to make it easy to pick up whether there has been an overrun. Unfortunately, there have been overruns, and I can recall at least two or three that have come to my attention. That is taken into consideration. If the supervising committee recommends that the overrun be picked up once it is satisfied with the reason for the overrun, accommodation is made for the project to receive an overrun. I am not aware of any situation in which the committee has not recommended the accommodation of an overrun, but I may be wrong about that. Mr Bentley may be able to give more information.

Mr Bentley: There have been one or two instances where project sponsors have sought more funds and, on inspection of the request, it has become apparent that the reason for the request was due to the way in which the nature of the project had partly changed during its course. In those instances the request was rejected and the project had to find its own sponsor contribution if it wanted the initiative to continue. Every request for a project variation is examined closely. I cannot recall the exact number of requests that have been rejected: it may be as high as 10 or 15 per cent, but I do not think it is any higher.

The committee looks at that first after obtaining advice from the Secretariat. The request is then forwarded to the Minister. More usually, the cost overruns have related to wage indexation increases, and on some occasions it has involved construction work. Even the best consultant in the world—and some projects have involved the use of consultants—could not anticipate a further problem being found after building work has commenced. They are vetted very carefully.

Mr ASHENDEN: Is it State or Federal funding which picks up the overruns?

Mr Bentley: The State picks up overruns only when a State Government Department or authority is the sponsor. If it involves a local council or community organisation, the only two possible ways in which the overruns can be met are from the sponsor's own money or from Commonwealth funds. The same applies with State Government projects: the only two possible sources are State Government funds or Commonwealth Government funds.

Mr ASHENDEN: Are unemployed workers who are employed under the scheme required to join a union before they are given employment?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: State Government policy is well known in regard to preference to unionists. It is not required that a person join a union before he begins employment. However, an employee is required to give an undertaking that he is prepared to join the appropriate organisation at

the first opportunity. It may be that the employee has no money to join a union before he starts a job. There is an expectancy, as there is in the State sphere, that preference in employment shall be given to financial members of the appropriate organisation. That does not mean to say that one cannot find employment because one is not a financial member of an organisation. However, an employee is expected to give a reasonable guarantee that he is prepared to join the appropriate organisation.

I think that is a very important feature of the industrial peace we have at the moment. The Government is not the only organisation which has this type of policy. The car manufacturing industry and other private employers around the country have come to the conclusion, I think properly, that, if an employee has the opportunity of working where there is a union or association which takes cases before the Industrial Court and has responsibility for looking after one's industrial needs, there should be an obligation on the employee to join that organisation.

It is like joining a club; one does not go to a club and use its facilities for nothing. If one wants to be a member of that fine Redlegs Club and use its facilities one displays a badge, such as I am displaying today and hope to be for the next few months. The State Unemployment Relief schemes and the RED scheme of a long time ago were similar in content to the current scheme, but I hope that we have improved in running them and are giving better service, better value for the dollar and better cost benefit than was the case in the past because we were all new in that sort of operation in those days. Since the introduction of the wage pause scheme (and I give credit to the previous Liberal Government for introducing that scheme; it just surprises me that it did not introduce it earlier than it did), there has not been to the best of my knowledge a stoppage or hold up of work over somebody refusing to join a union. Generally, throughout Australia these days, the more thinking and co-operative employers realise that they will not have disputes over someone who refuses to meet their obligations as a result of the working conditions provided for them.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As a supplementary question, and I do not want to get into debate with the Minister in relation to that attitude to so-called preference to unionists—

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that you will not.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I may get a chance to raise it later in the afternoon. Some complaints came to the Opposition, I think from a district council in the first instance, that the unions were demanding a year's subscription from the CEP people who may have been getting only six months work. I saw letters to the Minister. What was the result of those approaches?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am of the opinion that if not all, certainly most, organisations—and my own organisation, the AWU, is one of those, and was bound by its Federal rules, which were effective within the State as well—up until a couple of years ago had the rule that demanded that somebody joining a union had to pay the full subscription irrespective of the period of the financial year. I know that within my own organisation, the AWU, that does not now apply; it has a quarterly ticket. It is my understanding that all organisations that would or could be involved in CEP programmes have had their rules amended, if that was necessary, to accommodate a situation of short-term employment. I will not try to mislead the Committee by saying that I know that for a fact, but that is what has happened as I understand it. Nobody in the past six or eight months has complained directly to me about having to either join the union or pay a full year's subscription for a part-year benefit. I would have to subscribe to that view.

The rules of the AWU—although I opposed them, I was a part of them for many years—were quite wrong. One cannot demand a year's advance payment for services that may never be rendered. I qualify that by saying, as I have said on many occasions, that anyone who works where an award operates and a union is responsible for it should be a member of that union, but I subscribe to the view that if one is to work for only three months that is all one should have to pay for. I do not think that many unions were left in that category about which the Deputy Leader talks. The AWU was probably one of the last to have changed that philosophy of a 12-month ticket. Almost all of them now can now accommodate people for whatever period they will work on that job.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a fact that the requirement to join a union is not one of the guidelines set down by the Federal Minister. In answer to a question in the Federal Parliament, he made clear that, despite the fact that there was a Federal Labor Government, that was not a requirement of the Federal Government. Therefore, it was a decision of the State Government to impose that condition.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: This is one of the very rare occasions on which the Minister of Industrial Relations, Ralph Willis, and I disagree. Mr Willis made that statement: he took the view that some of these people may have been out of work for long periods and therefore ought not to be required to join a union. That is not the policy of the State Government and never has been. We have taken the view that if one decides to work in a place where other unionists are working one ought to carry one's weight and be part of that organisation; otherwise there can be disagreement and dissent within the work force. As I said earlier, many of the very major organisations in Australia now require a person to sign a contract of agreement that that person will join the appropriate union almost immediately on joining that organisation. So I do not think that the State Government is offside with the general question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It does not make it right, though.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a matter of conviction.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Deputy Leader and I would not agree on this matter.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No way.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Deputy Leader would take the view that a person need not join at all and he would leave it on a voluntary basis, but he would not take that view concerning his local bowls or croquet club.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: One does not have to join the bowls or croquet club.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: One does if one wants to play. If one wants to participate one becomes a member of that club. I do not see any difference between that and wanting to play in the field of unionism.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: One does not have to play bowls, but one does have to work to earn a living. I come now to the area of occupational health, which is mentioned first on page 5, in relation to Government strategies, aims and what have you. The Government report into occupational health has just been published, and the final report follows pretty closely along the lines of the working paper—predictably so; that is the track down which the Victorian Labor Government has gone and it is the track down which Labor Governments around Australia are going. That is not surprising because they are going down the same track in workers compensation, as I pointed out this morning. Despite the Government commissioned Cooney Report in Victoria, which has recommended differently and lines up with what the Liberal Government here has

proposed, there seems to be not collusion but certainly more than a similarity between what the Labor Party in South Australia is proposing and the track down which the Victorians have gone in relation to their legislation on occupational health.

I understand that the Bill has been put to Parliament but has been held up in the Upper House. I am not quite sure of the end result. I believe that the report is fairly predictable. It is interesting that the only employer representative on the committee of inquiry (which has a membership of eight or 10), Mr Maslin, has made a personal statement, which appears at the beginning of the report. From that, it is pretty clear that the hang-ups in Victoria and the hang-ups of employers here indicate that the Minister will have a lot of trouble obtaining consensus for what is proposed. The Minister has heard the objections of the single employer representative echoed by employer groups generally on the basis that the proposal will add to the cost of industry, therefore affecting employment.

One of the major objections relates to trade union health centres, which are to be funded by the taxpayers. We talk about such things being funded by the Government, but the Government gets funds from the taxpayers—all of us. Everyone who earns anything in South Australia will be funding the trade union health centres. This scheme has been vehemently opposed by employers and by people in the health industry. I have read the report and the initial recommendations in relation to funding. Control is quite clear. Will the Minister say what worldwide experience (and I know that a similar scheme has been operating elsewhere in Australia) leads him to suggest that public funded facilities are the best means by which to look after the health of employees?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Deputy Leader stated that the only employer representative made certain comments. For the record, the membership was as follows: John Matthews, Chairman; John Lesses, the sole representative of the trade union movement; Malcolm Maslin, the sole representative of the employer organisations; Hedley Bachmann, representing the Government; Keith Wilson, representing the Health Commission; and Stephanie Key, from the Working Women's Centre. I believe that that is a fairly broad committee. May I say at this stage that I have received no criticism, either before or after the appointments were made, that that committee—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There were three working parties with a membership of eight people.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There were also three working parties, yes? I have received no complaint that that committee was not broad enough to bring down a report. It is interesting that there are some areas of dissent; Mr Maslin and, in fact, Mr Bachmann did not agree with some aspects, but that does not detract from the total report. On the evidence taken and the knowledge available to the committee, it was recommended that trade union health centres be established. I believe it is important to bear in mind that we have before us a report, certain recommendations of which are totally acceptable to all sides. In fact, I would say (and this is an assessment virtually off the top of my head without my having obtained a specific report) that there is almost 80 per cent agreement at this time to the recommendations of that report.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is disagreement on pretty fundamental issues—on 20 per cent of the most important matters.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will deal with one issue, and the honourable member will have an opportunity to raise those matters. I believe that most people in South Australia are reasonable enough in their attitudes and wise enough in their knowledge to know that we cannot accept the present

rate of industrial accidents. Ralph Willis stated recently that 300 people will be killed in the work place in Australia this year. The costs relating to industrial accidents are becoming totally exorbitant, and in my view and in the view of those who sat down to think about it, the total scene of occupational safety, health and welfare is wound up with workers compensation. My view is that those areas run parallel. If we obviate the possibility or probability of accidents in the work place, we must de-escalate the very high cost of workers compensation at the same time. I view those matters as parallel. We are reviewing workers compensation and occupational safety, health and welfare at the same time.

There is a very strong belief in the trade union movement, which presented the committee with very positive evidence, that, unless they have control of occupational health units, the average person on the job who has an accident will have no trust in those units. It has been put to me (and I place it no higher than that) that there is a lack of confidence in some of the units that are operating at present, because the direction seems to be that by necessity and at all costs accident victims must be channelled back into the work place as soon as possible. It was also put to the committee that the confidence of accident victims will be restored when they are placed back into the workforce if they have their own centres. I know that there is a contrary opinion. Mr Maslin and Mr Bachmann do not subscribe to that view, but many people do. The simple answer to the honourable member's question at this stage is that the report is a document; the Government will be advocating consensus, agreement, and a move forward in the right direction. It may not be possible to achieve all that Dr John Matthews and his committee recommended in one period, but I believe that the ambitions and directions of the report are the right way to go to create consensus.

I turn now to the matter raised by the honourable member in relation to the direction that the Victorian and South Australian Governments are taking with regard to workers compensation and industrial, safety, health and welfare matters. There is quite positive consultation between Labor States as to what types of programmes should be implemented to give added and better protection to workers. I make no apology for that, and nor should I. If Labor Governments do not do that then I am convinced that other Governments—whatever their political colour—will not and do not do that. History provides evidence that the same interest in safety, welfare, protection, and compensation of workers is not shown by other types of Governments. Therefore, if Victoria and South Australia happen to be going down similar tracks at the same time in relation to this area, I make no apology for that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister has indicated that there might be some second thoughts in relation to some of the recommendations of the report. I recall that one of the resolutions of the Australian Labor Party Conference deals with this matter, as it dealt with workers compensation. In fact, it endorsed the inevitable findings of the Committee before this report was published. I think on the basis of the working party report. I am one of those who believes that such resolutions are not the best way to deliver rehabilitation and health care in this area. Therefore, I find myself in agreement with every employer group that has thought about this matter.

The Minister indicated the other areas Mr Maslin points out, areas which were discussed in a number of places and which disagree with the thrust of the report. I turn now to the penalties that the report is proposing and the question of the authority of the safety representative on the shop floor. I think that the point being made is that if any safety measure is to be successful it needs to be a co-operative effort between employer and employee. I am of the view

that the incentive exists for this to happen. I do not disagree with a lot of what the Minister said as everybody understands the cost of industrial accidents. The incentive certainly exists for employers, because of high workers compensation premiums, to minimise the number of accidents that occur on their premises, because the penalties associated with accident claims are quite prohibitive.

The point being made, and the thrust of this report, is the reference to an 'us and them' attitude, which gives authority to a safety representative to close down an operation. It is one that they are objecting to. Does the Minister believe that this report represents what I would term 'a co-operative approach' to this question of industrial safety, or does he believe that there is an element of confrontation about it? This is what struck me about the report of the working party, and the final report, which mirrors the track that it was going down very closely and which indicates that there is a 'them and us' attitude to this question of industrial safety.

I was reinforced in that view when I heard a representative of the trade union movement and the TLC speaking at a forum on workers compensation prior to a Ministers' conference. It was perfectly clear that that spokesman was on about punishing employers, and the idea of retribution being available to unions in terms of Draconian penalties was very much to the fore in his mind. It seems to me that, if any safety proposals or preventive measures are to work, they must have the wholehearted support of employers and employees, and that that support needs to be co-operative. I am interested in the Minister's comments about the thrust of these recommendations and the fears that employers have about putting this weapon in the hands of an employee in terms of that employee's ability to close down the operation of an enterprise.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The first point I comment on is the one in which the honourable member said that to really facilitate occupation, safety, health and welfare into the workplace one needs to have a co-operative system working between employer and employee. I could not agree more with that statement, and I have used that phraseology many times in speeches on this matter. Irrespective of what type of legislation Governments introduce it can only be a framework under which parties involved need to take guidance and need to be able to ensure that that is carried out on the work floor.

From time to time I have been invited to present special certificates where a safety record has been exceeded or a record broken. It has been clear in such circumstances that where that is occurring there has been much co-operation one with the other. If a foreman is vitally interested in this matter, a shop steward is just as interested as that foreman and a direction comes from management that it wants to make the workplace safer to work in, that is great and that is when a great deal of co-ordination and co-operation comes into being. Therefore, I have no argument with the statement made by the honourable member as it is one of importance, and, irrespective of whether we are able to change this piece of legislation, that sort of co-operation and leadership will always be required—not only co-operation, but leadership from above, which is a very important factor.

I think that it is important to recall that there have not been any major changes in the occupation, safety, health and welfare legislation for 12 years, I think since 1972 when the legislation was last amended. I think that that was done by a Select Committee of Parliament, which considered this matter in detail because there had been no reforms for many years before that. I can recall that in 1972 that legislation was claimed to be the best in Australia. I heard trade union officials, such as Mr Carmichael and others,

laud that piece of legislation. However, times have changed, and there are more difficulties now in industry than there were in 1972. The Government has seen as one of its priorities the establishing of the Committee that Mr John Matthews chaired to examine this matter in great detail. This was a committee that the Government considered had broad participation and broad ideas and would achieve broad objectives.

Having said that, I point out that there is some disputation with employers about some of the recommendations that have been made. We have already dealt with one of them. The other major one that employers disagree with is the recommendation that a properly—and I use that word advisedly—elected, trained representative will be entrusted with the power—before an inspector from the Department is able to arrive at the scene—to stop the job and say, 'Look, this is an unsafe place in which to work.'

I remind members of the Committee that already under Australian common law there is an applicable provision that, if any employee decided he was working in an unsafe place and protested about it and was forced to continue work or be dismissed, he has a claim under common law, first for the instruction to go out and, secondly, for anything that happened to him by way of an accident.

The recommendations contained in the report come from overseas in the main. On the evidence provided to me at this time—and no-one has provided evidence to the contrary—this particular system has been in operation in Canada for many years and has never been wilfully abused. One should remember that, first, there is a person in that capacity who is trained and has the responsibility of looking after the welfare of the people working in that place. At this moment there is provision for safety representatives under the Act: that has never been taken up because we never gave them proper protection in the first place.

If one talks to building industry unions one will clearly establish that the reason they would not take up safety representatives jobs is that they were not given similar protection. What was happening, particularly in a downturn period, was that the employee was blamed for some union activity or something and found that he never got to the next job.

The report recommends that we install those safety representatives with powers to stop the job and that we also afford those persons the same protection as is given now to shop stewards, because of the possibility of victimisation. The other alternative (which I think is worse—to be completely honest) is that, if one has people with no responsibility, no training, no leadership and no understanding of the circumstances, one will find that bedlam is created by someone on the job making up his or her mind that it is an unsafe place in which to work and that that work should stop immediately. We all know that that has happened. However, if one has a trained, responsible person who knows the law and where to go to get someone to verify the situation or order them back to work or whatever, it seems a much more organised and regulated way of tuning into this particular problem.

I reiterate that this report is now out for consultation and feedback, which is coming in. Some of the criticisms that the honourable member raises are afforded in those submissions. Again, it is a matter that has to be closely looked at and filtered through IRAC. We need consensus. I am not sure why the fears raised by the honourable member are accentuated in this way.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am only voicing the fears I detect in the community.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The filtering arrangements are there, and consensus will be achieved in this manner.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The report talks about not only the authority but also setting up an institute of occupational health. It is far from clear what the role of the institute will be in relation to the Federal institute that is being mooted. Things are happening on the Federal front in this area and it is far from clear in the report how this institute will mesh in with any Federal body that is set up. Will the Minister throw some light on this? I take it that the time table for this legislation will be about the same as for the workers compensation legislation? As these two matters are complementary and go through the same process, one would expect that they would finish up in final legislative form at about the same time.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am delighted that the honourable member agrees that these two matters are parallel: there is no question about that. I have been saying that publicly for some time. It is important to remember that, whatever negotiations are proceeding in relation to the workers compensation area, similar negotiations are taking place in relation to the occupational health and safety report. As I said earlier, they need to proceed down the same road at the same pace with effect, in my view, on the same people.

The honourable member asked two questions concerning the institute. He might have seen in the press that I recently presented a quite long, involved argument to the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Ralph Willis) supporting a view that the establishment of an institute—and unlike South Australia, the Federal Government has made that decision to establish an institute—is an excellent idea. It is something we have never had. We have therefore had no research on what is happening in these areas. It should be in South Australia. At this moment I have not received a negative reply to that submission. I was notified that a decision was to be made last Wednesday. Not having had a response to my correspondence, which is now about 10 or 12 days old, I think it is apparent that the Minister is having some regard to the case that South Australia has been able to put.

I hope to get a positive reply, but I place it no higher than that. Obviously, if there is a Federal institute and if it is not established in South Australia but on the eastern seaboard or elsewhere, one would have to further consider how one would establish a State institution. I do not say whether we will do that but I refer to the way in which we might do it. It will make much difference when the Commonwealth establishes its institute, because it will be necessary for South Australia to examine what the Commonwealth has done and what is required in terms of back-up support from South Australia and what is required for us to get total information. I am not putting all my eggs in one basket and I just hope that in those circumstances we might get that institute in South Australia.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Are you saying that we would not need a State institute of our own?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: If the Federal institute was established, that is what I am saying.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What about the time table?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am coming to that. The Matthews Report has now been released for about eight weeks and we have given recipients until the middle or the end of October to respond. The report will take much analysing, but there will be great interest in responses to the report, mostly relating to the matters raised by the honourable member. As I stated, about 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the report will not be criticised. IRAC can look at those areas and we can follow a pattern similar to that followed in respect of the Industrial, Conciliation and Arbitration Act where we set up a subcommittee of IRAC officers who reached their own compromises and came back to me with few matters

that were not resolved. That will be the method used in regard to this report. It will take until May, June or July of next year and I want to introduce the legislation to Parliament in July or August.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have no further questions on that topic, but I have other questions and obviously we will not have time to get through them all. I now refer to page 16 of the Programme Estimates in respect of trading hours and the resources put into the area. The first sentence states:

Fair and orderly trading by retail shops is essential for the survival of the small shopkeeper.

It further deals with funding the operations of the Department. What is the position about the proposed extension of shop trading hours? The Minister is on public record as saying that he would agree to an extension of trading hours on Saturday afternoon and suggested that it was up to the unions and the employers to sort themselves out. I was absent when much of this was going on, but there was much publicity in the afternoon press about the extension of shop trading hours and I understand that the Minister said that he would not oppose the extension on Saturday afternoon. What is the present situation? What progress has been made concerning the extension of retail trading in general on Saturday afternoons? Since that statement by the Minister I have noticed that a number of groups have come out in opposition, the latest being the TLC, which has adopted a policy of opposition and which would be a formidable force in terms of the Minister's thinking. What progress has been made in implementing the desired aim of the Government to open up shops on Saturday afternoon?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Let me clear up the last point, because it is important that I do so. The member asked what had been done in order to clear up the desired aim of the Government to introduce Saturday afternoon trading.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That was the impression I got, that you were going to be in it.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Government has no desired aim at all in this matter. I will tell the member what has transpired in this area. When we first came back into Government several public statements were made (at this stage I will not give names, because they are not important; the honourable member will be able to attach names to statements). Many statements were made and much pressure was put on me as the incoming Minister. Obviously, faces change somewhat during a period in Opposition. I was getting telegrams, and public statements were made in favour of Saturday afternoon trading. I believed that it was incumbent upon me to do some work in this area and see exactly what the people who were affected by the industry were thinking. I gave that task to Max Johnson, then Deputy Director, Department of Labour. Anyone who knows Max will know how zealous and eager he is to give a proper perspective of what is happening. He and another officer—a lawyer in the Department—set about talking to groups of people affected in the industry, including consumers, small business, big business and all people with an interest in shopping or not shopping on Saturday afternoon in South Australia.

The report to me was a mixed bag indeed. In regard to percentages there was almost a nil result. Some people wanted it and some did not. It was a mixed bag. I analysed the report and then reported to the Government and said that I did not believe that there was much of a problem at the time and that the position was best left to run its own course and for us to see what developed. There was virtual silence for 12 months, during which I received no telegrams and no public statements were made. I thought the position had settled down and that, in regard to the great problem of shopping hours, no-one wanted any change. Then the

situation in New South Wales developed and telegrams started again and the pressure was applied again and I received a delegation from the Retail Traders Association.

I said that I was unclear as to what people wanted. I also told the association about the report I referred to earlier. I told those people to go away and sort it out with the various groups and within the Retail Traders Association and with the unions and then get back to me. I also said that I would then submit a recommendation to the Government. That is not to say that the Government would accept it. That fact was carefully phrased as it was in my press statement: it was my commitment not the Government's. I said that if they had an agreed parcel, similar to New South Wales, all well and good. That story received front page treatment, from memory. I am not quite sure why the shop trading hours issue was on the front page, but one can speculate. I then discovered, for the first time, that there was a strong group within the Retail Traders Association which wanted no change to shop trading hours. That group met and has now formed its own association.

I understand that the RTA executive is very much divided in relation to this issue. The main thrust seems to be coming from those who support Saturday afternoon shopping. It is very strange but those people who are now opposed to an extension of trading hours make the point that the New South Wales agreement was much too liberal, gave too much advantage to workers, was too costly and they would have no part of it. I suppose to a large extent that stopped the union moving in and putting its argument, as did the union in New South Wales. I do not know what the union's view is. It is obvious that there is no agreement in South Australia for extending shopping hours on the same basis as the agreement in New South Wales.

The Director and I are going to New South Wales to look at the situation on a Saturday afternoon and to talk to the people involved. We have meetings arranged with the Minister, David Jones (which is one of the opponents in that State), the RTA, Justice Makin (who prepared the report), and the Shop Allied and Distributive Union. We will talk to all those people about the system in New South Wales. The person whom my Director rang said, 'It is a bloody shemuzzle. Christ knows what is happening—no-one seems to know.' That is the situation in relation to shop trading hours. To be completely honest, we have received very little response from consumers, and that may be surprising.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Who would write to the Minister on a question like this?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I always answer my correspondence.

Mr ASHENDEN: I refer to the task force on women's employment and unemployment. The Minister touched on the CEP and how the Government is addressing it to ensure that women are given employment opportunities. I refer to the task force report of 7 November 1983, as follows:

1. Acknowledged that 'the issues (priorities and options) reflect our interpretation of the statistical data and, of course, the individual and collective concerns of task force members, but not necessarily the views of our wider audience'.
2. Indicated it would 'seek a response from interested persons on their perception of the issues, their relative priority and what ought to be done to assist women achieve equality of opportunity'.
3. Advised that 'in the coming months it anticipated releasing individual reports containing detailed discussion on the various issues summarised in this report. We also anticipate the early release of the statistical data studied by the task force'.

As anticipated, has the task force released individual reports containing discussions on the various issues summarised in its report and, if so, will copies of the reports be made available?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Very few responses were received following release of the report, and one wonders why. I would have thought that the women's movement would be active in responding to the report. Since the release of the report there has been a change in the chairmanship of the committee. The original Chairman was Phillip Bentley, who is with me today. Once he became Deputy Director of the Department the chairmanship passed to Sandra Eccles, who is the Economic Adviser to the Premier. She is currently overseas. The task force may have met since she became Chairperson, but I have not yet received a report from it.

Mr ASHENDEN: Has the task force released, as anticipated, the statistical data used by it in its studies and, if so, will copies be made available?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That information has not been released, but there is no reason why it cannot be. I see nothing untoward about making it a public document, and a copy can be made available to the honourable member.

Mr ASHENDEN: The statistical data is available but not the report?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That is correct.

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister indicated earlier that there had been little response in relation to input into the task force. When the Minister provides me with the statistical information, will he also inform me as to how many responses have been received from interested persons? I would also like some information about the organisations (not necessarily their names) which have made representations to the task force and the nature of their representations.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: We can give you a summary. It would not be reasonable to nominate the names of people of organisations, but the contents would be available in a summary form.

Mr ASHENDEN: I would like that made available at the same time as the statistical data. Finally, I gather from your comments that the task force is still operating because you have mentioned that it now has a new chairperson. If this is the case, have arrangements been made to release a final report incorporating responses from the public and statistical data? If so, when will that report be released and will it include firm recommendations as to the directions that should be taken?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will have to seek advice from the chairperson of the committee as to exactly what stage it is at and will advise the member accordingly.

Membership:

Mr Groom substituted for Mr Plunkett.

Mr BECKER: On page 54 of Estimates of Payments, under Programme 10, Employment and Employee Incentives, Self-Employment Ventures Scheme for youth workers is allocated \$176 000. Last year, \$136 000 was expended. Are you able to report to the committee how many persons have been assisted through these schemes in the 12 months to 30 June and how successful the scheme is?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The honourable member has picked up something that is very important. It is important to put this in the *Hansard*, and I will do this by reading a report.

The Self-Employment Ventures Scheme with an initial budget of \$20 000 commenced in April 1979. In the 15-month initial period, April 1979 to 30 June 1980, 959 initial inquiries were made. Seventy-nine formal applications were received and 23 applications were approved for assistance. A sum of \$54 340 was advanced as grants and loans to the 23 ventures, which involved 31 unemployed people. In the 12-month period 1 July 1983 to 30 June 1984, 5 891 inquiries were received. One hundred and twenty formal applications were received and 41 were approved for assistance. A sum

of \$130 191 was advanced as grants and loans to the 41 ventures, which involved 72 unemployed persons.

The Self-Employment Ventures Scheme commenced as a pilot scheme in April 1979 with one project officer. The initial budget for funded ventures was \$20 000. Since that time, the scheme has expanded to the point where three officers are now involved. The 1983-84 budget for the Self-Employment Ventures Scheme was \$135 000 and it is estimated that the 1984-85 budget will be \$176 000.

A significant initiative in relation to Self-Employment Ventures in 1980-81 has been the development of self-employment training courses. The pilot programme was funded by the Commonwealth Government through the National Employment and Training (NEAT) Scheme and run by the Workers Education Association (WEA). Participants in the courses were recruited through the Commonwealth Employment Service and interviewed and selected by a panel made up of representatives of the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, the WEA and this Department. Both courses had 20 participants and their average length of unemployment was 10 months.

The Department was successful in having a submission for the funding of two more courses in 1983-84 accepted by the Commonwealth Government. These courses involved 48 students, and the Department is currently receiving applications as a result of those courses. Some statistical information concerning these students is provided.

The project officers, Self-Employment Ventures Scheme, have the responsibility of receipt and research of applications, making recommendations for support or rejection, participating with the interdepartmental committee in assessing the submissions, and providing ongoing monitoring and support to funded ventures.

To date, 142 businesses, involving 226 persons, have been funded to the value of \$411 120.93. Of these, 27 have completed their loan repayments: total value \$53 054, and 10 have been written off, total value \$15 508.42. The total amount repaid to the scheme since its inception is \$108 794, which is a repayment level of 64 per cent of moneys advanced. That is not bad.

Mr BECKER: It is excellent, because we have to do everything that we can to help people obtain worthwhile employment, no matter what the schemes are. That is one that has paid its way.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Further to the response that I have given to the honourable member, who has shown an interest in all these schemes over the years, I present a table, which is purely statistical. I seek leave to incorporate it in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SELF-EMPLOYMENT VENTURES SCHEME Funded Ventures—April 1979-June 1984

Period	Funding	Loans	Grants	Total Loans and Grants
	\$	\$	\$	\$
April 1979	20 000.00	10 180.00	2 322.57	12 502.57
1979-80	60 000.00	31 503.60	13 587.00	45 090.60
1980-81	62 000.00			
1981-82	21 000.00	60 633.25	22 117.75	82 751.00
1982-83	86 000.00	38 815.40	16 856.36	55 671.76
1983-84	86 000.00	64 254.00	20 660.00	84 914.00
	19 000.00			
	116 000.00	95 797.50	34 393.50	130 191.00
Totals to 30 June 1984	451 000.00	301 183.75	109 937.18	411 120.93
Project written off:		\$2 500.00	\$750.00	\$3 250.00

SELF-EMPLOYMENT VENTURES SCHEME
Funded Businesses to 30 June 1984

	Budget	Expen- ded	Business Nos	Persons	Male	Female
April 1979-80	20 000	57 593	23	31	26	5
	60 000					
1980-81	62 000	82 751	30	45	28	17
	21 000					
1981-82	86 000	55 672	21	34	19	15
1982-83	86 000	84 914	27	44	23	21
1983-84 (to 30 June 1984)	116 000	130 191	41	72	41	31
		411 121	142	226	137	89

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The table gets the funding into the record. It would be of advantage to all honourable members to look at it. One of the features about the Self-Employment Ventures Scheme is that we have been frightened to advertise it; already there have been 5 891 applications. If we advertise it too much, obviously we do not have the funding or staff to be able to accommodate those people who would apply for it. It is very popular and very successful.

Mr BECKER: Unfortunately, those who have been thrown out of work—mature persons or even those who have not got off the ground—are looking for the alternative opportunities to create employment opportunities for themselves, whether it be to establish a business or whatever. I am also concerned with what other action the Government is taking to assist in creating employment opportunities in South Australia. We have to work away at this unemployment ratio that we have in South Australia.

Over the weekend I received in my letterbox a document from the Commonwealth Employment Service, headed 'The Right People for the Job'. It reads:

Part-time and casual work opportunities: experienced waiters, waitresses, cooks, kitchen hands, bar staff required for hotel, restaurant and motel work. Contact our Hospitality and Tourism Industry officer today.

It is from the Glenelg Job Centre, 128A Jetty Road, Glenelg. The area has been letterboxed. What concerns me is whether there is an increase in part-time and casual work opportunities to the detriment of full-time work opportunities and what we can do in South Australia to improve the employment opportunities for those who need work.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Earlier in the year I put a proposal to Cabinet to set up a Special Employment Initiative Unit (SEIU), which has a staff of seven people whose role is to advise me as Minister how we can develop certain proposals or schemes to assist the unemployed. We have never had such particular advice previously; we have guessed it or tried to sort it out, or whatever the case may be. I have just asked for a report, not because I was coming down here but because I wanted to know exactly what was happening with the unit. We appointed Mr Robert Johnson from Tasmania to head up that unit. We have now been able to complete the staffing of the unit. I am looking forward to some real assistance and advice from this organisation.

I will certainly monitor the situation every two or three months to see what sort of programmes are being produced. The honourable member referred to part time work as opposed to full time occupations. That is a difficult problem. As the honourable member would probably be aware, I hold the view that, every time we do away with a full time job and introduce part time employment, we lose a job forever. That view is not supported by many people in the community, although some people would agree with me. There is a great deal of anxiety in the workforce, mostly among married women (those who have other responsibilities, those who are divorced, or those who have a child, and so on)

that jobs should be divided. Those people come to an agreement among themselves to share responsibility, and that happens not only in Government departments. I do not know what we can do about that: we cannot control peoples' lives to the extent that we tell them that they cannot divide jobs. However, I am worried that, each time a job is divided, we lose a full time job, but I do not know how we can prevent that.

Mr BECKER: According to departmental research, is there a trend towards part time and casual work rather than full time work?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: In all probability that is true. There is a tendency in that direction, particularly in State Government departments. The Government does not have a rule to prevent people from doing that. If people want to share jobs and if there is a reasonable arrangement that does not interfere with the management structure, people are allowed to share jobs. I understand that that also applies to private enterprise. As I said, I do not encourage that practice, but it is a fact of life. There is a tendency in this direction.

A committee was set up recently to examine in close detail the possibility of establishing worker co-operatives in South Australia. There are worker co-operatives in many other countries, but they are not prevalent in Australia. Unfortunately, most people in Australia consider that, before a co-operative is set up, management must be run down or circumstances must be such that the company cannot compete in the market place. I do not believe that that is the way in which co-operatives ought to go: I believe that, if there is to be some sort of co-operative arrangement in South Australia, the co-operatives must be viable; they must be new businesses so that we do not pick up old businesses with a defunct management; and they must be competing in the market place. It is not a matter of workers getting together and trying to make a business successful whereas previously it failed. A committee will advise on worker co-operatives. I believe that this is a feasible proposition.

There will also be a report on adult employment. The honourable member would probably agree that we all allowed ourselves to be carried away with the difficulty of youth unemployment, never thinking about mature age unemployment. There is nothing wrong with being concerned about youth unemployment, but one of the special tasks of the special employments unit is to make recommendations to me on how we can find suitable employment for mature age people.

The CHAIRMAN: I advise the Committee that, in line with the agreement that we continue to question the Minister on the Department of Labour vote until 4 o'clock, I intend to allow the Deputy Leader to question without break until 4 p.m.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: At page 33 of the yellow book under '1983-84 specific targets/objectives (significant initiatives/improvements/achievements)', it is stated:

A review was carried out of the participants in business and commerce related courses in South Australia and of employers in the business and commerce area.

This is the interesting bit:

An investigation was commenced into the training needs of the beauty industry in South Australia. As a result of the farm skills working party a report was developed on formal structured training arrangements for farm skills training in the rural industry. The report was accepted by the ICTC and 'farming' will become a declared vocation.

What are the results of the investigation into the beauty industry?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Obviously, that refers to beautification. That area is being considered by the commercial training people. The honourable member raised an important point in regard to farming.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I believed that that was an important point, but I could not see how it related to beauty.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There has been discussion for some time as to whether or not 'farming' should be a declared vocation. I have held the view for at least six months that those occupations should be declared vocations. It is a wonder that the yellow book is so up to date, because it was only in the past few weeks that Cabinet endorsed farming skills as declared vocations. The courses will operate under TAFE this year, qualifying young and older people—people do not have to be apprentices. Farmers will receive subsidies.

I understand that the final report on the beauty industry will go to the Commercial and Training Commission next Monday. I have not seen that final report; I will not see it until it comes from the Commission. However, if one thinks about it a bit, one will see that in this area employees had no declared coverage whatsoever.

It really is an area in which people should be trained and which should be a declared vocation. After all is said and done, women take a great deal of interest in the beautification of their faces, hair and so on.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You say that there are no ground rules.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know that it is a growth area. There is reference made on page 18 to the funding of the Industrial Commission. Again, this is back into the area of Government policy about which I have expressed particular interest today. I draw the Minister's attention to an article that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*. I guess he has seen it. The article is by Professor Blandy.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The article is by Michael Atkinson.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is by Michael Atkinson, but he quotes Professor Blandy's sentiments in the article, which argues a point of view that I guess is not dissimilar to some of the views expressed by John Stone in his recent lecture. I do not think that it is being advanced in any emotional way here. The point Blandy is making with which I agree, and obviously with which the Federal Liberal Party agrees in terms of the industrial relations policy it has advanced, is that there is a lack of flexibility in the industrial and arbitration tribunals in Australia that is peculiar to Australia. I know that the Minister has voiced his support for a centralised wage fixing system previously. Professor Blandy would take issue with the Minister on that point, but the crucial point in what Blandy is saying is that if we persist with our industrial and arbitration system as it is now constituted we will institutionalise unemployment. I agree with that.

I do not want to emphasise all of the points in this article, although they would be anathema to the Minister. However, there is not much in this article with which I do not agree. I agree with the major thrust of what Stone said the other day, although his timing might be a bit unfortunate. The article states, in relation to Professor Blandy:

He argues the system has made the market for labour so rigid that Australia faces permanently high unemployment and an economic decline similar to Argentina's. Arbitration is one-sided, he says, enforcing only those aspects of awards that suit unions.

Of course that is like a red rag to a bull, that latter part of that statement. The overall thrust of that argument is that we have to get more flexibility into the arbitration system. Will the Minister state whether or not he agrees with that view? The only view that the Minister has stated publicly is one of total support for the arbitration system and the idea of consensus being gained via that system, whereas

Blandy's argument is that it institutionalises conflict. As I said previously, the Federal Liberal Party recognises this in its policies and I agree with what is being said there. Will the Minister state his views in relation to this matter?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes, I will. I want to place on record my views about this matter, which might take me a while to do.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have one more topic before four.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will try to squeeze that in for the member, but he has raised this matter and I must answer it my way. Blandy argues that the Commonwealth Arbitration System worked well from its establishment in 1911 through to 1969 in correcting the imbalance between the power of strong employers and weak unions. He argued in 1969 that the O'Shea affair made the decisions of the system binding on only one of the two parties—the employers—and voluntary on the other—the unions. He says that the balance of power shifted manifestly and heavily in the unions favour, and that the system has been unable to correct this imbalance between strong unions and weak employers.

Blandy argues that the usefulness of the present arbitration system now relies on the voluntary co-operation of just one party—the unions in general. He says that the commission has become an enforcement arm of policy acceptable to the union movement, and adds that it is hard to believe that such a situation can be stable in the long run. Those are his words, not mine. He believes that the long run evolution of the system must be towards a system which is voluntary on both sides.

Blandy argues that the doctrine of comparative wage justice is a straightjacket which produces low wages for some (causing shortages of labour) and too high wages for others (causing oversupply of labour). He argues that these imbalances accumulate over time until they reach a size where they become visible politically. This will, taken together with the power imbalance referred to, produce a more flexible system over the next few years. Blandy says that this will, however, be insufficient until a more fundamental restructuring occurs towards a voluntary, industry-based system. Blandy then attacks the proposals for change put forward by the main actors in the Australian industrial relations system—the Arbitration Commission, the ACTU, the CAI and the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations—who he refers to in a somewhat derogatory manner as the industrial relations 'Club'.

He summarises the agreed future as seen by the Club as one of strengthened existence for the existing system, simplified, co-ordinated and with greater recognition for and influence of the 'peak councils in the system'. Blandy suggests that the members of the club are selfishly concerned with their own goals and problems as parts of the system and not with the final outcome on the health of the Australian economy. Blandy says the members of the Club have ignored this latter question. Blandy argues that the following should be done to address the 'overall malaise' of the industrial relations system:

1. A more 'dynamic' system that has evolutionary capacity—the capacity to 'sail on the shifting socio-economic winds rather than trudging relentlessly on with fixed structures to ultimate defeat in the snows of Moscow'.

2. He argues for 'structured chaos', small organisations, decentralisation, counting as a person and the importance of 'shared objectives'. The self reliant individual becomes the leading point of change.

3. The stripping down of Government regulation and the release of the dormant energies of Australians in all walks of life.

4. Organisations will need to embrace industrial democracy in its participative but not decision sharing sense.

5. Union structure will have to shift from a craft basis to an industry basis.

6. The ability of employers to freely negotiate with their own workers (or a single Union representing them) in the light of that company's own conditions.

I will now comment on Blandy's argument: Blandy's paper is more an expression of a personal philosophy than a carefully considered review of the present system of industrial relations in Australia. It is difficult to take seriously the comments of someone who argues for 'structured chaos' or who, in effect, accuses the Arbitration Commission of being a tool of the trade union movement. Both propositions are simply absurd. If the latter were true employers would be trying to bail out of the system—that is the very first thing that they would do. In fact, and as Professor Blandy points out in his own article, the major employers groups that have made submissions to the Hancock Committee have overwhelmingly sought the retention of the Arbitration system and have rejected the Blandy alternative of collective bargaining. The fact that employers support the retention of the present system (albeit with some refinements) clearly contradicts any notion that the commission is a puppet of the trade union movement.

Regarding Professor Blandy's plea for 'structured chaos', small organisations and survival of the fittest, they are also concepts likely to go down like lead balloons with business, workers, and the general community. Such concepts are simply out of touch with reality. Business requires a certain degree of stability if it is to make decisions on long term investments. The free-wheeling system that Professor Blandy talks about is a nineteenth century philosopher's dream which makes poor economic sense. Once again it implies that the general business community is ignorant of what is in its broader interest. His assertions on the effects of the doctrine of comparative wage justice are also not supported by the many economic studies that show that relative wages have no influence on the supply of labour.

What is more disturbing about the Blandy scenario is the suggestion that we should strip away a system that has undeniably introduced a more equitable system of wages in Australia by giving protection to workers who are in an unequal bargaining position with their employer. In my view it is a mistake to think that a system of collective bargaining will somehow correct the so-called 'power imbalance' that is supposed to be propped up and supported by the arbitration system. Strong, well organised unions will retain their bargaining strength, whatever the system. What you would do away with is the current level of protection given to weak unions. Such a move would be quite unacceptable.

In making these comments I am certainly not arguing that the present system cannot be improved. Indeed, the South Australian Government made extensive submissions to the Hancock Committee suggesting a whole series of changes to the current system. That submission was well received by the Hancock Committee and, in due course, we will be looking forward to the Hancock Committee's blueprint for the future of industrial relations in Australia.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: A report was commissioned by the Minister's Department called 'Social and Industrial Relations in Isolated Resource Development Projects'. This final report of November 1983 by an officer in his Department is causing a great deal of consternation among those involved in trying to develop mines in the outback. I hope that the Minister is aware of this. I also understand that it is on the agenda of IRAC—it is rather disturbing it got that far. In the annual report of IRAC, reference is made that this report is one of the matters to be dealt with. I was hoping that it would be dead and buried long before it got to IRAC, but I understand that it has to

be discussed. The report recommends a degree of Government interference to a quite intolerable extent in an area where there is no need for interference. The first recommendation of the report states:

The South Australian Government establish a more comprehensive legislative framework for gaining information about resource development projects and co-ordinating negotiations between companies and Government bodies on such matters.

What is the status of the report and what will happen to it? I do not think that there has been a real problem with developments in South Australia that have occurred in recent times in terms of the legislative framework to see that the social infrastructure and all the rest in due course are provided. I raise it with the Minister to see what is happening with the report, whether he intends to press on with it and is going to do anything about its recommendations.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: First, if I did not take the opportunity of placing that report before IRAC I think that I could be criticised by the committee—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: An officer of your Department wrote it.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Nevertheless, it is a report that the Department—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Be criticised by the officer?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No, by the committee of IRAC. The understanding with IRAC is that anything of an industrial nature will go before that committee.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Only if it is the Government's intention to press on with it.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No. Any discussion paper on any matter at all to do with the industrial relations situation is to go before IRAC.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Even if you have no intention of proceeding?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It doesn't matter what we have got to do with it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is wasting its time.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is not wasting its time. That report, while it may not have a great deal of significance at the moment, because there are no major developments occurring in outback areas presently—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What about Roxby?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am talking about developments of a new nature: Roxby is established. Personally, I think that the report is quite useful because if South Australia, or anyone else for that matter, has the responsibility of establishing outback cities, towns or living conditions it can take lessons from the report. Graham Harbord was responsible for the report and travelled to Western Australia and Queensland, viewed those areas and put down his thoughts concerning the difficulties. It was not long after he went to Western Australia and it may have been before (I cannot remember the exact date) that there was a 12 or 13 week strike which he took into consideration when dealing in the report with how difficulties can be overcome. The only organisation I know of that has made any criticism of the report has been the mines and metals people.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: And the ones who are implicated and are not on IRAC.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is impossible to accommodate everyone on IRAC. It was reported to me by a member of IRAC that the mines and metals people were a little upset about it. At the moment that report is for consultation. It was placed before IRAC for information. IRAC has taken it away to absorb it, talk about it and come back at some future stage when we will have further discussions on it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is it true that the Minister will go to London as Agent-General when Mr Rundle retires?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it may incriminate me.

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

[Sitting suspended from 3.59 to 4.15 p.m.]

Auditor-General's, \$2 836 000

Chairman:

Mr G.T. Whitten

Members:

Mr H. Becker
Mr H. Becker
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr J.K.G. Oswald
Mr J.K.G. Oswald
Mr K.H. Plunkett
Mr K.H. Plunkett
The Hon. D.C. Wotton
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Chief Secretary and Minister of Emergency Services.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr T.A. Sheridan, Auditor-General.
Mr. K. Cotter, Administrative Officer, Auditor-General's Department.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I compliment the Auditor-General on his excellent report.

Mr BECKER: I, too, compliment the new Auditor-General on his excellent report. True, he left out one bit, but I have asked a Question on Notice about that, and there were a few blank pages in the first copy that I received. I am concerned about a decline in the number of staff in the last couple of years. Administration staff have gone from 10 in 1983 to nine in 1984; field staff have gone from 78 to 76; ADP staff have gone from five to four; and research and development staff have remained at one. The complement has fallen from 94 to 90, but I hope that the requirements of greater accountability, which are supported by Parliament, are such that the Auditor-General would at least be holding his staff numbers if not increasing them. Is the Auditor-General satisfied with his staff as it is?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I pass that question to the Auditor-General.

Mr Sheridan: The short answer is that I am satisfied with both the numbers and quality of staff employed in the Auditor-General's Department. There has been a reduction in the number of staff, as Mr Becker points out. For the reason, one must look at what was introduced by my predecessor in 1980, that is, a new method of auditing practised extensively interstate and overseas—systems based auditing—which replaces in some departments, especially large complex departments, transactional auditing. Briefly, it enables an auditor to look at a process on a systems basis, and to identify key control points and audit against those key control points—examining transactions to a much lesser degree than is the case in transactional auditing. It was introduced in 1980 and the benefits are now being felt. It has led to two things: first, it has enabled the number of people employed in the Audit Department to be reduced; secondly, it has also enabled us to get to areas of more

materiality, that is, value for money auditing, as much as anything. The answer briefly is that the method of operation has changed.

Mr BECKER: At page 49 of his Report, the Auditor-General states that receipts, audit fees and sundries (1984), totalled \$721 177—an increase of \$71 746 over the previous year. I understand that fees are charged to clients and reviewed annually and are based upon the recovery cost of each audit. Can you say how many organisations and authorities are audited by the Auditor-General and how fees are arrived at for those audits?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will ask the Auditor-General to reply to that question.

Mr Sheridan: Basically, the fees charged are not charged to Government departments but are charged to statutory bodies and those statutory bodies raise charges and fees themselves. The basis is on the assessment of the time that it is believed it takes to do that audit and a recovery of the full costs of doing that audit over the period.

Mr BECKER: Is there a set fee per hour or does it have to be worked out in respect of the degree of complexity per type of audit?

Mr Sheridan: We have regard to the degree of complexity of an audit. It can vary—we might be placing more emphasis in one area on value for money audits rather than in another area.

Mr BECKER: How do your fees compare with those in private enterprise?

Mr Sheridan: If you look at it purely on the basis of content (that is, financial and compliance auditing) in the audits that we do, our fees would compare favourably. They might even be a shade lower than in private enterprise but, where a value for money content is in that audit and one looks at it in total—financial and compliance auditing and value for money—obviously the fee would work out higher. That has led to a couple of complications where the private sector competes with us for audits in certain areas such as the hospital area. Because of that, because they do it basically on compliance and finance, it has made it difficult in one or two areas for us to hold the audits.

Mr OSWALD: The Public Accounts Committee recently passed down a report on the post implementation reviews on the acquisition of computers and their subsequent use in the Public Service. It came out that most departments so far have not bothered about post implementation reviews or considered them important enough to address themselves to. Are you in a position as Auditor-General under your Act to monitor the purchase and implementation of computers in the Public Service and to report on their cost effectiveness in future Auditor-General's Reports?

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

Mr Sheridan: Yes. The present Audit Act gives all the authority that the Auditor-General needs to look at the questions raised by the member. It gets back again into the value for money area rather than the financial and compliance auditing side. That is an area that my Department is concerned with and we will certainly be looking at some computer systems that have been implemented over the past 12 months or that are in the process of being implemented.

One difficulty is that some of the systems take time to develop. In fact, it may take as long as 12 or 18 months before they are implemented. The situation can change from the time the system is first conceived and when it is implemented and then another 12 months until the post audit report is done. The basis on which some of the systems are implemented is not always clear. We will have to correct that situation in future when deciding to do post audits of not only computer systems but also in relation to reorgan-

isational matters, and so on. At the outset we will have to make sure that the bases from which changes spring are fairly well defined so we can make comparisons back to those bases.

Mr BECKER: For the first time in many years the Auditor-General has made quite a lengthy introductory statement in his report, and I appreciate that. I believe it gives Parliament an overview of how the Auditor-General and his staff feel when conducting audits. Under the heading 'Management of Resources' the Auditor-General states on page 1:

Total payments in excess of \$2 500 million were made from the Consolidated Account in 1983-84.

When it is considered that the whole of that amount is provided by the public through taxes and charges, whether levied by the State or by the Commonwealth, it is clear that a serious responsibility rests with those who are vested with the authority to manage those resources.

An efficient and economic approach to resources management is the cornerstone in the discharge of that responsibility. It needs to be accepted and practised at all levels of the public sector management structure. It needs to be backed up by effective and prompt management reporting systems.

Emphasis has been placed by successive Governments on the efficient and economic use of resources in recent years. That emphasis has given rise to an improvement in the management of public sector resources.

Despite that improvement, there is still a tendency in some areas to protect resources, rather than look to their reallocation to other areas of need. As a result those resources remain locked into the budget base, with additional funds being required for new or expanded programmes.

Can the Auditor-General expand on the final paragraph of that statement in relation to protecting resources?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I put it to you, Mr Chairman, that the statement by the Auditor-General encompasses the Government as a whole rather than the Auditor-General's lines specifically. In those circumstances I really think that the honourable member's question should be ruled out of order, because it does not pertain to the lines of the Auditor-General.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule the question out of order.

Mr BECKER: Mr Chairman, how can you do that? We are looking at the Auditor-General and the allocation for the operation of the Auditor-General's Department. The Auditor-General has reported to Parliament, and his Department costs about \$2 million to finance.

The CHAIRMAN: To clear up the matter, the honourable member should ask questions that relate to the Auditor-General and his Department. As I said this morning, I will not allow questions on policy. Questions will relate to the Auditor-General and his Department.

Mr BECKER: Surely I can ask the Auditor-General to expand on his statement. It is an important statement because it deals with the whole question of accountability to Parliament. That is the Auditor-General's role as the State's financial watchdog. If the Auditor-General is not happy or if he thinks that resources are not being used wisely, surely it is up to Parliament to seek an explanation. If advice can be given to Parliament as to what should be done, it would be a foolish Parliament which did not accept that advice.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to rephrase his question. If the honourable member's question relates to the Auditor-General's Department, that is all right. However, if it relates to money spent by another Department, that question should be raised under that Department's lines.

Mr BECKER: What specific findings has the Auditor-General made to back-up his statement in the report, '... that there is still a tendency in some areas to protect resources, rather than look to their reallocation to other areas of need?'

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I do not want to be difficult about this, but I think the honourable member is getting into an area far beyond the Auditor-General's lines. The statement

is a general comment by the Auditor-General in his overall view of what is happening within the resources of Government. I do not think that I am competent to answer that type of question on a general basis, because it applies to other areas on which I am not competent to report in any case. I imagine that it could be argued that the Auditor-General may be in a position to do that. However, whether or not he should be forced into that situation before this Committee I think is a question of some doubt.

The CHAIRMAN: I stand by my original ruling and rule the honourable member's question out of order.

Mr BECKER: Mr Chairman, I protest. I fail to agree. This is the only chance Parliament has to question—

The CHAIRMAN: It is not. If the honourable member took notice of what I said, he would know that he can raise the matter in relation to the department concerned. He cannot question the general policy of the Auditor-General. I do not want to be difficult, but I will be if the honourable member persists.

Mr BECKER: I can be difficult, and I can be very strop-py. The point is that this is the work of the Auditor-General. I am questioning the Minister in this area because there are areas of concern where the work of the Auditor-General involves many types of auditing systems. It is excellent advice for Parliament. Therefore, we seek the help and guidance of the Auditor-General in this area. We are funding his operation. If we cannot question the Auditor-General and ask him to expand on statements in his report, we may as well give all the auditing to free enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN: I will go no further than to repeat that, if the honourable member wishes to ask that type of question, he should ask it of each department and not the Auditor-General or the Minister. It is an unfair question. There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Police, \$118 774 000

Chairman:

Mr G.T. Whitten

Members:

Mr H. Becker

The Hon. Peter Duncan

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr J.K.G. Oswald

Mr K.H. Plunkett

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Chief Secretary and Minister of Emergency Services

Departmental Advisers:

Mr D.A. Hunt, Commissioner of Police.

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

Mr J.A. Humphries, Manager, Resources.

Mr F. Bowering, Senior Finance Officer.

The CHAIRMAN: I advise the Committee that I will recognise the member for Murray as the lead speaker for the Opposition. All questions will be directed to the Minister and not to his officers. The Minister may refer those questions to officers, but the questions will be directed to the Minister.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I do not want to be critical at all of your chairmanship Sir, or of the activities of the previous Committee, but I found it somewhat difficult to be able to immediately locate information when there was a jumping from one subject to another. I wonder whether it is possible to pursue one subject—I do not care who asks the question—without jumping on to some other subject. Members only have so much time, I am only trying to make it easy for everybody.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing that I can formally lay down that that shall take place, but I ask for the co-operation of the members of the Committee, and I think that we will get their co-operation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: We will attempt to co-operate as much as we can, but in some cases it will be necessary to do a bit of jumping around because we will want to refer to and come back to matters that have been discussed earlier. The figures to which I will refer relate to pages 62 and 63 of the Estimates of Payments. I will refer to matters that are also contained in the yellow book, Programme Estimates for 1984-85.

During Question Time last Thursday I asked you to indicate what is the most serious aspect of organised crime in South Australia. Further, I asked you whether you considered as Minister that the police in this State need wider powers to deal with organised crime. You indicated at that time that you would bring down a report, and I will await that statement. I refer to page 78 of the yellow book under the heading 'Issues'. In paragraph 1 it states:

The general trend over the past few years has been for the demands for police services to increase along with the rising level of reported crime.

I am sure that you would agree that there is concern within the community about the increase in crime in South Australia. There has been for some time; in fact, your own Premier in 1982 when in Opposition moved in the House of Assembly a motion calling for a Royal Commission with terms of reference to consider amongst other things the establishment of a permanent crime commission to investigate and advise on organised crime and to advise whether or not police powers are adequate to deal with organised crime and drug offences.

In looking at the Budget papers, there now appears to have been a change of attitude, however, because in the first paragraph on page 79 we read that the proposed total expenditure for 1984-85 is \$137.769 million, which is an increase of \$8.827 million or 6.9 per cent over the 1983-84 financial year. That is not even keeping up with inflation. Also, we find in the third paragraph that the Government has allowed the average active police strength to drop by 15.2, for 3 276 from 1983-84 to 3 261 in 1984-85. Will you explain the change of attitude?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I can give a very good comparison of total funding between the actual 1983-84 figure of \$128.942 million and the proposed figure for 1984-85 of \$137.769 million, which reveals a 6.9 per cent actual increase, but in real terms an increase of .8 per cent. This assumes a 6.1 per cent inflation rate for 1984-85, *vide* the Federal Treasurer's Budget speech. However, this is not a true comparison because other factors need to be taken into account. With the Budget system, for example, the 1983-84 actual funding includes the following types of expenditure that have not been catered for in 1984-85 allocation: salaries and wages increases awarded during the year, \$3.876 million; other salaries and related payments due to increments and abnormal situations (for example, the Roxby Downs demonstration), \$217 000; other unpredictable, unavoidable non-salary expenditures arising during the year, \$1.784 million; making a total of \$5.887 million.

Funds for the above types of purpose are not provided in the initial departmental allocation, but are included in the round sum allowance shown in the summary in the front of the Estimates of Payments, and these funds are released to the departments during the year on a claim basis. This Department's share of the round sum allowance for 1984-85 is \$2.23 million, or an 8.9 per cent increase on the recurrent allocation of \$118.774 million. A sum of \$2.23 million added to the proposed overall departmental allocation represents an actual increase of 8.6 per cent or, more importantly, an increase in real terms of 2.5 per cent.

It should be noted that the 1984-85 allocation provides sufficient funds to provide an active strength above the 1981-82 level. The active strength at 30 June 1982 was 3 241; on 30 June 1983 it was 3 286; and at 30 June 1984 it was 3 277; it is estimated that at 30 June 1985 it will be 3 261. The reason is simply that there are not as many trainees of the Police Department as there were previously, because of the change in the training direction that the Department itself has introduced. Rather than having a three-year training course, which immediately suggests that one must have a greater number of recruits than previously, the training period is now 12 months, so that breaks down two years of training. In fact, the position is the reverse of the honourable member's statement about a depletion in the number of active police officers. The facts are here for him.

In simple terms, that approved active strength of the Force has increased by a net 20 positions over the past two years, from 3 241 to 3 261. Fourteen positions have been converted to Public Service positions. In fact, the effective increase is 34, not 20; it is 20 plus 14 Public Service positions. In real terms, the Budget allocations have increased, as I say, over and above inflation by 2.5 per cent, and the active strength of the Police Force has increased by 34 bodies.

Mr OSWALD: Not uniformed bodies.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There are 20 uniformed bodies—20 active police officers. The active strength approved average is 3 261. The approved police active strength can vary as a result of new initiatives approved by Government or by transfer of functions and associated staff to non-police areas of the Department.

During 1983-84, 14 police positions in the special projects section and computer systems section were converted to Public Service positions. Although this did not affect the total departmental power of the members, it resulted in a reduction in active strength of 14. Similarly in 1984-85, two police positions in the State Emergency Services have been converted to Public Service positions. During 1984-85, the approved active strength has been increased by 27.5 full time equivalents to 3 261 on account of the following: new assistants; new initiatives; 4.5 full time equivalents under communications plan; 18 full time equivalents under the strategic plan; one full time equivalent, STA securities secondment of S2A, salary reimbursed to the Police Department; and four full time equivalents, Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. That makes a total of 27.5 full time equivalents. This increase is not clearly evident from a comparison of the 1983-84 and 1984-85 figures, because the Department's active strength has been recovering from an over-strength situation in 1982-83, which resulted from less attrition in that year than planned for. Dealing with the honourable member's question—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Could we deal with staffing?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The honourable member made an initial statement, and I believe that I have the right to answer that part of his statement.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am trying to help the Minister, in line with the suggestion made earlier about staying on the same subject.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The honourable member deviated, not me. He raised the question whether or not at some stage I would advise the Parliament, if bikie gangs were not the main source of organised crime in South Australia, what in effect was the main source of crime. He also asked whether police powers should be increased to overcome those problems if they are occurring. The honourable member is well aware that I gave an assurance to the House that I would do that. I advise the Committee that I have already discussed that matter with the Commissioner, who is preparing a report.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There is a problem in relation to the figures. Obviously, it will be necessary to consider the figures in more detail. However, regarding staffing, the yellow book indicates quite clearly that there has been a decrease of 15.2 in average active police strength. However, the Auditor-General's Report states that there was a decrease from 3 842 in 1983 to 3 823 at this stage. That takes into account commissioned officers, non-commissioned officers, constables, trainees, a six-month dog course, a one-year cadet course, a two-year cadet course, and other staff—total staff. Obviously, it will be necessary to look more closely at the figures, but I would like clarification on the details that the Minister has just provided to the Committee.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The figures are correct.

Mr OSWALD: Which figures—your figures or the Auditor-General's figures?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: They are probably all correct.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They cannot all be correct.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: They can be correct. In 1982-83 there was virtually an increase over the manpower requirements. That is why we then find that a percentage reduction actually occurred. To get back to the ordinary strength, or what is considered to be the proper manpower strength, there was a need to reduce in that intake. There is also another difference. One set of figures refers to active strength, whereas the other refers to the total full strength.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What do 'full strength' and 'active strength' mean?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Full strength would be the requirement, the number at that stage, as compared to active strength. The difference is that the figure of 3 823 in the Auditor-General's Report relates to the total strength of the Police Force, including cadets, trainees and public servants—everyone. The figures in the yellow book relate to those who are active members of the Police Force.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does the Police Force employ casual workers?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Not as members of the Police Force.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I realise that, but are there casual employees in the total staff?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There are no casual staff, as I understand the meaning of 'casual'. There are weekly paid personnel other than salaried officers, but one could not call them casuals.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have no further questions, but I would like to refer to funding later.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The police mounted division has been a longstanding interest of mine. In previous years, details contained in the yellow book have indicated in the attachment the number of horses and the number of officers employed in the mounted section. I cannot find details in this yellow book. I thought that there might have been a departure in the last couple of years from the policy of the former Commissioner, Mr Draper, who had a deep and abiding interest in this matter. Will the Minister indicate the general position in relation to the mounted squad? I understand that either horses were sold or that the facility was being wound down.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is true that the activity of the squad is winding down, and the number of horses has been reduced.

They have done away with the breeding system that the Department had as the new policy is to purchase horses rather than to breed them. I will give the honourable member some figures in relation to this matter: horse strength as at 30 June 1984 was 63. It is desirable to increase this number soon by two to allow a full strength of 45 duty horses to be available in 1986. As I understand, those horses will be purchased and good grey horses are available. Quite obviously, it was not economically viable to continue with the breeding programme. There has been a reduction from 71 horses in 1983 to 63 horses at present, but that number will be increased to 65 when the two new horses are purchased.

The objective is to increase patrol activity to achieve in excess of 200 patrols in areas such as the trouble spots along the Torrens River, city and suburban shopping areas, and school complexes, particularly at night. Several major crowd control roles are undertaken at pageants, Oakbank, pop concerts, and at similar events. Police activity at Roxby Downs in 1983 involved the whole division for over two weeks. That exercise was repeated recently. The Echunga facility is being used to grow fodder and for agistment of horses. Feed costs for the coming year should remain at last year's level, provided the growth season remains good. I call on the Commissioner to elaborate on the usefulness of the greys for patrols in and around the Torrens River area.

Mr Hunt: Following criminal type activity escalating around the Torrens River area during the past couple of years there has been an escalation of the operational nature of the Mounted Police. In fact, about 60 per cent of their time is now spent in operational matters supporting motor and foot police patrols. As the Minister has said, there has been a reduction since 1982 in the number of horses from 71 to 63. We have set a policy of not exceeding 65 horses. This allows us a patrol strength of fit and ready horses of 45. We must take into account there are some horses reaching old age and others in training.

Mr BECKER: I still cannot agree, Minister, with your explanation relating to the number of personnel attached to the Department. Page 82 of the yellow book shows an employment average for full-time equivalents of 3 817 proposed, and an actual figure for 1983-84 of 3 819. Therefore there is a difference of four between that figure and the one given in the Auditor-General's Report, which shows administrative and clerical staff as 469, compared with the yellow book which shows 470.3. It seems strange that we cannot balance the number of personnel shown in that department between those two reports. We must have a balance and must know exactly how many people there are in that department.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Auditor-General's report deals with actual numbers at the time he compiles that report. The number shown in the yellow book is an average, so it is almost impossible to line up the numbers on an average basis when one takes an actual figure at a given time when the Auditor-General prepares his report. As the member has said, there is only a difference of four in a workforce of over 3 000 which seems to indicate that it is correct.

Mr BECKER: What I am trying to establish is the accuracy of the programme performance papers. I am tying that down, as it happens, in the police line. I realise that these papers involve a tremendous amount of work, and that sometimes there have been mistakes in the Auditor-General's Report, too. I turn now to page 86 of the yellow book where I notice that 'General Metropolitan Police Services' shows that in 1983-84 that proposed figures was 1 104, the outcome in the same year was 1 108 and that the proposed figure for

1984-85 of 1 084.4, a drop of 24 positions. If one then turns to page 87 one sees that in 1983-84 'General Country Police Services' had 587 positions, the outcome in that year was 582.7 positions and the proposed figure for 1984-85 is 582.7 positions. What country police stations were closed, if any, and does the proposed 1984-85 figure take Roxby Downs into account? In other words, are there any permanent police stationed at Roxby Downs, or is there likely to be a wide fluctuation in the number of police required in that area in future?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: First, there have been no country police stations closed on a permanent basis. They may have been closed on a part-time casual basis to accommodate certain criteria at a certain time. There are no full-time police allocated to Roxby Downs. To elaborate on that, the Roxby Downs position, as I understand it, is that it will not be considered for a local police station until such time as there is a permanent town there.

Mr BECKER: On page 89 of the yellow book there is a slight increase in staff for general criminal investigation services shown which relates to the Department of Armoury, laboratory equipment, photographic equipment, and breath analysis equipment. Can the Minister say where the extra positions will be created? Will they be in breath analysis, or elsewhere?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: If the honourable member looks at the increase, it is virtually rounding off: it is only 1.7 staff and is not a huge increase.

Mr BECKER: Will the increase go to the breath analysis unit?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Minister obtain information, if he does not have it, on the number of incidents requiring police attention that have occurred in or around Government House in the 12 months covered by the last financial reporting period? In 1983-84 six police officers were delegated for police security services for the Governor, and again this financial year six police officers are proposed. I know that under Standing Orders it is difficult to deal with questions involving the Governor and I want to be careful not to infringe those Standing Orders. However, it seems to me in recent years that the Governor and his establishment have not been the source of any adverse political or other activity in the community. Maybe the provision of six police officers for a round-the-clock security operation is an historical situation that could possibly be reviewed. Will the Minister obtain statistics concerning the number of incidents that have occurred during the past 12 months?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: We do not have those statistics; the honourable member indicated that we probably would not have them. I know of no extraordinary circumstance or event that has occurred; nor has any been reported to me. I will undertake to obtain the rostering procedures for the honourable member. That is where the initial problem is, if it is a problem. I will get details of any incidents that have occurred that have led to a continuation of six officers being rostered. I imagine that it is a 24 hour shift; so, it may be the way that the roster works that takes six people to complete the shift.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Concerning the Roxby Downs demonstration, will the Minister indicate the cost of police surveillance up to this point of time?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I emphasise that these figures are only estimates. While the Roxby Downs demonstration has certainly wound down over the past couple of weeks it is my understanding that there are still some 30 or 40 demonstrators hanging on. Reading a report from the Commissioner only yesterday, I noted that it was established that some of the people who have stayed there have actually

physically, not with their clothes, glued themselves to posts and other equipment belonging to the company. They have used some form of super glue. This behaviour is almost unheard of.

I suggest that there will probably have to be a continuation of police surveillance for some time because there is evidently a hard core of demonstrators who are intending to stay. The Commissioner is supervising the situation daily and withdrawing some of the police officers at various times. The original estimate was \$1 607 958. The estimate now, as we know what has happened and are able to foresee—and I make that point strongly—is \$1 534 000. So, the figure is not far off what the Police Commissioner estimated in the first instance. I am not in a position to say, and do not know, just how much longer the vigil may stay up at Roxby Downs. I know that there were negotiations with police officers concerning whether or not these people were going to stay. The Commissioner may have later news on that than I have—he may have today's news. What is the current position? Is there any sign of movement?

Mr Hunt: No, there is not. My representatives had discussions with the group yesterday for the purpose of trying to estimate how many people we were going to pull out. In fact, we made a decision that we have to continue for a while because we are currently of the view, based on information from them, that they might even hang on until the Federal election, hoping to influence the community or members of Parliament.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Minister able to indicate the present strength of the Police Force at Roxby Downs?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: At the zenith of the demonstration the number of police was a maximum of 272. Of course, as the demonstrators dwindled and went back to wherever they came from, there has been a daily assessment of what is required and a depletion of the force. The figure has been reduced to the present contingent of 80 officers.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: How many demonstrators are currently there?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: One of the difficulties that the police have had is to assess and gauge how many police should be there. One day the numbers are down and then someone arrives from Queensland. When a decision was made by the major recognised groups to pull out of the place a hard core of people decided to stay. That caused further problems. Obviously, the Commissioner would like to have all his men home and the men, I am sure, would like to be home after what they had to endure with the weather up there. Because of the vast amount of country that the police have to cover and working three shifts, one needs a minimum of about 80 police to ensure that they can cover all the area they are responsible for.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: How is it intended to pay this cost? Is it to come out of general revenue or the police line?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There will be a deficiency of about \$800 000 in the original estimates. It works out at about half. The wages part of the bill will happen in any case, although it must be escalated by shift work, overtime, penalties, living-away-from-home allowances and so forth. Generally wages would be covered from the police lines. The outstanding amount will have to come from general revenue, whatever it finishes up at.

Mr BECKER: In regard to Roxby Downs, is any charge made to the company, Roxby Management Services, because the police are protecting the company's property? Should there not be some cost to the company for that protection?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It's not the company's fault.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Opposition members can argue about it between yourselves.

Mr BECKER: If people trespass on company property, is it not normal practice for all companies to have their own security systems? Is it a requirement for the police to protect the whole area?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: A system operates up in the field where the company has its own security to look after certain aspects. I am not sure who runs it—whether it is one of the well recognised security services or whether it is done internally by the Roxby Downs administration. I see a wider picture than the member does. The police have an overall responsibility to protect property and life in all circumstances, and in my view the police role at Roxby Downs is much more than merely to protect the property of the Roxby Downs administration. The police must protect the people working at Roxby Downs and the role of the police also is to protect the demonstrators. Something could occur between the demonstrators and the people living at Roxby Downs; indeed, I received a rather long telex from the workers during the demonstration at Roxby Downs protesting about the demonstrators being there. The police not only have a role to ensure that peace and order are maintained but they also have a role to protect the demonstrators, the property of the demonstrators, the mine property and the people working at the mine site. I put that in no particular order. I see it as an overall policy of the police that applies in the city as well as in the country. There is no charge against the company for any services rendered by the police, nor could there be.

Mr BECKER: Many resources are tied up for one project at a great cost to the State. What can we do?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I would like to have the answer, too.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In respect of the Government's policy on these matters, is it the case that the Police Department or the Government charges the South Australian National Football League for policing duties at football matches?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No. I have explained what I see as the role of the police. The police have no right to charge anyone. The police are funded directly by the Government. Regarding the police being requested to provide protection at Football Park, I am not sure how it is done; perhaps the Commissioner determines how many police should be at Football Park for each function, or there might be consultation between the League and the Commissioner. I imagine the Commissioner would make up his mind about how many officers would be required at Adelaide Oval, Football Park or wherever else they are required. There is no way that any organisation in such circumstances can be charged by the police. It does not apply only at Roxby Downs. I hope that I have made that point clear.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Does that apply to rock concerts and the like?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: No charge is made by the police for any area of protection that is required under the law.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is fair enough. I had always assumed that, for those additional and extraneous police activities, there might have been some charges. I have no further questions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I noted in an *Advertiser* article recently that the Police Association had urged the Government to review the position of demonstrators to ensure that they do not interfere with the rights of the public and that the Association had asked for a set of guidelines to be set down to allow protesters to make their point without inconveniencing others. Has any official request been made by the Police Force for such a review? If there has, what action has the Government taken?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The member would be familiar with the Police Offences Act which is presently under review

by the Government but which is not under my control as the legislator but under the Attorney-General's Department. I know that the Attorney-General is wrestling with many amendments to that Act.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will that specifically set down guidelines in respect of demonstrations?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: In my view it will take demonstrations and other matters into consideration.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As the Minister representing the police, do you believe that such guidelines are necessary, that is, setting out guidelines as to what can or cannot happen at demonstrations?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I believe that we all need guidelines by which to work. That does not mean necessarily that I agree with what your guidelines would be, and I refer especially to spontaneous activities. Certainly, guidelines would assist not only the police but also people who are involved in the demonstrations occurring at the time. Whether or not it is possible to determine guidelines for a spontaneous situation and have them in operation—the member would agree that it would be difficult to arrive at that situation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I referred earlier to the Programme Estimates and the rising level of reported crime. The first paragraph at page 78 states:

The general trend over the past few years has been for the demands of police services to increase along with the rising level of reported crime.

Can the Minister indicate how this relates to other States, whether in South Australia we are seeing a greater increase in crime than is reported in other States, or is it about average?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I refer the question to the Commissioner.

Mr Hunt: I do not think I have information with me to compare with other States in relation to crime. The information we have is that 'calls for assistance' has seen an increase in the past two years. In 1981-82 we introduced a system whereby we graduated calls for assistance and classified them as A, B and C. The A classification was for urgent and 'must attend straight away' calls; B was those we would attend and get to when we could; and C was for calls that we referred to a police station or to another agency. When that system was introduced there was a reduction of 6.7 per cent in the total number of calls responded to. We did this to best re-allocate our resources. Since then, in 1982-83 there was an increase of 5.2 per cent, and in 1983-84 there was a further increase of 7.7 per cent. Despite the savings we made two years ago, the calls for assistance this year exceed those that we were experiencing before we introduced the new system. On the basis of calls for assistance from members of the public, there has been a significant rise despite the savings we were able to make two years ago.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can I be provided with information relating to how South Australia compares with other States in relation to the increase in crime?

Mr Hunt: I can obtain that information, but I doubt whether it will have full meaning. The difficulty is that there is a difference in counting rules and practices between the different States. Whether or not the offences will come out the same I do not know. We could still come up with a comparison from the Bureau of Statistics in relation to major crime.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What part has South Australia played in the establishment of the National Crimes Authority? I understand that legislation will be brought down to ratify the move. When will we see that legislation in South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It so happens that Mr Justice Stewart and his committee of prominent citizens were here

last week. The very matter of complementary legislation was discussed with the Premier, the Attorney-General and myself. No doubt the honourable member is aware that the Attorney-General is the South Australian representative on the intergovernmental committee, and he is also responsible for bringing in the complementary legislation. The Attorney-General informed Mr Justice Stewart that the legislation would be in place in South Australia before the end of the year. South Australia, through the Police Commissioner and the Attorney-General, has at all times acted as a party to the establishment of the National Crimes Authority, which requires the co-operation of all States. South Australia has guaranteed the Federal Government and Mr Justice Stewart that it will co-operate at all times. I understand that all States have given similar guarantees that they will work with the Authority.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand that it is necessary for the States to bring down mirroring legislation.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Yes, I said that. I said that the Attorney-General, who is responsible for the legislation, has said that he will bring it down before the end of the year.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to police numbers. The active police strength, I understand, is comprised of uniform, non-uniform and back-up clerical officers who are involved in crime control and all aspects of the Police Force. The yellow book indicates that the active police strength—those involved in police work—has been reduced by 15.2 FTE. On page 88 of the yellow book it is admitted that serious assaults and drug offences have continued to increase. I agree with that. The offences of break and enter, larceny and white collar crime could also be added to that list. In other words, the whole ambit of crime which the police are committed to attempt to control and stamp out in our community is on the increase. However, the Government has obviously accepted and budgeted for a reduction in the actual number of police officers.

I think the Minister owes Parliament a detailed explanation as to why he is presiding over what is virtually a no-growth budget for the police. I concede that the figures he has given could show an increase of 2 per cent in real dollars. However, the Minister is virtually presiding over a no-growth budget and a drop in the number of active police officers at a time when it is admitted that there is a serious increase in assaults, white collar crime, drug offences and other crimes in the community.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am not sure whether the honourable member has been present at all times since the Committee began this morning, but I thought this question was pursued by both the member for Murray and the member for Hanson. I thought we gave satisfactory answers to explain the situation. If the honourable member wants me to go over it again, I will, but he may be content to read it in *Hansard*. We have already dealt with this matter at some length. I dispute that we are budgeting for a reduction in actual numbers.

Mr OSWALD: I am referring to the difference between the total police strength and the active police strength. To me the active police strength involves the number of officers available to do the work or provide back-up assistance. The yellow book implies that there is a reduction in active police strength at a time of increased criminal activity. Has the active police strength—in other words, the number of officers fighting crime—in South Australia been increased to combat the increasing crime rate? I will be happy if the Minister can give that assurance.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will deal with the whole thing again now because the honourable member must have missed what I said about it. We need to go back to 1982 to pick up what was considered to be the correct number of staff. At that stage it was 3 241, which was considered to be

sufficient active strength by the Police Department, and it was quite satisfied with that arrangement. I have already explained, but I will go through it again, that the training courses have been reduced, not by the Government's whim but by the Police Department's making amendments and alterations to its training programmes, reducing those from three years to one year, which immediately takes two-thirds of the trainees outside the actual gang strength.

If only one lot of training is held per year instead of one lot in the first, second and third years, clearly, fewer people are in the Force. As I said, the figure in 1982 was 3 241; the target in 1984-85 for a funded average is 3 261; so we have an increase of 20 from what was considered to be the requirement in 1982. In 1983-84 there was an over supply because of lack of loss by attrition (people not leaving, turnover, retirements and so forth). So, it was necessary to get back to that 1982 figure.

New initiatives, which are all recent (only this year) and funded this year, are 4.5 full-time equivalents for a communications plan, which was introduced since I became Minister; 18 full-time equivalents for a strategic plan, which has also been introduced since I became Minister; we have one full-time equivalent secondment to STA for security on salary reimbursement to the Police Department; and four full-time equivalents in the Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. That is a total of 27.5, purely active police, and not including any public servants who may have been appointed in the meantime. I hope that I have been able to clarify the situation; that is about the third or fourth go that I have had at trying to explain it and I hope that it is now received as I am trying to give it.

Mr OSWALD: I still need to do some homework on those figures. I will not delay the Committee any further because we wish to pursue many other questions. I will study *Hansard* and write to the Minister later to seek further clarification on the figures if I cannot get them out of *Hansard*.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On the winding down of Special Branch, I notice on page 80 under 'State Security Services' that the employment average of full-time equivalents has been reduced from seven to 4.8. I notice also under 'Expenditure and Receipts Summary' that Recurrent Expenditure has been reduced from \$164 000 to \$134 000. I will ask a series of questions in regard to this. When the Attorney-General announced that Special Branch was to be axed, he announced that a new unit would be set up in the Police Force to operate in the areas of terrorist activity, visiting dignitaries, and violent behaviour between or within community groups. Has such a unit been set up? If not, when will it be set up? What will the unit comprise, and what will be the responsibilities of that unit?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I suggest that describing the new system of the Operations Planning and Intelligence Unit as being a unit that has been axed merely because there has been a change of name is pretty strong language. The unit has not been axed at all; it has been re-established under a different name, which is the Operations Planning and Intelligence Unit. It commenced operations on 25 July 1984. The unit comprises two sections, which work in close liaison. The responsibilities of the Operations Planning Section (OPS) include formulating, maintaining and updating major police emergency contingency plans, the Operations Command Manual, providing assistance and advice to personnel preparing operation orders or undertaking operational planning tasks, forming the nucleus of an operations planning team for large-scale police operations (for example, major demonstrations, Royal visits, Jubilee 150) and maintaining a central repository of all operation orders, debriefing reports and other material relevant to the planning and control of police operations. Additionally, it will be responsible for

operational planning liaison with external emergency services and other organisations. Staff may be required to assist in manning a police operations centre for large scale operations.

Secondly, the responsibilities of the Intelligence Section within the approved guidelines include collecting, evaluating, storing and disseminating operations information in respect of persons who may pose a threat to individuals, groups or property; providing similarly in respect of those individuals, groups or property considered at risk; and maintaining liaison with relevant police personnel, Commonwealth and State officials and other people, including members of community groups who may be of assistance within and without the State pending State Government examination of formal directives relating to the operations of the former branch known as Special Branch. This section will be responsible for the intelligence functions of the former branch.

I am further informed that the staff is seven and will remain on seven. The staff establishment of Special Branch before the formation of OP and IU was six, plus one clerical officer. This comprised one CO, one sergeant, four ORs and a CO1 clerical officer. The OP and IU comprises operations planning operations and intelligence. Operations planning comprises one CO, one OR; and Operations Intelligence, one sergeant and three ORs. Six members were previously attached to Special Branch. No other staff were transferred to OP and IU. The present establishment of the unit is six, plus one clerical officer. The reason for the 4.8, which figure the honourable member picked up, is a movement of two staff formerly in Special Branch to another programme on a temporary basis, but they will still be attached to the new unit.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What reason is given for the decrease in the current expenditure for State security services?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There was a decrease in allocation of \$53 000—is that the figure to which the honourable member referred?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There was a decrease from \$164 000 to \$134 000.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The information indicates that two staff members who were formally in Special Branch have been moved to the crime prevention and general police services programme, which offsets the full year costs of salary and wage increases awarded in 1983-84 and an increase in administration expenses of \$1 000

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Why was it necessary to change the name of Special Branch? The Attorney-General, when making the announcement, stated that the new unit would be responsible to a Minister of the Crown: to whom is the unit responsible?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The unit is responsible to the Minister in charge of police. It is under the control of the Police Commissioner, who is responsible to the Minister of Emergency Services. There has never been any question about that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There was some question at the time of the announcement.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I was overseas when the announcement was made. The name of Special Branch was changed for the simple reason that it was the Government's policy before the election to change the name.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will return to that point later. For some time there has been a need for a study on stress of police officers. It was announced some time ago that a major study of stress affecting South Australian police was being planned and that a committee had been formed by the Police Association in conjunction with the Police Department to have a wide ranging and ongoing inquiry into stress in the force. Has any such report been brought down and, if it has, what action has been taken in regard

to that report? If a report has not been brought down, when will that occur?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There has been increasing concern by police management in recent years regarding stress related disorders amongst police personnel. Consequently, a psychology unit and a welfare office were established in 1977 and a full-time police medical officer was appointed in 1980. These three units have reported a steady annual increase in the number of police officers suffering from stress. Some cases have resulted purely from occupational hazards; however, the majority have developed from the interaction of personal problems and work pressures. Approximately 25 per cent of invalid retirements during the past 10 years have been for mental disorders. Also, a significant proportion of other invalid retirements have possessed a stress related component. Stress related disorders are treated by offering a confidential counselling service and making referrals to outside consultants as required. A case management committee also considers the problems of individuals who are suffering from severe stress and who require rehabilitation back into the work environment, and it makes appropriate recommendations to personnel command.

Recently an occupational health and welfare committee was established to organise an ongoing programme to deal with stress related problems experienced by both serving members and their families. This committee has proposed a number of preventative approaches, which are currently being examined. Recommendations include undertaking research into local police stress problems, developing policy for the management of reviewing problems, careful selection and induction of personnel for high risk stress areas, regular medical examinations, promotion of physical fitness among police officers, and conducting stress awareness and stress management training courses for recruits and personnel attached to high risk stress areas.

I am very concerned about this matter and I am delighted that the honourable member has raised it, because it relates to occupational health, safety and welfare in industry. There is no more stressful occupation than that of police officer. I suppose that other people could claim similar stress, but in my view a police officer's occupation has all the conditions for stress. For example, police officers work shift work; they never know when someone is around the corner waiting for them; they have to deal with criminals; and they attend break-ins and all sorts of things. It is a worry. The Department is trying to get on top of it, and, from the report that the Commissioner has given to me, I am convinced that everyone is very concerned about this matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Last year when Mr Keneally was Chief Secretary he indicated both in the House and publicly that he would investigate allegations that police were being 'blackmailed' into dropping charges against offenders who threatened counter prosecution. He indicated that he was concerned about this matter and was anxious to resolve it. Mr Keneally went on to say that officers were reluctant to take court action when threatened with a counter prosecution and that, depending on the severity of the charge, it could cost an officer a substantial amount if an offender proceeded with such a prosecution. The Police Association indicated at that time that false charges against police were occurring at an increasing rate. I was concerned about that at the time.

Will the Minister indicate the current situation? Will he say what has been done in that regard? Was the previous Chief Secretary able to follow up the matter? The Police Association stated that, although the State Government covered reasonable costs, the amount was still inadequate, and it was suggested that in such a situation the Government should fulfil its obligations and meet all the costs, if justice was to be done.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I would appreciate the Commissioner's commenting on this matter, as it was raised before I was appointed Chief Secretary. The matter has not been drawn to my attention.

Mr Hunt: I am not competent to talk about whether or not the recompense is adequate, but at this stage, off-hand, I am not aware of any substantial increase in the past year or so in the number of incidents of what we call 'cross charging' of behaviour of police officers by defendants. There was a time when this matter was rightly given some prominence because of a growing practice among people with whom we were dealing to lay counter charges against police officers. There was quite a deal of concern.

However, these matters are always referred to us and we invite comment from the Crown, and not only on the handling of the case. That is often carried out in consultation with the Police Association. Sometimes the Crown is able to appear on behalf of an officer, the Crown may brief counsel, or in some cases the Police Association is asked to take up the cudgels and seek recompense at a later date.

I am not able to comment on the adequacy of the reimbursements, and I am not aware at this stage of any further increase in the number of incidents of this cross-charging practice by people we deal with. I can take up the matter and ascertain whether or not that is the case.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It was reported earlier this year that nearly one in four active police officers was injured on duty last year. It was stated that these figures meant that the injury rate for police trying to control violent offenders had reached nearly 25 per cent. I found that to be a fairly staggering figure. Can the Minister say whether or not the South Australian Police Force is concerned about this matter? Obviously it is, according to the report that appeared in the media. Is this something that we have to go along with, or can something be done to overcome this problem?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: We do not have those statistics available but will certainly get them for the honourable member. If that figure is correct we will let him know what we are doing or intend doing about this matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On page 83 of the yellow book there is quite an increase shown in recurrent expenditure for State disaster planning control and relief. Will the Minister provide further information relating to that increase?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Is the honourable member talking about the whole programme?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes. On page 83 of the yellow book under the heading 'State Disaster Planning Control and Relief', a recurrent expenditure of \$253 000 is shown for 1983-84 and a figure of \$503 000 is proposed for 1984-85.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There is quite a report on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Minister can find this information during the dinner break. Earlier today permission was granted for replies to questions to be produced at a later stage. I have been advised that replies from the Minister or his officers must be in the hands of the Clerk of the Committee by 19 October to enable those replies to be included in the *Hansard* record.

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

The Hon. J.D. Wright: When we adjourned I was asking the honourable member to identify whether he was looking at the whole of the programme or part of it. He indicated that he was looking at the whole of the programme of State disaster planning control and relief and indicated that there had been an increase from \$297 000 to \$503 000. He is perfectly correct in that. What is happening is that there are

two subprogrammes in that area. They are 'Planning and Co-ordination Training' and 'Government Disaster Operations and Maintenance Centre Services' to State Emergency Service units. In order to give the honourable member a full explanation, it is necessary to take up a little time of the Committee.

Concerning 'Recurrent Expenditure—Variations' the proposed 1983-84 figure was \$176 000 and the outcome was \$136 000—a decrease of \$40 000. That decrease was due to the following factors: the movement of salaries for two regional officers to the 'Assistance to SES units' subprogramme, an equivalent of \$35 000; the position of Director, SES, was not filled until October 1983 (these occurrences offset the effects of salary and wage increases awarded in 1983-84); and an increase in administration expenditure of \$4 000.

The outcome for 1983-84 was \$136 000 and the proposed expenditure for 1984-85 is \$332 000—an increase of \$196 000. That increase results from the following factors: the full year cost of salary and wage increases awarded in 1982-83 of \$6 000; the allocation of \$85 000 for salaries for additional 9.1 full-time equivalents associated with the reorganisation of SES (salaries of additional seven regional officers, that is, 5.3 full-time equivalents, in 1984-85 were met by the Commonwealth); and an increase in administration expenditure of \$105 000 associated with the reorganisation of SES.

Concerning employment levels, the proposed figure for 1983-84 was six, and the outcome was 5.5. The proposed figure for 1984-85 is 14.6. The variation of 0.5 full-time equivalents between the proposed 1983-84 figure and the outcome for 1983-84 results from the position of Director, State Emergency Services, not being filled until midway through the year. The variation of 9.1 full-time equivalents between the outcome for 1983-84 and the proposed 1984-85 figure is due to the appointment of additional staff associated with the reorganisation of State Emergency Services. The 9.1 full-time equivalents are made up as follows:

Seven regional officers—5.3 full-time equivalents.

Two training officers—two full-time equivalents.

One Deputy Director—0.8.

One Administrative Officer—1.

Those figures deal with one of the subprogrammes and I think that the explanation has been fairly full. The next subprogramme I deal with concerns 'Assistance to SES Units, Recurrent Expenditure—Variations'. The proposed 1983-84 figure was \$77 000 and the outcome was \$161 000—an increase of \$84 000. That increase is due to the following factors: an increase in subsidies paid to local government bodies of \$49 000 (due to increased local government activities resulting from bushfires); and salaries of two regional officers previously included in subprogrammes 'Disaster Preparedness, Planning and Training' and 'Disaster Operations Services (Police Emergency Operations Centre and Other Police Services)'. The outcome for 1983-84 was \$161 000 and the proposed 1984-85 figure is \$171 000—an increase of \$10 000. I do not think that this is an extraordinary increase. This increase results from the following factors: the full-year cost of salary and wage increases in 1983-84 for two regional officers of \$1 000; and an increased allocation for subsidies to local government bodies of \$9 000.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Page 78 of the yellow book, under 'Strategies', states:

Legislative amendments will continue to be pursued as required to increase the facility for detection of crime.

The Minister will be aware that I have asked numerous questions concerning my support for changes to the Police Offences Act. Is the Minister prepared to inform the Committee of the stage of negotiations as far as the legislation is concerned? Will he provide some information regarding

the amount of consultation that has taken place between the Police Department and the Government concerning this legislation?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am not in a position to fully inform the member of the final conclusions of the Attorney-General who, as I indicated earlier, has the control of the introduction of the amendments to the Police Offences Act. The Attorney-General and his officers met with me and the Commissioner of Police. The Departments, rather than the principals of the Departments, have met on several occasions, so there has been a great amount of consultation. I am not in a position to inform the Committee of the final drafting of that piece of legislation. I am afraid that the member will have to wait until it is brought into Parliament.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There has been talk about the introduction of legislation setting up an authority to look into complaints against police. I am very much aware of the time span since that report was handed to the Minister. Will the Minister now indicate to the Committee what stage has been reached concerning that legislation and when it is likely that it will be brought before the House to enable that authority to be established?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have had before Cabinet what one, I suppose, could describe as the first draft for the establishment of an independent authority, call that body what you will—Police Ombudsman, Police Investigations Authority or whatever. There are some objections from within the community even concerning the name of that body. I have now sent out two drafts to interested people. The first draft I sent out of proposed legislation drew some comment from those people who are interested in this type of legislation.

I have now redrafted it and taken into consideration all the matters, objections, proposals and suggestions raised. I have given it much consideration and have now sent out the second draft for further comment. The member would be aware that there has been a great deal of consultation on this matter. I am now waiting on replies which, I think, should be back by 28 September. Following the receipt of those submissions I will be in a position to take a final document back to Cabinet within three or four weeks and I hope to introduce and debate the legislation in Parliament in this session.

Mr OSWALD: Can the Minister quantify the actual numbers of crimes that have been specifically solved through the registration of firearms?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have some information that I can let the honourable member have. The report from the Commissioner to me states:

1 January 1980 to 31 July 1984:	
1. Persons licensed to have firearms	121 317
2. Persons licensed as dealers	317
3. Total firearms registration	276 345
4. Total licence applications refused by Registrar of Firearms (the Commissioner)	788
5. Total licences cancelled by Registrar	232
4. and 5. above are on the basis of criminality, mental instability, youth, lack of safety knowledge.	
6. Total licences issued with conditions, that is, specified uses, parts of State or because of lack of English language.	59
7. The following table sets out the number of applications received and voluntarily withdrawn, when it has become known that the Registrar has an objection and that the matter would be referred to the Consultative Committee.	
Class A—Air rifles and .22	2 333
Class B—Shotguns	1 388
Class C—Pistols	1 774
Class D—Other	1 059
Total	6 554

It is fair to say that many in this category are young people who have not been able to sustain a good reason for the possession of such firearms. The Police practice in these cases is to contact the parents and this interaction has been appreciated by the parents.

8. Prosecutions under the Firearms Act in the same period:

Persons arrested/reported	1 541
Number of offences committed by the above	6 247
9. The provisions and penalties prescribed by the Act are sufficient. I make no comment about penalties imposed by the courts.
10. In discussing the matter of penalties, mention is often made of stricter penalties under the Firearms Act for robbery, acts of violence, etc. however, it should be pointed out that these penalties and crimes are catered for under pertinent Acts such as the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.
11. I am satisfied with the operation and policing of the Act, and point out that there are other submissions to be considered by Government.

That gives the member a good overview of what has been happening in the area which, like the honourable member, I have been interested in myself.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to the \$50 charged by the police when required to attend a false alarm after three visits. What is the percentage of false alarms attended by police patrols?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I refer the question to the Commissioner, who has detailed knowledge of the question.

Mr Hunt: The reason the Department recommended to the Government the imposition of a penalty or payment for attending in the case of a false alarm was that South Australia, consistent with the rest of the world that we had studied, was involved in a 94 per cent to 96 per cent attendance at false alarms. Of course, this was a fair drain on manpower and it was decided on this tactic to make people more responsible in respect of the type of alarms used.

Mr OSWALD: What microcomputers has the Department? I understand that you have one in the Fraud Squad and another in the Major Crime Squad. Have you any other microcomputers? How much did they cost, and when were they purchased? Are you planning to purchase other new microcomputers in this Budget?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Commissioner seems to have all the facts and figures in his head and I refer the question to him.

Mr Hunt: One microcomputer is attached to the Fraud Squad and another to the Major Crime Squad. These are recent innovations. One is placed in Special Projects for executive research and has been renewed in the last year or so. A microcomputer has been in that section for about three years. These are the only three that we have. In regard to buying more this year, I do not believe that that will be the case. We are moving ahead and developing programmes on a larger mainframe computer that we acquired only a few months ago.

Mr OSWALD: Does that mean that the computers for the Fraud Squad and the Major Crime Squad were interim measures only, or will they continue in use?

Mr Hunt: The Gaming Squad also has a microcomputer that was made available to it by the TAB to assist in resolving gaming offences. At present it would be intended that these machines be used until they can be taken over by the larger mainframe computer. One purpose in acquiring the larger computer was to use it for the management of criminal investigations. The Special Projects computer will stay in its current use.

Mr OSWALD: What has been the cost of these microcomputers?

Mr Hunt: This type of computer runs out at a cost of between \$7 000 and \$10 000 each.

Mr BECKER: I want to get on to crime detection and investigation services. I have had complaints that it takes several months for the change of ownership of motor vehicles to be recorded through the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. If, following a sale of a motor vehicle, a crime is committed, the police search the records of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. From what I can gather, they do not appear to update their records thereafter. I had a case of a young chap who sold a panel van to a couple who used it as a mobile brothel, committing drug offences and for other things. For six months after the chap sold it he was being called on by the police in relation to several offences, and it took quite a bit of effort to get the records of the Police Department upgraded. I realise the difficulty lies with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Has the Department had any other complaints about this type of thing occurring, and what can be done by the use of a computer to keep the police records up to date within a few days. Can there be greater liaison between the Police Department and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in relation to a change of ownership.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I personally have not had any complaints about the matter to which the honourable member has referred. Whether the Police Commissioner has had complaints about the matter, I am not able to say and he can comment in a moment. It would appear that the matter is more outside his area and within the responsibility of the Registrar rather than the police needing to get their records up to scratch. Let us find out from the Police Commissioner what method is being used.

Mr Hunt: The Police Department itself has a unit dedicated to trying to keep up to date on stolen vehicles. However, the honourable member is talking about current information on the registration of vehicles. Up to a short time ago we were relying on getting microfiche information from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and that was necessarily dated. I am not quite sure whether or not we have established an interface with that division via a computer, but I understand that the Motor Vehicles Department is investigating and about to install other computing equipment.

Mr BECKER: I would be pleased if that information could be supplied as I have been on the receiving end after selling my old car. A month later I had one or two visits because the change of ownership had not gone through. I felt for this young lad at West Beach because he was in the clear, but the people who bought it were committing all sorts of offences and the police were wasting a considerable amount of time chasing up the wrong person. That may be an area in which resources could be saved.

I refer to the crime alert programme (page 95 of the yellow book) in regard to community liaison and public awareness. From my own experience in Henley Beach, the person there is doing a good job through schools and community service organisations. What feedback does the Minister have in relation to the success or otherwise of the crime alert programme and whether it will continue to expand as an important part of community liaison and public awareness?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The areas mentioned under the crime awareness programme are the traffic safety education campaigns and the administration of blue light discos. To deal with the latter first, the blue light discos are one of the best organisations of this type in Australia. I have not been to a blue light disco, but I have met many young people who have. I was privileged, about a year ago, to have been at the presentation of trophies at the Marion Road complex—the Western Community Youth Centre. I am not sure whether the honourable member was there, but he does come when he is able to do so. The person in charge of

blue light discos was the guest speaker on that occasion. He told the 150 to 200 people present about the great job the blue light discos are doing. I see it has an area of crime prevention because we are getting hold of young people who have nothing else to do and giving them an opportunity to enjoy themselves.

I have some details for members in regard to the blue light discos. They continue to provide, arguably, the most successful public relations exercise yet initiated in South Australia by the Police Department. The reasons for this include the confidence the public has in the police to provide a well supervised and disciplined entertainment area free from drugs, alcohol and disorderly behaviour, and provide safe, healthy recreation. All discos are controlled, organised and run by off duty police officers supported by various service clubs and community groups. It is important to make the point that off duty policemen interest themselves in this matter. They are not being paid for attending these blue light discos. They are to be commended for giving up their free time to associate themselves with this very worthy cause.

The period of rapid growth in the inaugural year has, as expected, levelled off in 1983-84. Nevertheless, 11 new branches have commenced operation, two more have been approved but are yet to operate, and a further eight branches are under consideration. The statistical status of blue light discos as at 30 June 1984 was as follows:

	1983	1984
Branches operating	32	43
(1984—13 Metropolitan, 30 Country)		
Branches approved but yet to operate	2	2
Branches under consideration	4	8
Branches closed	2	1
Total	40	54
Dances conducted	200	245
Total attendance	112 816	122 249
Average attendance at each dance conducted	564	499

The figure for the number of dances conducted indicates that they are on the increase. The honourable member will be delighted to note (as he has an interest in this) that the figure for total attendance increased from 112 816 in 1983 to 122 249 in 1984. The drop in average attendance is probably due to the fact that there are now more branches.

Some of the highlights of last year's effort include discos for disabled youth being held at St Anne's School, Marion, and at the North Adelaide Football clubrooms.

A humid crib valued at \$6 134 was presented to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Elizabeth. An electric wheelchair valued at \$2 500 was purchased for a 13-year-old boy suffering from muscular dystrophy. A motor vehicle capable of transporting wheelchair patients, valued at \$10 000, was donated to the Multiple Sclerosis Society. An unemployed youth was sponsored to attend a 'live in' camp for one week. This camp was aimed at youths who had been unemployed for a protracted period and who lacked motivation to seek employment. A disco was run in conjunction with the drink/driving campaign sponsored by the South Australian Health Commission. Cricket coaching classes were sponsored at which international cricket identity, Mr Tony Grieg, gave tuition. A further \$3 000 was allocated to assist with the formation of a new SACA Club. A community worker was sponsored for an unemployed youth health programme. A riding school for disabled youth was provided with the funds to keep a horse for one year. A training film for the Kinder Gym Programme was funded.

From this list it can be seen that the profits accrued are returned to the community in areas which will benefit a wide cross-section of youth related activities. The continued outstanding contribution made by volunteer police personnel is worthy of the maximum possible praise and acknowl-

edgement. It is doubted whether any other group of Governmental employees could even approach the level of self sacrifice and private contribution to the welfare of young people as that displayed by blue light disco police managers and officials. I am quite sure that the honourable member would agree with those comments.

The honourable member also asked me about the community relations officer pilot scheme. In 1983-84, in furtherance of a perceived need to attach community relations officers to each police regional or divisional headquarters in order to enhance police/community relations by the introduction of planned community policing/crime prevention programme, a pilot scheme was run in the Henley Beach area. I have no doubt that the honourable member is quite acquainted with the area and I thought he would be interested in it, but I notice that he is not listening.

A relatively young but mature and experienced member holding the rank of first class constable was chosen for the role of crime prevention officer. This member's duties included the identification and assessment of local community crime prevention needs and the undertaking of experimental programmes designed principally not only to foster increased police/school student liaison but to also include the older unemployed youth of the area, particularly those young people considered to be 'at risk' (persons having some criminal record or a history of delinquency and considered likely to re-offend or become involved in serious criminal behaviour).

Concentrating on students in the 14-16 years age group in three selected schools in the area, the officer concerned embarked on an intensive programme of police/student interaction. This included both formal contact, in the nature of class instruction by himself or other visiting police officers on matters of road law, vehicle defects, firearms safety and so on, and informal liaison such as arranging visits to police headquarters, lunch-break barbecues, and personal involvement in student sporting activities.

Other initiatives undertaken included the running of a crime prevention poster competition, prizes for which were sponsored by the Henley Beach Rotary Club. The success of this particular scheme can be gauged from the fact that 16 schools saw fit to participate, resulting in the submission of over 1 000 entries and continuing requests for further police involvement by many of the schools in question. I think it is very important that the police were penetrating, being required for more services.

Although experimental in nature, the pilot scheme appears to have been an outstanding success, due in no small way to the dedicated and untiring efforts of the member concerned, First Class Constable G. Holloway. The support given to the programme by school principals and staff, community service organisations and Government welfare agencies augurs well for future schemes of this nature.

The principal function of the Department's newly created Crime Prevention Programme Unit will be to both develop and assist in implementing crime prevention strategies in the various police regions/divisions, according to properly determined local requirements. While the maintenance of any such programme will be the responsibility of the respective police commanders, it will still be necessary to appoint community relations/crime prevention officers in each area to co-ordinate local initiatives. It is intended that this matter be further addressed during the re-organisation and rationalisation of police resources which will result from the current review of metropolitan and country policing requirements.

I think it is only fair to the honourable member that I give him all of this detail. There is a little more, if the honourable member requires it. As mentioned earlier, one of the principal functions of the newly-formed Community

Affairs and Crime Prevention Branch (C.A. and C.P. Branch) is to develop a number of community policing and crime prevention programmes and to co-ordinate the implementation of relevant initiatives in the various police regions and divisions, on a state-wide basis, according to properly defined local requirements.

In many western countries, including Australia, processes of industrialisation, drug use, communication, changing morality and disaffection amongst subgroups in society (among other factors) have resulted in exacerbating problems for those authorities assigned to combat crime, violence and disorder. In particular, increases in the incidence of house-breaking, motor vehicle theft, vandalism and violence against police have emerged as major causes for concern in recent times. As a result, many police authorities are placing increasing emphasis on community crime prevention programmes designed in many cases to involve ordinary citizens in the processes of crime prevention and reporting and, in all cases, to improve relations between police and citizens.

It is accepted that, while there is a necessity to adhere to certain basic principles, one of the essential requirements of any police system is that it should be capable of adaption to meet the requirements of different communities. This is because one of the most effective weapons any police organisation can have in its fight against crime is the confidence of the communities it serves and the continuing support of the general public. I believe the South Australian Police Force has that support.

In any community it is essential for the police and the people they serve to work together to accomplish mutual goals. Fortunately, in these times of rapid social change, both police and community attitudes are changing and there is increasing awareness of the need for a more unified effort to help society remain intact within the framework of law and good public order.

Evidence relating to the extent, the cost and the public fear of crime supports the need for the development of new strategies in the fields of community policing and crime prevention. The former is being addressed as part of a current State-wide review of policing requirements. The latter area is the province of the Department's new Crime Prevention Section. Owing to the currently outstanding success in Victoria of the 'Neighbourhood Watch' programme, it is intended to initiate this type of scheme in selected metropolitan and country areas in our State, on a trail basis, early in 1985.

Other crime prevention strategies to be addressed include such initiatives as bicycle marking and other household property identification programmes, possibly enlisting the support of the various community service organisations. Such programmes are currently still in the developmental stage. However, it is intended that comprehensive plans of proposed major initiatives in the areas of community policing and crime prevention will be presented to Government early in the New Year as part of the Police Department's Strategic Plan 1985. I hope that my response satisfies the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to page 79 of the yellow book, as follows:

The increased expenditure will be offset by non-recurring costs for the Splatt Royal Commission, [and] Coronial inquiries into the bush fires.

Can the Minister provide information as to the actual costs as they relate to the Police Department for the Splatt Royal Commission and the Coronial inquiries into the bush fires?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The police investigation into this disaster—I am talking about the Ash Wednesday bushfires—centred on 17 fires that occurred in five separate areas. On 20 July 1984 the State Coroner, Mr K.B. Ahern, completed the final inquest when he handed down his findings into

the Adelaide Hills (Central) fires. At the completion of the police investigation and prior to the bushfire investigation unit disbanding, a comprehensive debriefing report was prepared into all aspects of the investigation. This debriefing report, along with the disaster investigation plan, has been prepared in the event of a similar occurrence in the future, and I think that it is important that the Committee is aware of that. As to costing, this is fairly long.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am asking for the cost involved, not for all the details.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: If I give it to the honourable member in part it leaves something to be explained.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am happy to sit here for the rest of the night.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have to give you the answer as I see it. The overall costing of the bushfires investigation has been calculated from records kept within the unit. The costing related to the field operation has been prepared by the finance section of the Department. The analysis of the costing incurred has been prepared in the following categories: overall cost, field operation, bushfire investigation unit, cost per individual areas, Amdel investigations per fire source, overall costs. The total cost of the investigation was \$909 600, of which \$84 000 was supplemented by Treasury. For the field operations, the following costs were expended between 16 February 1983 and 27 February 1983: salaries, \$448 000; motor vehicle expenses, \$49 600; other, \$103 000; total, \$601 400.

For the bushfire investigation unit the following costs were expended from 1 July 1983 on the primary teams that operated, until the completion of the investigation on 25 July 1984: salaries, \$194 000; travelling expenses, \$12 989; Amdel examinations \$86 355; motor vehicle expenses \$10 965; mapping, \$712; other, \$2 579; total, \$308 200. I do not want to belabour this too long. I ask leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the rest of the statistical information because I do not want to take the time of the Committee. It is simply a breakdown of the figures.

Leave granted.

Costs per individual fire areas: (28.2.83—25.7.84)

Adelaide Hills (Central) Bushfires:

	\$	\$
Salaries	57 200	
Motor vehicles expenses	926	
Amdel	30 228	
Mapping	301	
		88 655

Willunga—Meadows Bushfire:

Salaries	11 000	
Motor vehicles expenses	446	
Amdel	7 279	
Mapping	110	18 835

Anstey Hill—Chain of Ponds Bushfire:

Salaries	10 800	
Motor vehicles expenses	362	
Amdel	558	11 720

South-East Bushfires:

Salaries	53 100	
Travelling expenses	11 428	
Motor vehicles expenses	7 890	
Amdel	40 794	
Mapping	199	
Commercial airlines	197	
Police aircraft	242	113 850

Clare Valley Bushfires:

Salaries	18 800	
Travelling expenses	1 561	
Motor vehicles expenses	1 340	
Amdel	7 497	
Mapping	102	29 300

	\$	\$
<i>Administration:</i>		
Salaries	43 900	
Stationery/photostating	1 200	
Telephone	940	46 040
Total Cost		308 200

*Does not include costs relating to the trials of Darren Mark Bing.

Amdel expenses—Individual fire sources:

<i>Adelaide Hills (Central) Bushfire:</i>		
Mount Osmond	4 726	
Bridgewater	2 795	
Mylor	15 967	
Woodside	2 097	
Hahndorf	3 507	
Macclesfield	1 135	30 227

Willunga—Meadows Bushfire:

Anstey Hill—Chain of Ponds Bushfires:

South-East Bushfires:

Naraweenra	5 184	
Claywells	1 901	
Avenues	2 249	
Mount Muirhead	4 406	
Range Road	1 726	
Konelgin	9 784	
Eight Mile Creek	14 643	
Koniak	25	
Tantanoola	876	40 794

Clare Valley Bushfires:

Total Cost		7 497
		86 355

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The costs of the Splatt Royal Commission from 1 March 1983 to 31 October 1983: normal salaries, \$70 028; from 1 November 1983 to 30 April 1984, \$26 704; total, \$96 732. Overtime: 1 March 1983 to 31 October 1983, \$27 109; 1 November 1983 to 30 April 1984, \$2 688; total, \$29 797. Photographs from 1 March 1983 to 31 October 1983, \$5 331; and from 1 November 1983 to 30 April 1984, \$801; total, \$6 132. Miscellaneous administration expenses from 1 March 1983 to 31 October 1983, \$3 520.

From 1 March 1983 to 31 October 1983, the total was \$105 988; from 1 November 1983 to 30 April 1984, \$31 708; total, \$137 696. There was an addition of pay-roll tax of 5 per cent on that amount, which came to \$6 328; total, \$144 024.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On page 87, under the sub-programme, General Country Police Services, Country Mobile Patrols, it states in the second line, 'More extensive involvement in criminal inquiries'. I ask for an explanation. I take it that it is suggested that the country patrols are becoming more involved as a result of increased criminal inquiries.

Mr Hunt: In order to maximise the resources we have in the Criminal Investigation Branch, we have had to rationalise the approach to the investigations. Both in the city and in the country we have classified crimes for investigation now, based on a screening model and a points score. These are broken down into classes (a), (b) and (c). Uniformly throughout the State now our practice is that uniformed patrols take a much more active part in investigating crimes in order to save the time of Criminal Investigation Branch officers, who can apply their time to more serious crime.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When will the review that is being carried out into B3 Division be completed?

Mr Hunt: This examination has been overtaken by the approach that we have taken in our strategy for 1984, where we are completely reviewing all of the metropolitan and country areas in the whole State. A report will be available for our intended strategic plan 1985, which will be prepared at the end of this year on the total State.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Again on page 88, under 'Issues and Trends', it indicates that the numbers of murders and attempted murders have reduced in 1983-84 and that

serious assaults and drug offences have continued to increase. Can the Minister provide any statistics with regard to the increase in serious assaults or drug offences?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have a table. Table I examines the number of murder, attempted murder, serious assault and drug offences reported to or becoming known to police during 1982-83 and 1983-84. Trends in the number of reported serious assault offences are discussed in greater detail in the report on crime trends in South Australia, which also discusses trends in the number of reported homicide offences. The number of drug offences reported to or becoming known to police depends on police activity and policy and does not necessarily reflect the actual level of drug offences in the community. Therefore, the number of drug offences reported to or becoming known to police should not be included in any analysis of the level of crime in the community. The number of murder, attempted murder, serious assault, or drug offences being reported to or becoming known to police during 1982-83 and 1983-84 is set out in the table. To save the time of the Committee, I seek leave to insert the table in *Hansard* without my reading it, as it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Table I: The number of murder, attempted murder, serious assault and drug offences reported to or becoming known to police during 1982-83 and 1983-84.

Offence	Number of offences reported to or becoming known to police		Per cent change from 1982-83 to 1983-84	
	1982-83	1983-84 ⁽¹⁾		
Murder	18	19	+5.6pc	-11.4pc
Attempted murder	16	20	-23.1pc	
Serious assault	653	726	+11.2pc	
Total drug offences	4 963	6 829	+37.6pc	

(1) Preliminary figures only.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note from the yellow book (page 88) that one of the specific targets/objectives for 1984-85 is 'to undertake a post-implementation review of the modified Criminal Investigation System'. Can the Minister provide details in that regard?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The modified procedures for criminal investigations involving changes to the responsibilities for criminal investigations and introduction of case screening models for break-ins, larcenies and illegal uses have been in operation for one year. The process has been monitored during that period and a report of the first year of operation with these changes is currently being prepared. In conjunction with this, a complete review of the uniform inquiry services role, its position in the organisational structure, selection and training, and working procedures is currently being undertaken. As part of the crime investigation review a crime investigation management system was implemented on 2 April 1984. The system was designed for use by all non-specialist CIB personnel and is comprised of two parts. Part 1 involves a standardised set of documentation, procedures to be followed by these personnel when further investigating crimes. This documentation system is designed to improve the quality and control of criminal investigations. Part 2 involves the managing and evaluating of CIB personnel and relates to their performance of investigations and further investigations. This part of the system is designed to identify those areas where investigators demonstrate noticeable ability or require further constructive assistance, and allows an assessment to be made of their investigative ability on a regular and continued basis. The entire man-

agement system will be reviewed after it has been operating for six months.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that there is to be an increase in expenditure because of an increase in the operating costs of the Central Fingerprint Bureau; why is there to be an increase?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am informed that there is a contribution by all States (we do not have the details) to the Central Fingerprint Bureau in Sydney. Our contribution as voted in 1983-84 was \$82 000, but \$102 805 was actually expended, an increase of 25 per cent. The final account for this Department's share of the cost of operating the Central Fingerprint Bureau was \$21 000 more than originally advised by the New South Wales Police Department. The sum of \$121 000 is proposed for 1984-85, and actual payments for 1983-84 totalled \$102 805, indicating an increase of \$18 195: the estimate provided allows for an increase of \$18 000 on last year's expenditure. Past experience has shown that the estimates provided by the New South Wales Police Department in December are usually short of actual requirements by about that amount. It is fairly consistent with what has happened normally.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note from the yellow book (page 91) that under 'Specialist Criminal Investigation Services' there is a component for fingerprinting. Does the Minister believe that the police should have extended powers to fingerprint and photograph any person in custody on a charge?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I believe that the honourable member is getting into a policy area; it does not have a great deal to do with the allocation of funds. I know that the honourable member is a very patient gentleman and he will just have to wait until the Police Offences Act amendments are before the Parliament.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is stated at page 92 of the yellow book under 'Issues/Trends':

No noticeable increase of visiting dignitaries has occurred since the upgrading and opening of the international standard airport and facilities, although it is anticipated in the future.

I note that there has been a decrease from \$164 000 to \$134 000 for 'General Security Services for Dignitaries'. Can the Minister explain the decrease?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: This comes under specialist intelligence services, recurrent expenditure variations; \$164 000 was proposed in 1983-84, \$187 000 was actually expended, and an increase of \$23 000, which is due to salary and wage increases awarded in 1983-84 (\$22 000) and an increase in administration expenditure of \$1 000. I have already referred to the movement of two officers.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The traffic infringement expiation system is referred to at page 98 of the yellow book. When that system was first introduced, concern was expressed by the police regarding the administration of the system. Do the police feel that that system is running smoothly now?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There is one thing I have learnt about police officers and the Police Association and that is that, if something is going wrong, they will let us know about it pretty quickly. I believe that that is a relatively good system under which to operate, because things do not then drag on. Having received no complaint or criticism about this project, it is reasonable for me to conclude that the traffic infringement expiation system is operating in a sound and effective manner. Regarding the review, the title of the committee changed to the Traffic Infringement Notice Management Committee. The committee was to meet quarterly, and its role was to review, forward quarterly reports and to provide a formal mechanism to ensure that day by day requirements are met. Initiatives taken during 1983-84 have been implemented, including a review of expiation

fees, resulting in an increase on average of 20 per cent, and a restructuring of the traffic infringement notice steering committee. Initiatives under consideration for 1984-85 are: administrative changes to allow for subsequent charges under the Motor Vehicles Act to be laid out without the necessity

of withdrawing a traffic infringement notice for the original offence; and a further review of expiation fees. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* the relevant statistics without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Traffic Infringement Notices

	March 1983	June 1983	Quarters		March 1984	June 1984
			September 1983	December 1983		
Notices issued	30 487	31 836	28 418	29 954	29 673	29 793
Multiple notices	1 116	1 186	1 066	1 241	1 199	1 115
Multiple notice rate	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	4.1%	4.0%	3.7%
Notices expiated	26 065	27 786	23 783	24 498	24 490	24 234
Notices expiated late	1 777	1 849	1 600	1 838	1 967	1 869
Expiation rate	85.3%	87.3%	83.6%	81.7%	82.5%	81.3%
Load expiation rate	6.8%	6.7%	6.7%	7.5%	8.3%	7.7%
Traffic offences						
Offences reported	31 697	33 102	30 621	32 520	32 157	32 111
Offences withdrawn	722	592	642	659	544	555
Remainder	31 062	32 510	29 979	31 861	31 613	31 556
Offences expiated	26 916	28 139	24 466	25 200	25 163	25 577
Offences expiated late	1 953	1 504	1 358	1 626	1 625	1 702
Rate of withdrawal	2.0%	2.6%	2.1%	2.0%	1.7%	1.7%
Expiation rate	84.9%	85.0%	79.8%	77.4%	78.3%	79.6%
Late expiation rate	7.3%	5.3%	5.5%	6.4%	6.4%	6.6%

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I suggest that the traffic infringement notice system is in good order, indeed. As I have indicated in the review, certain suggestions have been made that will be adopted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Page 105 of the yellow book, under 'Specific Targets/Objectives' mentions reintroduction of highway patrols on all major country roads within the State. I was of the opinion that highway patrols were already operating. Will the Minister give detail in relation to this matter?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: In 1976 the former highway patrol was disbanded and the responsibility for policing country highways was left to local police with some assistance from the Speed Detection Section within a 100 km radius from Adelaide. In 1980, a survey of State highways revealed a high percentage of vehicles exceeding relevant speed limits. Statistics revealed that approximately 30 per cent of all accidents occurred on country roads and approximately 50 per cent of all road fatalities. Consequently, a project to investigate the possibility of reintroducing highway patrols within the State was commenced.

During the 12 week period 15 September 1983 to 7 December 1983 a simultaneous two phase trail highway patrol was staged. Phase 1 involved existing 'Digitector' patrol personnel from the Traffic Region; patrol areas were increased from 100 km to 160 km radius from Adelaide; and personnel were rostered for 'day' and 'afternoon' shifts with four members (two patrols) deployed in outer country areas for five days each week. This necessitated four nights per week absence from the station. Phase 2 involved two motor traffic members being stationed at Mount Gambier to perform patrol duties solely within the South-East of the State on a two shift basis.

Workloads for each phase were monitored by Organisational Services and after evaluation the following recommendations were made: two MTCs to be stationed permanently at Mount Gambier to perform highway patrol duties in the South-East; and a 24 man Highway Patrol, based at the Traffic Region, to be reintroduced and perform duties within 160 km of Adelaide on main roads, the per-

sonnel to be taken from the existing 'Digitector' patrols. Recurring costs per annum for these patrols, based on kilometres travelled, meal claims and change-over costs of police vehicles, was estimated to be: Traffic Division, \$68 000; and the South-East, \$24 500. Both recommendations have been approved by the Commission, but implementation is now dependant on a reallocation of the department's resources.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Page 105 of the yellow book states that one of the specific targets is to complete the evaluation of the effectiveness of red light cameras in policing traffic light offences and to instal those cameras at selected intersections. There has been an amount of publicity given to this subject of late to which I will not refer. However, I would like to know how extensive this evaluation will be and when it is intended it will be completed.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Over a number of years records have highlighted the incidence of vehicle accidents at traffic light controlled intersections and junctions within the greater metropolitan area. The physical policing of traffic lights involves the deployment of three members and their equipment, and is a costly operation of limited effectiveness. It is believed that adoption of red light cameras interstate and overseas has resulted in initially high offender detection rates followed by a reduction in the incidence of accidents at the locations treated.

A camera has been offered to this State for evaluation. It will be installed and operated at three selected intersections over a three month period. The Police Department together with the Highways Department will evaluate it. This unit should be operating by December 1984. Current cost of each unit is in the vicinity of \$25 000. There are also the associated and continuing costs of maintenance and follow-up of offending motorists. The two units are being made available for assessment purposes free of charge. The Department will incur (in conjunction with the Highways Department) a \$12 000 establishment cost, plus \$1 500 for insurance of equipment. Therefore, they will be installed on a trial basis and an assessment will be made in conjunction

by the Highways Department and the Police Department as to whether or not they will be continued with.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It has been indicated that a major upgrading of the country communications network is in progress. I would like detail of that network and to know specifically what stage has been reached in relation to negotiations taking place to have the tower built at the top of Mount Barker.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will deal first with the metropolitan and country communications upgrade. The Police Department has developed a comprehensive communications plan to serve the police and community in this State. This has been necessary primarily because of the outdated equipment being used by the department and the unavailability of additional frequencies to expand the existing VHF network to meet increasing workload demands. To avoid channel interference and to satisfy user demand the Department of Communications is implementing a policy to phase out VHF operations. That department is now offering new radio channels in alternative frequency bands where there is less congestion and room for further expansion. The metropolitan plan will provide a total mobile UHF network throughout the metropolitan area and ensure compatible UHF communications for both mobile and portable radio equipment.

I refer next to the country plan. In country areas the department does not have a communications network as in the metropolitan area but rather a number of communications cells. This provides limited police coverage for individual townships but does not satisfy the primary need for mobile coverage for patrols outside townships.

Operationally the police service can only be as effective as communications will allow. The expansion capability of the present country system has reached its limits without the introduction of a new high band VHF mobile and the construction of a series of radio towers to ensure coverage. The recent coronial inquiry into the bushfires in the South-East highlighted the lack of communications coverage for mobile and mobile to base communication, and continuous coverage along major roads. Unfortunately, the deficiencies within the South-East reflect the actual situation throughout the State.

I turn now to the communications centre. The heart of the police communications network is the communications centre, which must be upgraded to cater for the expansion and changeover of frequencies. This is not planned to commence until the 1985-86 financial year, but will ensure that the department's communications are compatible and can expand with satellite support systems into the next century.

The communications centre is based on electronic technology that was available in the mid 1970s. The equipment is hard wired and modular in construction. It is therefore not possible to expand existing switching networks and cables with the new generation of broadcasting frequencies. With the change to new mobile transceivers and the proposed channel expansion the present communications centre is unable to accept or process the new technology. The most efficient implementation of the communications network provided that all elements, that is, equipment, sites and towers, and the communications centre upgrade, be co-ordinated over the implementation period.

The construction of towers is the vital element of the country plan as without radio towers it is not possible to extend radio coverage for sufficient distances to establish networks outside of townships. Expenditure on sites and towers is a Public Buildings Department responsibility. Every effort is being made to share these facilities with other Government departments in an attempt to reduce costs. The communication plans relate to the mobile network of the overall systems.

Other equipment in the network that requires replacement and maintenance is telephone equipment, voice recording, telex, intercom, satellite, high frequency network in the Far North, facsimile, radio workshop test equipment, replacement of UHF portables purchased over eight years ago, maintenance of radio towers, SAC—PAV and region 'J' DVP networks. It is important for the member to know that last Monday week the Government approved slightly over \$16 million for a projection on capital costs over an eight-year period for a total communications network and that this year in the South-East we will be spending \$1.5 million on communications.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to know the latest situation.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The latest situation is as I told the member in the House a few days ago: there were consultations going on with the Mount Barker council and the Department for Environment and Planning. As I understand it, those discussions are still continuing.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: So, a site has not now been selected.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I did not say that. I said that negotiations are proceeding at the moment.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The last question I have concerns the current status of the Justice Information System.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That is really a question for the Attorney-General.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is referred to and is something that will surely assist the police a great deal.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It surely does. The Attorney-General will be in charge of the system. Do you want a police view on it?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would appreciate a police view.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Commissioner has made a study of this concept and can tell you what he knows about it.

Mr Hunt: A few days ago after receiving final approval from Cabinet that this project was to be funded further, the Policy Management Committee convened a meeting and drew up guidelines for the steering committee and the development of the specifications for the tender process. Directions are now in the process of being drawn up for the steering committee to develop so that the public tender process can be put into operation.

Mr GUNN: I would like to raise a matter concerning country police stations in general, but in particular the situation at the Minnipa Police Station. The Minister will be aware that I have made representations to him, the Chairman of the District Council of LeHunte, Mr Gerschwitz. I have received many representations from the local community, which believes that the Department intends to close the Minnipa Police Station. One letter states:

Dear Sir,

It has been suggested that the Minnipa Police Station is to be closed and shifted to Wudinna 'approx 24 miles east of Minnipa'.

The Minnipa Branch of the UF & S strongly objects to this suggestion.

We cannot understand why it has been suggested, to build a new home at Wudinna for an extra man, then he travels to and from Minnipa two-three times a week.

When a new house built at Minnipa could have the same objective.

The police station is now at the gate way to the Gawler Ranges, be at a better point to servicing the outlying area and nearby stations, and better situated for accidents or local incidents.

He would also be part of the two-three hundred local population. It seems to us that Wudinna who already has a police station is to be expanded at the expense of smaller towns like Minnipa.

Sir, we strongly object to this suggestion or idea and make the proposition to you, to help keep our local police station and our identity, in the diminishing of country towns.

Yours faithfully,
G.W. Phillips

Secretary of the UF & S
Branch of Minnipa

A number of people have approached me concerning this matter and I agree with the sentiments they have expressed. I can think of no reason why the Minnipa Police Station should be closed. Will the Minister or one of his officers give me an assurance that the fears of the people of that community are unfounded?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is important to put this into perspective. Country policing strategies relating to the provision of police services in country areas of the State have been written and approved by the Commissioner. The strategies outline the criteria for the establishment of regional, divisional and station boundaries, headquarters stations, station and office locations, necessary staffing levels and office hours. The strategies also allow for the provision of support functions including: highway traffic patrols; prosecution services; a transport and/or operational role by police aircraft; a training facility using existing senior NCOs; a reliable, flexible and acceptable communication network; an effective crime prevention programme. Some of these functions are being dealt with as separate projects.

Currently, reports aligning existing divisional facilities with the approved country policing strategies are being written and, where possible, changes are being considered. Further discussions are to be held with local government and community leaders. The project is scheduled for completion and implementation at the end of December 1985. That concerns the overall strategy that has been considered for implementation by the police. No decision has been made at this stage about the closure of the Minnipa Police Station or any other police station. I think that the honourable member should have received a reply from me to a Question on Notice.

Mr GUNN: I have not received a reply.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is on the way. It sets out in detail the response to the honourable member's Question on Notice.

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister give me an assurance that adequate discussions will take place with the local communities that are concerned about losing their identities? Every time a Government department moves out it has a significant effect on that community. This area is very close to where I was brought up. It appears to be a foolish suggestion to shift the police station from Minnipa to Wudinna and would defeat all the objectives that the Minister read out earlier.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: When I was outlining for the Committee the proposed implementation plan put forward by the Commissioner on behalf of the Department I indicated, as the member will recall, that further discussions will be held with local government and community leaders. That was no idle statement: I was making a positive statement. I signal to the honourable member, who has not yet received my reply (and I thought that he would have), that the answer to question 3 states:

A statewide review of policing operations is currently in progress. The police services provided at Minnipa and Wudinna are being examined as part of that review.

I went further than that and stated:

The meeting between representatives of the District Council of LeHunte and the Police Review Team is scheduled for next month when issues arising from the review will be discussed.

So, quite properly the consultation the honourable member is looking for has already been arranged.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Is Mr Haitana, an alleged participant in a recent horse race ring in, currently the subject of surveillance or protection by the South Australian

Police Force? How much a week is this costing? It has been obvious on metropolitan racecourses in recent days that this person is being shadowed by police, and I wonder in what category that shadowing is occurring. Further, if Mr Haitana is as involved as recent media reports suggest, why is he allowed on the course? Whether or not his attendance is legitimate, who is the authority who would ban him from South Australian racecourses if it is desirable and/or justified to do so?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: My information is that Mr Haitana is not under surveillance by the South Australian Police Force. I am further informed that his bail commitments from Queensland compel him to report to the Elizabeth police station every three days. I do not keep the records in my back pocket and so I do not know whether he is or is not doing that. I do not even know whether the man is in South Australia. In respect of Mr Haitana's attending race meetings, I do not believe that that is a proper question for this Committee to attempt to resolve and the honourable member, with his experience in the racing industry, would know where that question ought to be directed.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: My question was: whose authority is required to ban Mr Haitana if, in fact, that was desired or was justified?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am not able to say whether he has been banned.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: That is not suggested. Whose authority is it to do so if it was thought desirable or justified?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am still not sure that such a question has anything to do with the Budget lines for the police. It seems to be a legal question that inevitably could be answered just as wrongly by me as by a lawyer. I do not intend to determine whose responsibility it may be if this hypothetical ban about which the honourable member talks does exist. I suggest to you, Mr Chairman, that it is not an appropriate question for me to answer as Minister before this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister is right. It is not a question that should go to the Minister responsible for the Police. I am sure that the member for Alexandra would well know that racing falls under the control of the Minister of Recreation and Sport and that the SAJC is the controlling body of racing in South Australia. It would be the SAJC that would warn off a person. I suggest that the question should be asked of the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who could give a definitive answer.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Thank you for your explanation, Mr Chairman. In regard to my question dealing with the police and what offences may be currently incurred, I suggest that the question is appropriate to ask in this Committee. I take your point in respect of the second part of my question. In regard to the first question that was partly answered by the Minister when he said 'as far as he is aware', I gather he has taken current advice—the gentleman as named is not under surveillance—but the Minister did not indicate under which police service the man in question was under protection, thus involving his obvious recent shadowing at racecourses.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: When the honourable member talks about protection, is he talking about protection by the police or by some other element? If he is talking about the police, then I point out that the police are not affording protection to Mr Haitana; the police are not shadowing Mr Haitana. The honourable member shakes his head, but I will put this question to the Commissioner. I am informed by the Commissioner that he knows nothing of surveillance, shadowing or following. All the police know about is the bail commitment. I now ask the Commissioner to comment because the member is nearly shaking his head off, which

is indicative that he believes that what I am saying is incorrect and that police are shadowing Mr Haitana.

Mr Hunt: My only personal knowledge is that he has to report to the Elizabeth police station as part of his bail recognisance, and to that extent he comes under the notice of the police.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: We have no further questions on that line.

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

Works and Services—Police Department, \$8 390 000—
Examination declared completed.

Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous,
\$6 643 000

Chairman:

Mr G.T. Whitten

Members:

Mr H. Becker
The Hon. Ted Chapman
The Hon. Peter Duncan
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr K.H. Plunkett
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Chief Secretary, and Minister of Emergency Services.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr Lloyd Charles Johns, Director, Country Fire Services.
Mr Allan William Bruce, Chief Officer, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.
Mr David Arthur Grubb, Deputy Chief Officer, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.
Mr Dennis Ray Mutton, Manager, Support Services, Country Fire Services.
Mr Brian Kenneth Treagus, Manager, Finance Administration, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.
Mr Frank Edwin Bowering, Senior Finance Officer, South Australian Police Department.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: As we are dealing with the Country Fire Services line, where is the Chairman of the Board?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is not normal, so far as I understand, for the Chairman of the Board to appear before the Estimates Committee. Chairmen of other boards do not appear before Estimates Committees. The administering officer and Director of Country Fire Services, Mr Lloyd Johns, is here with me this evening.

The CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the member for Alexandra, all questions will be directed to the Minister, who may then refer them to one of his officers to answer or may ask an officer to supplement his answer.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Has the Minister considered the 1983 public report recommending the amalgamation of the MFS and the CFS? It was released following an inquiry into the feasibility of amalgamating the two services. Mr Lewis, Mr Scriven and other officers were involved.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have studied the report.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Minister give this Committee an assurance that, if he had any idea of adopting the principal recommendation in that report, he has totally abandoned the idea?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have not totally abandoned any idea put to me—I never do that, irrespective of the circumstances at the time. An idea at this point in history may be considered not to meet the circumstances but, in the future, might be an acceptable idea. If the honourable member is trying to get me to say that I have discarded any intention of amalgamation of the MFS and the CFS, it is not the intention of the Government at this stage to propose that amalgamation.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Minister indicate to the Committee the basis on which his Government has decided not to proceed in light of the quite positive recommendation of the report to do so?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The main instrument of concern at the moment is to be in a position to find the necessary funds for amalgamation. That is one of the difficulties and I am sure that the honourable member, who was a Minister in the Tonkin Government and responsible for the CFS, would be well aware of the very high cost structure that would come about. We have a system which I believe in the main works very well. We have a great number of volunteers in the community who give their time and lives in some circumstances (and I hope no more lives are lost) for the State and the community.

The system is working fairly well. I suggest that, in all probability, the time at this stage is not right to consider amalgamation. I have said that publicly before. It is not news that I am circulating this evening. I have said that at Renmark, at Berri and at other places. I am sure that the honourable member, with his great ability to read particularly the country press, would have picked up my statement at some stage that it was not the Government's intention to amalgamate. I simply believe that a certain amount of time is necessary to condition people, both the MFS and the CFS, to understand that if there are advantages in amalgamation they need to be understood. I do not believe that at this time it would operate successfully.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I am sure that all members of the Committee on both sides would appreciate hearing the Minister place on record his recognition of the volunteer element of our CFS services and, indeed, what a great job they perform with their administrative colleagues. If not on all, on most of the occasions when the Minister has spoken about the matter the reason he has given why he and his Government have not adopted the amalgamation is the money aspect. Do I take it from that repeated remark on this occasion that the Government sees merit in the principle of amalgamation and is only refraining from doing so because of the money or the additional cost that would be incurred?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is a totally hypothetical question. I have told the Committee of the situation so far as the Government is concerned, and I do not think that there is any need for further elaboration on what I have already said.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Is the Minister satisfied that the Board generally, and the Chairman of the CFS Board in particular, are aware of their obligations under the CFS Act? Several times in recent days, and again in today's newspaper, the Chairman of the Board is reported as identifying his basic role as a need to co-ordinate the Board over which he presides. That is not a requirement under the Act. He is also reported as saying that he is to protect the countryside of South Australia, its natural and historic environment and its people. No part of that statement can be identified with the stated objectives and functions of the

Board under the Act. At no time in the report does the Chairman identify himself as being the Chairman of a Board which is responsible to prevent or suppress bushfires and other fires. At no times does he identify the requirement under the Act which calls on him and his Board to co-ordinate regional and district fire fighting organisations in emergencies.

At no time in the report does the Chairman identify the requirement of his Board to review and report to the Minister on the most modern and effective methods of fire fighting. The Chairman argues against the requirement of the Board to make payments of grants to local authorities for the purchase of equipment and maintenance of fire fighting facilities. Paramount to all of those functions, it is omitted in the report and previous reports that the Chairman is to test and appraise fire fighting equipment and other equipment for fire fighting and publish the results for the benefit of the Country Fire Services organisation. I am not saying that these points are not picked up in the ordinary activities of the Board and that that has not been the case over the years. I raise these discrepancies or oversights as a result of an interview with the Chairman who was called on to identify his role and that of the Board. Is the Minister satisfied that the comments I have related are either as a result of bad reporting of the interview—indeed, oversights by the Chairman when speaking on behalf of the Board in recent days—or has something been left out, or is there some other reason?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I have no intention of discussing in this arena the public conduct, press statements, press reports, television interviews or whatever by the Chairman of the Country Fire Services Board over the past few days. I have told Parliament, I think on at least two occasions, that the Country Fire Services has been the subject of a review and a report. The report was prepared by the Public Accounts Committee. The Government is considering its position in relation to the future of the CFS Board and the general operation of the CFS. I have also indicated to Parliament that I will study responses from both the Director of the CFS and the Chairman of the Board on behalf of Board members along with the PAC Report, and I will make full disclosures to Parliament when it resumes in relation to the Government's intentions.

I do not think it will help anyone if we get into a slanging match about those involved in this area at this time. Therefore, I have no intention of responding to this type of questioning until the Government has made its decision, which it will do. The Government will not allow itself to be placed in a position where it will not be strong and firm about this matter. That will certainly be the case. In those circumstances, I am afraid that honourable members of the Committee will have to wait until the Government has determined its attitude and policy in relation to this matter.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I note what the Minister has said, and I respect the need in this forum to refrain from slanging, slinging or whatever term he used. My question was of straight intent and I was hoping for a straight answer. There was no reflection on individuals. My remarks were based on quotes from press reports. A week or two ago the PAC among other comments reported to Parliament its findings on a nearly two year investigation of the activities of CFS administration in South Australia. The recommendations contained a call for the Board to be sacked or replaced, claiming it to be indecisive, ineffectual and grossly negligent. Indeed, they are very strong terms.

In defence of the PAC Report, it is appreciated that the Minister proposes to take on board the comments and responses of the officers and senior representatives of the Board. There is no argument by me about that, and I am sure that will be the approach adopted by my colleagues

until the Minister prepares his response to the report. However, in the meantime, it has been reported yet again that the Chairman of the Board recently wrote to the Minister asking for a public cleansing and supporting statement from the Minister or from the Premier. Apparently, the contents of the letter have been released to the media by the Chairman of the Board himself and/or the Minister. As a recipient of that allegedly three or four page letter, will the Minister table it before this Committee?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will deal with a few aspects of that situation. First, I think the honourable members of this Committee, including the member for Alexandra, would agree that the Public Accounts Committee Report contains some very serious allegations. Of that there can be no doubt. Other people may make a different judgment, and that is for them, but I consider that it would be quite wrong of me to initiate any action prior to giving the people accused or indicted in the PAC Report an opportunity to respond to the allegations. Accordingly, to jump the hurdle before one gets to it often causes one to make mistakes (and I suppose I make as many as most people). I did not want to be accused of denying the people involved natural justice. I said that publicly. I wrote to the Chairman of the Board and to the Director, both of whom responded.

The Director has responded at length and has not committed himself in any way to releasing that document publicly; for that I am grateful. The response from the Chairman of the board was not as long as the one put forward by the Director; it was a four-page letter. The phraseology that was used by the Chairman near the last paragraph was that he ultimately requested (I think that that was the word, or he used a similar word to that) that the letter could be shown publicly in a public place; by that he meant releasing it to the press. I asked one of my officers to contact the Chairman of the board, not that I had any great qualms, nor did I intend to order him not to release the letter. If someone writes a letter I suppose that they have the right to release it, but I thought that in the interests of all that was happening in regard to the CFS, a non-release of that letter may have been better. It may have been better for no statements to be made, no challenges to be thrown out, and no calls for support until such time as all the options had been considered by the Government and me in relation to what we intended to do.

Unfortunately, or fortunately, that officer was not able to contact the Chairman of the Board. Within a day or so he decided to release his letter. I do not give the Chairman any marks for that action, to be completely honest with this Committee. I thought that those letters between the Director and me and between the Chairman of the board and me ought to have been kept away from the press until such time as the matter was at least about to be cleared up one way or another. As I say, the Chairman does not win any points from me for that action. However, he has chosen to do that. He has gained a lot of publicity in regard to his side of the question.

The Government is still honouring its pledge in the first instance in not making public comment about this matter until it assesses its position. I intend to carry out that until its final conclusion. The first public statement that I will make on that will be when the House resumes, and not before it, no matter how hard I am pressed by the press or by honourable members of this Committee or anyone else. I will not make a statement. That is what I have said and I will stick to it. In relation to the tabling of the letter—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There will be no tabling of any letters in this Committee because there is no provision in our Standing Orders for the tabling of any document other than matters to be included in *Hansard*, which shall be of a statistical nature.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Thank you, Sir, for your assistance at a critical time because I was going to say that I did not have the letter with me anyway and that therefore it was impossible for me to table it. I remind the honourable member who is pursuing this line of questioning that it is hardly now necessary to table the letter because most of it, one way or another, has been released. In due course, clearly, that letter will be tabled in the Parliament; that is of necessity so that everyone knows what is in it.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: In conclusion on that line of questioning, having heard from the Minister—Do you not want me to ask any more questions, Sir?

The CHAIRMAN: I want to stick to Standing Orders, which allow three questions from a member without another member getting an opportunity. You have had seven questions now. If Government members wish a question—they have not signified whether they do—they can have it. The member for Murray has signified that he wishes to ask a question; so he gets the question. Once he has signified he will get the call after your three; you have had seven. The member for Murray.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I wish to ask the Minister questions relating to the Metropolitan Fire Service. The stated strategy of the Fire Service is to continue with its programme of upgrading the radio communication system. At page 118 of the Agency Overview I note under 'Issues':

Essential communications systems are being progressively updated, but further resources will be required.

On page 129, under Capital Expenditure, we recognise that even though it has been reduced from \$381 000 in 1983-84 to \$141 000 in 1984-85, recognising that radio communications is the lifeline of emergency incidents, command and controls, I would like the Minister to indicate how that upgrading of the communication system is to continue at the rate that I believe it should continue with the proposed decrease, which is very significant, in expenditure for that purpose.

Mr Bruce: The capital amounts are part of an overall programme. They do not recognise specifically radio communications, but all aspects of communications. A significant amount of that Capital Works item relates to fire alarm receiving equipment. Most of the equipment is now installed and operating. There is a continuing policy of upgrading the radio communications.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The alarm monitoring replacement programme to improve operational efficiency, I understand, is also a stated strategy. How much funding has been provided specifically for that programme?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am advised that the amount this year is \$124 000.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister indicate whether that is an appropriate sum for the amount of work that is required on that programme at this stage?

Mr Bruce: This adequately covers the improvements programme for this coming year. It does upgrade the alarms equipment to a greater form of sophistication and to a basic computerisation.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Alexandra.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: It is okay, I take it, after another question in the meantime, to proceed?

The CHAIRMAN: If the member for Alexandra does not want the question, the member for Murray.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: We are aware that working parties have been examining the recommendations of the Cox Report on the rationalisation and regrouping of resources. What effect on funding has there been and to what extent has funding been influenced by that working party?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Very dramatically, because of the implications of the Cox Report. Funding has escalated and

will continue to escalate with the replacement of fire stations and the extra crews that will be required for the new rostering system.

For 1984-85, the accumulated annual Budget effect is \$1 385 000 in regard to staffing alone because of the Cox Report; in 1985-86 it will be \$2 million; in 1986-87, \$2.7 million; and in 1987-88, \$3.3 million. It has a dramatic effect on staffing.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The stated strategy of the fire service emphasises the importance of intensified training programmes. Apart from the new headquarters and training building project, what funds have been made available specifically to support this requirement and particularly for the development of inservice courses?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am advised that we do not have a breakdown of the inservice training schedules or costing, but we can provide those details.

Mr BECKER: How many false alarms has the Metropolitan Fire Service attended in the metropolitan area in the past 12 months, particularly in the city? I ask that question because the Public Accounts Committee meets on Thursdays at IMFC Building; for the past four years I have felt that every Thursday morning all the units go past that building to a fire somewhere. In fact, one morning the service arrived at the building and we had to evacuate the premises. The magistrates from the Industrial Commission also had to leave the building. Because of that experience, I wonder about the number of false alarms and the resultant cost. I discovered that the larger trucks are equipped with ladders, but does the service have equipment to reach the top of the tallest building in Adelaide and mount rescue operations?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The Chief Fire Officer will answer the question about equipment. The number of calls increased during the year; figures show an increase of 544, and the calls are classified. In 1983-84 there were 1 530 fires relating to installation faults, thermal, and in 1982-83 there were 1 459 fires—the situation became worse.

There were 218 sprinkler type installation faults in 1982-83 and 340 in 1983-84. In 1982-83 there were 976 installation calls and in 1983-84 there were 1 294. Installation calls for sprinklers numbered 88 in 1982-83 and 171 in 1983-84. The figure that the member is probably very interested in, which relates to malicious false alarms—which we recognise as mostly phone calls—increased as well: in 1982-83 there were 571 such calls and in 1983-84 there were 727 calls—almost two a day. I ask the Chief Fire Officer to address the Committee in relation to equipment.

Mr Bruce: The fire service does not have any aerial equipment that will reach the height of the highest buildings. It is not our intention to endeavour to procure such equipment because modern technology just cannot cope with the heights that buildings are currently going to. The modern system is to provide fire fighting equipment within the building in the form of a sprinkler system above a certain height and, as well, internal mains from which the fire service can operate. Therefore, present procedures are not to compete with the height but rather to put the fire protection equipment within the building itself.

Mr BECKER: I believe that it is an MFS role to examine buildings for fire protection and safety, including restaurants, nightclubs and other places of entertainment where large numbers of people gather. Has there been an improvement in the provision of fire prevention equipment in the past 12 months, or is the situation deteriorating?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will ask Mr Bruce to answer that question.

Mr Bruce: We can provide statistics relating to the number of inspections of these premises. Generally, there is an increase in the number that we are inspecting. We have

increased our fire prevention establishment and, as a result, are able to do more inspections than previously. Generally, our role is one of supervision and inspection rather than a mandatory one.

The CHAIRMAN: Before Mr Bruce continues, I point out that earlier today I advised the Minister and the officers then present—at which time Emergency Services Officers were not present—that, if officers intend to provide material arising from questions, the deadline for the provision of that material is prior to 19 October.

Mr BECKER: I am pleased to note that the Government has maintained its grants to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron. The proposed amount for this year is \$17 300 and supply of fuel \$5 000. Last year I believe the grant was \$17 200. Although there were not as many call-outs last year, the Sea Rescue Squadron spent \$3 471 on fuel and the Squadron estimates that that amount could be greater this year because of the increased price of fuel and because it anticipates a busy season because of the increase in the number of boats registered. The Sea Rescue Squadron, like most voluntary organisations, does a superb job. However, it is plagued with a problem in the area of personal accident insurance cover for its operational members. According to its annual report, the cost of insurance was \$6 034.

This takes up a substantial amount of its income. Is there any possibility of the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron coming into a Government employees workers compensation scheme or some fund operated by the Government that could give protection to the volunteers of the squadron and lessen the impact of the high cost of insurance.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I cannot recall, and I may be wrong, having any notification from the Sea Rescue Squadron in relation to this matter, otherwise I am sure that I would have had it investigated. But, I am having investigated at the moment how we can give volunteer fire fighters adequate coverage. If and when we come to terms with the matter I see no reason why, on application by the Sea Rescue Squadron, it could not be included in a similar programme. The honourable member obviously has some contact with them and I leave it to him to drop me a note and we will look at it.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: When the Minister has regard to materials received from the Director of the CFS and the Chairman of the CFS Board, and before he makes his announcement to the House when Parliament resumes, will he have regard to the contents of a statement in the Department of Agriculture's files dated 23 August 1982, a document dated 24 August 1982 to Mr D.M. Curtis—a seconded accountant from the Woods and Forests Department to the CFS at that time—and another document dated 27 August 1982, which represents material forwarded to each of the local district councils and the CFS brigades in South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: To give an open check for the checking of some correspondence would be a rather unusual procedure. Unless the honourable member is prepared to put into *Hansard* some idea of what it is about I will not say 'Yes' or 'No'. If the honourable member wants to give me some indication of what it is about, then I will be in a position to make up my own mind.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: It was purely for the purposes of saving time that I referred to the dates and identified the actual documents, all of which are in the Department of Agriculture's files on the CFS. I suppose they are either still there or have been transferred to the Minister's Department following the transfer of that portfolio.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You have made me very inquisitive now.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I am simply asking whether the Minister will consider the contents of the documents

that have been clearly identified by their dates as they are now recorded in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will give the honourable member's request every consideration.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Does the Minister acknowledge that, since the PAC Report was tabled in the House of Assembly a couple of weeks ago, despite malicious attacks on individuals and organisations, including the previous Tonkin Government and me by the aggrieved Chairman of the CFS Board, the Opposition has made no public critical comments (nor has the Government) and that, in fact, the only public utterances made by the Opposition throughout that period—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is totally out of order, as the member is now dealing with policy. The question has nothing to do with the lines under consideration.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Does the Minister acknowledge that that courtesy and restraint has been observed, as he explained had been observed and practised by his own Government in the interim?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I must confess that I have no qualms about answering that question. I have not seen or heard anything that has been said by the Opposition. In saying that, I am qualifying my answer. I am not sure whether anything has been said publicly; I do not know. I have not seen or heard of it.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: To clear up that point, I have certainly made public comment when the opportunity has arisen, as outlined by the Minister, in relation to consideration of the report in the interim period.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Arson is a growing problem faced by society generally. I understand that one strategy advanced by the Fire Service is to have specific courses and specialist officer training in investigation techniques to combat this problem. What steps have been taken to fund this project specifically in the Budget?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The policy of the Metropolitan Fire Service is to work in conjunction with the Police Department. That has been a continuing policy and there is not any special provision in the Budget in relation to arson itself. It is just taken into consideration in the normal training programmes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is information available to show what is happening in respect of arson? Through the media we are much aware of the increased cases of arson. Are there any specific details available?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: As I am not in a position to give the member any reliable information this evening, I am willing to take his question on board and ask both the Commission of Police and the Chief Fire Officer to give me a report as to their activities. It has been drawn to my attention that there is some information here. Fires due to arson are estimated at 25 per cent of fires, and a higher percentage of cases are suspected arson. The number is increasing. The honourable member has probably read that, but I will try to get some detailed information for him.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Multi-purpose appliances have been proposed for rescue, dangerous substance and foam requirements. I know that these are expensive. Can the Minister say how the project is progressing? I seek specifics about funding for that project in the Budget.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I will pass that question on to Mr Bruce.

Mr Bruce: I assume that the question relates to the support tenders. Under the capital works programme the proposal is that three of these units be purchased for the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. The first has been procured, although it is at present not in commission. The equipment required to be carried on the vehicle is now being installed. Training will commence within the next two

weeks and, following a period of concentrated staff training, the first of those appliances will be in commission and running probably within a month from today. The second of these appliances was scheduled for the 1983-84 capital works programme.

The calling of tenders for this vehicle was withheld, pending receipt of the first one. We want to determine the suitability and ascertain whether there are any problems with the first unit. Once we have carried out that exercise, tenders will be called for the second unit. A third one is programmed for the 1984-85 financial year but, because the second one is already one year behind, we will probably delay that a further year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister indicate the current status of the Brookway Park complex? I know it is being used for training purposes at this stage. Will the Minister indicate the future situation as far as Brookway Park is concerned?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: There has been some development with Brookway Park. It was one of the very first matters, after I became Minister, that the Chief Fire Officer put to me. It was a programme which he considered to be invaluable to South Australia—to use, in the long term, Brookway as a dual training centre. There was concurrence on that basis from the Board of the CFS and certainly concurrence from the Director in regard to making it a dual training centre. As the honourable member will be aware, the building was not dedicated to the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Brigade, and that had to be done. It was in the name of Community Welfare. The building has been dedicated to us. We can now plan for the long term in relation to that training complex, and it is our intention to proceed along those lines.

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister confirm that there are no short or long term plans afoot to close the Glenelg fire station?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: That has a two-part answer. The working party involved with the Cox Report recommended that replacement of certain stations, and Glenelg was one of them. I cannot put a date on it, because of the availability of funds and the whole reconstruction in the capital investment area. Some cases may be way down the track. There is no intention to deprive Glenelg of a fire station, but planning at the moment is to resite the current fire station. The new venue for that fire station would be well within the Glenelg district. The best information I can give is from the development programme of station locations, which refers to the 1989-90 financial year. There is a proposal for Seaton Park, Albert Park, and Morphettville/Glengowrie stations, followed by the closure of the Woodville and Glenelg stations and the sale of those properties. It is not going to happen until 1990, in any case.

Mr OSWALD: Where is the new site?

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I cannot give the honourable member an exact site at the moment.

Mr OSWALD: I am advised that it costs \$1.7 million a year to run the Port Pirie Fire Station, for example. The Minister may be able to verify that figure. If it costs approximately \$1.7 million just to run the Port Pirie Fire Station, how can the Government justify giving the CFS only \$2.23 million to run the entire CFS throughout the State? To me, that is quite out of proportion.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: The CFS does not receive only that amount of money allocated in the budget. It receives double that amount of money in actual terms. The final figure amounts to \$5.963 million, not \$2.23 million. More importantly, that figure is double that amount because the insurance companies match the budgeted figure dollar-for-dollar. In the Port Pirie Fire Station, or any other station, everyone is a paid fireman or a paid officer. When I last looked at the paid staffing arrangements in the CFS, I think it was 39 full time equivalents. As from 1985 it is planned to increase that to 43. One only has to meet a financial commitment to pay the wages of 43 officers in the Country Fire Service. However, everyone employed by the Metropolitan Fire Service at any station one likes to nominate is a paid official.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister give an indication of the success or otherwise of the State disaster exercise which was held, I think, last week? I would particularly like to know how the communication system worked and I would like some information about the success or otherwise of the new Centre Fire.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I visited the site at 7.30 a.m. and discussed the exercise with everyone. The Commissioner has given me a favourable report. I will provide a detailed reply to the honourable member in writing.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed. I thank the Minister, the Committee and the officers for their co-operation.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 26 September at 11 a.m.