

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 29 September 1983

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr S.J. Baker

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr G.M. Gunn

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

Mr I.P. Lewis

Mr K.H. Plunkett

Mr J.P. Trainer

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Before declaring open the first line for examination, the Chair directs to the attention of the Committee certain points that have been made each time the Committee has met. First, the Chair would appreciate, but not immediately, from the Opposition some idea of the programme, so that we can ensure that officers of the Minister are not unduly delayed.

The Chair intends to proceed along the lines previously adopted. In opening a line for examination the Chair intends to give the Opposition lead member the opportunity to ask three questions or seek information from the Minister, and then I will ask a Government member, and so on, alternately. After yesterday, the Chair should repeat what it has said every time: that is, the yellow book does not contain the vote that we are referring to. It is there simply as a guide for members. It can be referred to and used, but it cannot be the subject of debate and must be linked with a vote or line. I hope that today the Chair has made that perfectly clear, because the Chair under no circumstances will allow the Committee to go into a second reading or a grievance debate.

Further, the Chair would like all members when directing questions or seeking information to do so from the Minister and, if the Minister wishes to refer anything to his officers, that is his prerogative. Members who are outside the Committee will not be recognised until towards the end of the questions and then only if it is agreeable to members of the Opposition. Does the Minister wish to make a general statement before proceeding with the vote?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Not at this stage. As is proper on these occasions, I will directly answer any questions that have a heavy political component, but it is my desire that members should have the opportunity for direct access to officers, so that on many points of detail I will refer the questions to them. It is also our desire to minimise the number of times that we will have to go away and obtain information, and that is one reason why the Department is so heavily represented this morning.

Environment and Planning, \$19 358 000

Witness:

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood, Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr E.J. Phipps, Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr M.D. Madigan, Deputy Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr B.J. Hill, Director, Management and Administrative Services Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr L. Djordjevic, Senior Finance Officer, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr C.R. Harris, Director, Conservation Programmes, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr G.R. Inglis, Director, Pollution Management Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr R.I. Nichols, Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr J. Hodgson, Director, Development Management Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to the Estimates of Payments in regard to salaries and wages wherein we note that in 1982-83, \$12,082 million was voted, with an actual payment of \$13 726 154. Can the Minister explain the significant increase in the expenditure in that 12-month period?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The increases were as follows: award increases amounted to \$1.496 million; terminal leave payments, \$49 000; costs of fire fighting (and I assume it is not necessary for me to dilate on that item), \$71 000; and an additional \$28 000 went on other minor expenses. Seven-eighths of the increase amounted to award increases.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand the extra expenditure relating to problems associated with the fires, especially Ash Wednesday. However, I express some concern about the increase. Moving on to the 1983-84 proposed expenditure in staffing, I note a reduction from the payment for last year. I refer to page 74, the line 'Development Management Division'. For staffing, again we see a reduction in the allocation of about \$100 000. Can the Minister explain that difference?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: At the beginning of last year there was still an abundance of redeployees being carried under this line as a result of the reorganisation that had occurred. The member for Murray will recall the circumstances of the amalgamation, which led to a considerable number of redeployments. Some of the payments were still charges against the line well into the past financial year. That matter has now been cleared and none are represented in the vote of \$1 894 500 as now shown.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: How often is the new Planning Commission meeting, is there a backlog of matters to be considered by the Commission and, if so, to what extent is that causing concern to the Minister?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Perhaps Mr Hodgson can give specific information, and then I might comment on the policy implications.

Mr Hodgson: The Planning Commission is meeting fortnightly. The planning Act requires the Commission to comment to councils or make decisions on applications within a specific period from receipt of applications, respectively three months and two months. In almost every case the Commission is keeping to that timetable, so there is no significant backlog of applications. The Commission has the power to require additional information on an application once it has been lodged. Where it seeks that information, the time available for dealing with the application does not take account of the time required for the information to be supplied. In other words, the clock stops for that period. However, there is no significant backlog.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I comment briefly on an aspect of this matter. Supplementary development plans come before the Advisory Committee, as the member would know. They are not formally the concern of the Planning Com-

mission, but the same person is Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the Commission, and there is a common servicing mechanism. A large volume of work has been done on the introduction of the new legislation and the consolidated plan, and I am concerned about the amount of work having to be done by my officers on the preparation of supplementary development plans in co-operation with local government. We are hoping that, as the new system works its way in, some of that work load will reduce and my officers will be able to get into some of the other areas of planning, which badly need to be addressed. However, that is one of the problems we are experiencing because we are still working through the new system.

Mr KLUNDER: The new development at Golden Grove was announced yesterday. Will this have any effect on the Estimates for your Department for 1983-84?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not want the situation that occurred yesterday. That question deals with the line 'Miscellaneous, \$2.433 million', so I must rule it out of order.

Mr BAKER: What is happening with manpower in the Development Management Division, and what areas will be affected as a result of the change of resource allocation?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Mr Hodgson can give some information on that.

Mr Hodgson: The main reason for the quite significant reduction in the recurrent expenditure under programme management and administration is the requirement in which we charge our time for various subprogrammes. In the early stages of the operation of the division there was a tendency to allocate a lot more under the programme administration area due to a lack of a more sophisticated mechanism for identifying precisely which subprogramme certain tasks fell under. As we have refined that mechanism, we are now more accurately defining subprogrammes and time worked within those subprogrammes.

Mr BAKER: You said that there has been a reallocation of time. In fact, has the service in any area changed at all, or is it just that administratively the numbers have been able to be allocated more accurately?

Mr Hodgson: I think it is more a case of the latter, namely, that the numbers are being allocated more accurately.

Mr BAKER: The matter to which I will now refer may come under this line, or it may be relevant to Management and Administrative Services. If that is so, I will refer to the matter later. I refer to the Auditor-General's findings on the management information system that has operated within the Department. My preliminary question refers to the fact that the project management information system appears to have had a number of hiccups over a period of time: does that impact on this item? If so, can the Minister explain what remedial action will be taken and whether an estimate has been included in the Budget to fix the problems highlighted by the Auditor-General.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Mr Phipps has a report on this matter which I would like the Committee to hear.

Mr Phipps: With regard to the Auditor-General's comment on the project management system, the issues that he raised referred to whether the reporting on status would be 100 per cent accurate due to difficulties that were being experienced in reconciling project expenditure with the Treasury Accounting System. I should point out that the discrepancies alluded to by the Auditor-General arose from the difficulty in reconciliation. They were very minor discrepancies, and we do have in operation now a reconciliation system which addresses the possibility of those discrepancies.

The project management system is achieving its objective in advising of the potential of any unauthorised expenditure. With regard to the Auditor-General's comment about duplication between divisional project management systems and

the overall departmental project management system, we have to discuss this with the Auditor-General first, but it is my strong view that the two systems should operate in parallel for some time into the future, because the divisional systems are aimed at having divisional control being a self-managing control. The purpose of the system is to give things such as the status of the project, when tenders have been let, details of when the project is expected to be completed, the likely cash flow on the project, and the project cost—all the things that are concerned with sound management of projects. The overall departmental project management system is aimed at determining whether any unauthorised expenditure is going to occur. So, it is my strong view that at least for some time into the future we need to keep the two systems going, and we will be bringing that matter to the Auditor-General's attention.

Mr KLUNDER: There might have been some confusion earlier: presumably, the member for Mallee thought I was going to ask my question under the Miscellaneous vote for the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Implementation Committee (page 76). That was not my intention. My question refers to the line 'Director and Staff—Development Management Division' (page 74) and to the Development Management Division referred to on page 75. Does the Minister expect any further costs under either of these two areas now that the Golden Grove development has actually been announced?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: No, and the Committee will note that certainly there has been no Budget account taken of this. The development of the area from the Government's point of view, whatever piece of mechanism is determined, will be in the hands of the Urban Land Trust, and it will be financed from the basic commodity that is there, the land, which has been in Government hands for many years, as the member would know.

The development will almost certainly have some impact on capital budgets elsewhere as we go along the line because there will be sewers and water supplies to be laid, and so on. In a development like this, one has to expect that there will be a planning and preparation phase and that will certainly carry us right through this financial year. There is an officer of the Development Management Division who has been working full time on the project for quite some time, and it is anticipated that he will be working with the Urban Land Trust in determining such issues as the way in which the partnership between Government and private enterprise will be worked out, which private enterprise developers will be involved in the project, and so on.

There will be public investment costs to be met further down the track but, while I would dearly like to see development there next week, we all understand how long it takes for a project such as this to get from the concept stage to actually breaking the ground, and no-one could seriously contemplate that that next step will be in this current financial year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Following on from that, can the Minister say what percentage of public housing there will be in the development at Tea Tree Gully or Golden Grove? I noticed in an article in the *Advertiser* this morning a basic comment saying that public housing would be part of the development.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: That matter is negotiable. It would be counter productive for Government to go to a private developer and say, 'We want to take you on board as part of a joint venture,' but then to lay down a particular figure, because that prospective partner may well have ideas as to what that figure may be. I am not trying to duck issues, but I can answer the honourable member by saying that he will be aware of the successful private enterprise venture at West Lakes. West Lakes had in it a component

of public housing of a particular type. I would anticipate that that sort of component, both in quantitative and qualitative terms, would apply to this venture.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: At a later stage I would like to come back to the matter of Golden Grove, but I will do that under the line 'Miscellaneous'.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair appreciates the point. I believe that the member for Murray also understands that it must be linked with the line. We do not want to get into a debate on Golden Grove.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will bring it up on the next line. A series of questions has been asked about amendments to the legislation which I suggest have not been answered as well as they might have been. Is the Minister able to say when we might see the amendments to the planning legislation?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Yes, I have noted from *Hansard* that the member for Murray has addressed himself to this question a couple of times, unfortunately when I have not been in the House. Of course, there has been a review committee which has been active in taking submissions and preparing a report on necessary amendments to the legislation since very early in this calendar year. That committee essentially has completed its deliberations and will soon be putting forward to me a consolidated report. It is my intention to return the compliment which the honourable member gave to me some time ago when he provided for briefing on the part of officers to me, as then an Opposition member, but at this stage I have not issued that invitation because I have had in a formal sense nothing with which to brief the honourable member. That report is imminent and I would anticipate that we would want to get some public reaction to it. We would then want, on the basis of that, to draft a Bill, to bring it in here and, perhaps judging on the nature of the public comment, let it lie for some time before proceeding with the debate. Mr Hodgson has chaired that committee and he might like to add to what I have said.

Mr Hodgson: The report of the review committee is now complete. I would expect it to be submitted to the Minister within the next two weeks, depending on the other three members of the committee, who have yet to give their final approval to the report as typed. I do not think I need add anything further at this stage.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister indicate where we are with the amendments to the City of Adelaide Development Control Act that we have been hearing about for a long time? Are they about to be introduced?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I think it may be some time before I am in a position to do that. I do not know that the honourable member has heard too much from me on that matter. I do not recall making any statements to the House, because I am aware of the delicate nature of some of the issues to be addressed, and I did not want to raise false expectations on the part of honourable members as to when we might be in a position to legislate.

There is a document which sets out basically, as I understand it, the position of the City of Adelaide in this matter, but there are some policy issues which still have to be addressed by Government, and it could be some time before that process is complete. I have been rather sensitive of the fact that one or two of those issues could even perhaps have intruded on the rather vigorous mayoral campaign going on, and I did not want the Government in any way to be drawn into that. It seemed to me to be not appropriate, even had we been in a position to go public on our intentions, to have done so at this time, given the sort of positions that the candidates have taken in that election on State heritage matters. Mr Phipps is, of course, a Government representative on the City of Adelaide Planning Commission.

Mr Phipps: The only matter to which I could add anything is in relation to the heritage component of the legislation. At the moment the City of Adelaide Planning Commission and the State Government have been following a procedure of close liaison on heritage matters. The City Council, in the way it has approached heritage, has recognised the interest of the State Government in items of heritage of State significance, and the work of the legislation with regard to heritage in the City of Adelaide Bill has been aimed at reflecting that co-operative approach so far.

Mr BAKER: Perhaps before I ask the question I would like to make an observation about whether or not the Department is becoming too top heavy in its management and cannot be kept under control. From figures shown in relation to information on salaries, wages and contingencies in the yellow book it is noted that the programme management administration has in every case except for the Development Management Division overspent significantly its allocation. The Minister originally explained that the variations in the total vote were mainly because of award increases. I cannot imagine that only people in the programme management and administration got whopping great increases and everyone else missed out. Can the Minister explain why in every case programme management and administration has got out of hand with the voted line? For instance, programme management and administration for heritage conservation was voted \$124 000 and spent \$206 000; Botanic Gardens was voted \$235 000 and spent \$482 000; conservation policy was voted \$60 000 and spent \$84 000; coastal management was voted \$142 000 and spent \$211 000; flora, fauna and park management was voted \$497 000 and spent \$697 000, and pollution management was voted \$184 000 and spent \$237 000. In each case it seems to have been the most ill-managed item and the question is: what is happening to programme management and administration?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I will hand over to Mr Hill. There has been no significant change to the structure of the Department that I inherited. Mr Hill will be able to elaborate on that.

Mr Hill: The influence being referred to relates to the fact that we prepared the Budget on the basis of full-time equivalents to the various programme areas, that is, on the average cost per f.t.e. When these numbers come out as actuals in fact the overhead costs come out under the administration heading and that is what has distorted the numbers. I believe the more correct and appropriate way to record then in future will be to take account of that influence; it is long service leave, annual leave, and that type of factor, which is creating the influence. I think page 11 of the programme book shows the extent of the actual allocation of support services to programmes and the numbers there display no significant shift; in fact, there is a minor reduction from last year's actual in this year's Budget.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: This information is readily available from the yellow book. It is to top up the f.t.e.s in regard to the chiefs and the indians and compare them with last financial year. That is probably as good a way as any of evaluating the extent to which the Department is becoming top heavy or otherwise or whether there has been any significant change.

Mr BAKER: Or, alternatively, they are getting extra equipment or a whole range of other things under those items. In future, will the Minister be attempting to more closely associate the voted amounts with the lines so that we will not see these discrepancies, unless they are due to some factors taken on board as policy or by accident of fate?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: We will be removing those overheads to a separate classification, so it will be clearer as to how that money will be spent.

Mr Hill: We will make an allowance for that in the Budget preparation.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the Botanic Garden section and the allied deposit working account. I notice in the Auditor-General's Report (page 267, under contingency items) a line 'Non-repayable capital grant from Conservation, Open Space and Recreation Purposes Account—Bush Fire Reconstruction', with receipts totalling \$323 600 and payments, \$210 000—a short-fall of some \$113 000. The total account was in deficit: has there been a misuse of funds allocated for bushfire reconstruction?

Mr Phipps: The major reason for that variation is bushfire damage at Mount Lofty, which was quite significant and which required an additional application of resources.

Mr KLUNDER: I refer to vegetation clearance initiatives introduced last year. I presume that that comes under the conservation policy and Programme Development Division referred to on pages 74 and 75 of the Estimates of Payments. Can the Minister indicate the need for and the scope and cost of the programme?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: It has been of some concern for a long time that South Australia's agricultural regions have been more substantially cleared than those of any other State, as far as I am aware. The matter was addressed in the mid-1970s in a report on the status of natural vegetation in this State. The former Government adopted a mechanism which, it was hoped, would assist in the retention of native vegetation under the heritage scheme. It has attracted some interest and attention from primary producers and provided for reservation of areas in return for Government assistance in various ways. My concerns related to information brought forward indicating that, since the report of the mid-1970s, clearance had continued throughout the agricultural areas of this State. That did not seem to issue in significantly higher figures of productivity in our agricultural sector—all that seemed to be happening was that more and more marginal or arid land was being cleared and, therefore, being removed from that stock that is available for habitat of our native species. There was also obvious evidence of soil erosion in some places which, in itself, obviously has an adverse impact on the productive capacity of the State.

I understand that, in the Lower South-East, in the Mount Lofty Ranges and on Yorke Peninsula, over 90 per cent of native vegetation has been cleared. On Yorke Peninsula, the only significant area of native vegetation left is within the Innes National Park. So, the regulation now familiar to members was brought down. It is a mechanism unavailable to us under the Planning and Development Act but available under the present Act as it allows me, by regulation, to define certain activities as development and, having so done, to bring them under the ambit of the Act and, hence, subject to the Planning Commission. That has further advantages concerning legal rights which are retained by the proponent of the development, such persons being able to take the Planning Commission to the Planning Appeal Board or beyond to the Supreme Court if they so wish.

Therefore, it was a control which stopped short of prohibition and which also provided for legal rights of appeal. Of course, there has been a great deal of comment and controversy about the institution of something which is quite unique to this country. It would have been remarkable had there not been some controversy. The Government has received much support in certain quarters for the initiative that it has taken. Of course, it has also received much criticism specifically from those people who had land which they wanted to clear and who are now subject to controls and, in some cases, may not be able to clear that land.

Generally speaking, I think that future generations will see the wisdom of the initiative we have taken. There have been a large number of applications for clearance (something in excess of 500 now), although the flow of applications has diminished in the last few weeks. My officers have been kept very busy examining these applications, because we certainly do not want to disadvantage applicants to the point where they are left waiting an undue length of time for some resolution of the problem. Therefore, it has been necessary in the short term to divert resources from other parts of the Department so that proper attention can be given and evaluation made of these reports. I know that my officers would have more specific information on the additional effort that has been necessary in that area to be fair to the applicants.

Mr Phipps: We initially started the programme with approximately three officers available full time to process matters in order to carry out the field work on vegetation clearance, and that included heritage agreements and applications for consent to clear. Since that time (six months ago) we have added substantial resources, and we now have an average ranging from nine to 10 people in the field working full time on the task of processing and examining applications to clear. Therefore, it is a very significant shift in resources into that area to deal with the problem.

Mr GUNN: I would like to deal with the line which the member for Newland raised in relation to vegetation clearance. Can the Minister briefly explain to the Committee the general policy, because there appear (and I have had some involvement in this matter) to be a number of suggestions floating around? One is that there is a general policy that there should be a retention of 30 per cent of scrub.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Plus corridors.

Mr GUNN: It was brought to my attention that one officer advised a district councillor that, if he went on to a person's place and thought that he had plenty of land developed, he would not be treated as generously as someone who did not have very much land developed. I think that this is important to the other questions that I have to ask, because people are concerned.

Last week at Ceduna I was approached by a constituent who put in an application on 5 May to clear land. He had 4 600 acres (I have not converted that to hectares), and he put in an application to clear it. He was told that economic viability is at stake. That person, by the name of Anderson, has not heard about that application. I was approached earlier this week by some people who bought a farm near Poochera, and there was a considerable amount of land developed. Four families are involved and they have approximately 8 000 acres, a large percentage of which is good arable land. I told them that I have heard that they would probably have to leave 30 per cent. This is an opportunity to ascertain once and for all from the Minister what the position is.

The Minister would be aware that this matter was canvassed at length before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, and I thought that some of the answers were contrary to information which has been generally available since. Can the Minister advise what the general criteria will be? I thought that the only policy would be that which is laid down by the Government and one under which everyone would be treated the same.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I will ask Mr Harris to comment on the criteria that apply. However, I simply say that, by way of general policy, no planning regulation operates in a vacuum: it operates to control development activities to secure a policy and, of course, the policy is that which is laid down in the specific supplementary development plan which has been brought in to amend or add to the development plan in relation to this matter. If the honourable

member examines the supplementary development plan which was brought down as a policy guide to the Planning Commission, he will find no reference anywhere to 30 per cent.

Put the case that all the remaining uncleared areas in this State in the agricultural regions were to be the subject over the next 15 or 20 years of development applications and, further, put the case that, as a result of that and the application of controls, only 30 per cent of that remained after that period: I would regard the control as having failed. I would hope that, when the honourable member and I in our dotage look back, we will be able to see that a great deal more of what was regarded as the remaining vegetation heritage of the State in 1983 had been preserved.

The effects of the application of the criteria (upon which Mr Harris will comment shortly) have in many cases to a result of about 30 per cent of the vegetation area being retained. However, that is not what we are about: we are on about the application of certain criteria to each application, which in some cases may mean the retention of 50 per cent, 10 per cent, or a complete thumbs down on the application. I ask Mr Harris to comment on the criteria policy document that is being applied.

Mr Harris: The criteria are laid down in the supplementary development plan dealing with vegetation clearance, which is currently out for public review and comment. Basically, the criteria can be divided into two main areas: those which could be described as essentially biological in nature, and those which could be described as pertaining to land management. I do not have a copy of the plan here, so I cannot spell it out chapter and verse. However, the biological criteria cover such things as the presence or absence in a particular piece of vegetation of endangered or rare species, either of plants or of the various animals. It also covers such things as plant diversity, the general principle being that, the more diverse a plant community or a particular set of plant communities are, the more habitat that is available for wildlife and, generally, the more species there are to be preserved. The biological criteria also include the presence or absence of sites of special scientific interest. For example, if an archaeological site is associated with or located in a particular piece of vegetation, that is a factor which is taken into account.

The biological criteria also include the relic value of a particular piece of vegetation. I think it would be fairly clear to members that very little vegetation is left in some areas of the State. A relic patch of scrub on, say, the northern portion of Yorke Peninsula has a value disproportionate to its size. It may be a very small piece of scrub but, because it is the only piece of a certain type—the only example remaining of a certain type of vegetation that once occurred more widely—it thus assumes considerable importance in the scheme of things. There are other biological criteria, but they are the sorts of things to be considered.

In regard to land management, the criteria basically boil down to soil erosion hazard and soil salinity hazard. If it is considered that a particular area is likely to drift or gully erode if clearance takes place, such an area can be reserved from clearance. If it is considered that clearance of a piece of land will exacerbate or create local erosion or soil salinity problems, that area also can be reserved from clearance. I think that that should serve as an example of the sorts of criteria that are being applied.

Mr GUNN: I thank the Minister and Mr Harris for that information. This is the first time that the Opposition has been made aware of the fact that a supplementary plan is available. To date we have not had an opportunity to examine it. As the Minister would be aware, this matter has evoked a great deal of discussion among people in my electorate and people in the electorate of the member for

Mallee. There are many people, particularly younger people, whose future economic viability is dependent upon their ability to properly develop their landholdings. I think it ought to be made clear that if the South Australian Government makes it a requirement that these people set aside large tracts of native vegetation which they are not allowed to develop, then someone must pick up the tab. We have examined regulations relating to this matter, and an attempt was made to take action in this place and in another place, but we have not actually seen the supplementary development plan. It may be available, but it has not been brought to my attention.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: It was gazetted—I recall its going through Executive Council. I will certainly undertake to make copies of the plan available to members of the Opposition. One would assume that when something is gazetted and becomes a public document available to members of Parliament (all members get a *Gazette* or, at least, have access to the *Gazette*) and the public, anyone with an interest in the matter would take action consequential upon that.

Mr GUNN: Has the Minister or the Government given consideration to how people will be compensated if they are not permitted to develop large tracts of native vegetation? It should be borne in mind that some people have purchased land with a view to developing it. I know of families, in which there may be two or three sons, who have sold small properties and purchased undeveloped areas with a view to developing them. They will be prevented from doing so. We would be telling those people that they are not entitled to earn a reasonable living. Someone must pay for the livelihoods of such people, because unfortunately there are no free feeds.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I think what the honourable member is advocating here is a completely new departure in our planning provisions. Let me put the case of a gentleman who has a fish and chip shop in a commercial zone which abuts a residential zone. He purchases the block of land next door so that the shop can be extended, with the intention of employing his children in the shop as the diversification of his activity leads to a greater turnover which will thus secure the livelihood of those involved. However, a local government authority may consider that that is not allowed because it would be an intrusion of a commercial activity into a residential zone. Nowhere in planning legislation in South Australia, or (as far as I am aware) in legislation in any other State, is there provision giving such a person rights of compensation. Even where there is a rezoning and an existing use right has not been established, there is still no compensation applicable.

The honourable member asks whether the Government has given consideration to the issue of compensation: we certainly have. There have been public calls from the honourable member, from some of his colleagues and from spokesmen of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and others about the matter of compensation. However, to concede compensation in a planning matter such as this (I remind the Committee that that is what we are talking about is a planning matter) is to concede compensation in all planning matters where people are prevented from doing what they want to do with their land in, say, a watershed zone, the hills face zone or within the city of Adelaide. If people believe that private property is completely sacrosanct, they are not in the business of planning legislation. What we would be really saying is that South Australia embarked on a disastrous course in 1976 when Don Dunstan, then Minister of Local Government, introduced the Planning and Development Act and that, furthermore, this outrage was compounded when the present member for Murray introduced a new Planning Act only 12 months ago.

I think that a vast majority of people in the community concede that from time to time planning controls must be exercised over the rights of people who nonetheless have a certificate of title in their fist. Although this means that sometimes they are not able to do exactly what they want to do with their own property, nonetheless, the overriding concerns of the community must at such times be paramount. However, it is important that certain legal rights, such as rights of appeal, and so on, must not be taken away.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling the member for Florey, I point out that the Chair has allowed cross-examination of the Minister on the lines currently being considered linked with the conservation line. However, I consider that we are now entering into a fairly grey area when discussing the matter of regulations. We must be careful not to stray from the line before the Committee.

Mr GREGORY: The vote for the Conservation Programmes Division for 1983-84, I presume, provides finance for the Government's efforts in devising new Aboriginal heritage legislation. I recall that legislation proposed by the former Government was withdrawn, and I understand that it is being re-examined. Will the Minister advise the Committee of the work being undertaken in the formulation of new Aboriginal heritage legislation for South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: This legislation has had a troubled history. The former Labor Government introduced legislation which passed both Houses but which was not proclaimed prior to that Government's going out of office. I recall that the member for Murray, as Minister, on two occasions introduced legislation that was not proceeded with. The reason for not proceeding with that legislation was not altogether known to me, although I am not interested in undertaking any sort of archaeological expedition or anything like that. But I imagine that it related specifically to the responsibilities and position of the Minister in the decision-making process.

In addition, almost certainly since we are to some degree talking about the arid areas of the State, we are caught up in the long-standing dispute as to the relative weight that should be given in the arid areas to pastoral activities, tourism, mining, nature conservation, and to the traditional culture and rights of Aboriginal people, and none of those matters are easily resolved. This Government when coming to office decided to initiate a consultative programme with Aboriginal communities throughout the State, so that we could be reasonably sure that the document that finally formed the basis of legislation was one that had been thoroughly discussed with Aboriginal communities and hopefully had their imprimatur. About 28 centres around the State have been visited by the committee, ranging from Mount Gambier in the South-East to places such as Amata, Ernabella, and Indulkana. Therefore, there has been a significant system of consultation.

A notice was sent to all of the communities before the first visit, explaining the purpose of the exercise. A list of key issues that would need to be included in discussions was put forward, and an invitation was given to people to put forward further matters that may come up for discussion. Those visits proceeded; a month then elapsed between the visits and the Aboriginal heritage section staff preparing summaries of the initial visit and reviewing them to see what trends were emerging. Then, the same communities were further visited by the same people who carried out the first visit, and meetings were taped where that was acceptable to all present so that the comments could be recorded. Instructions were given to our officers that they should not pre-empt the discussion. It was important that they should not lead but rather that they should get a good idea of exactly what the Aboriginal people had in mind.

We are now close to a second set of recommendations for inclusion in new legislation. I imagine that it will be necessary for us to have further consultation once we have that piece of legislation, so that we can assure the House, when the legislation is brought in, that we believe that the concerns of all people have been properly addressed. It has been a long process but, considering that there has been legislation on the books since 1979 that has not been proclaimed anyway, the many months that have been spent on this and the time still to be given to it before I bring legislation to the House is, I believe, time well spent.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Referring to the Planning Act, can the Minister say whether the review that has been carried out and the amendments to this Act will take into account a review of the e.i.s. procedures, bearing in mind the policy of the Government when it stated that it would undertake a complete review of the presently accepted environmental impact assessment scheme with a view to replacing it with a system that accepts certain forms of development as inevitable, but subjects them to a cost benefit analysis taking into account social as well as economic considerations?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: That undertaking at the election has not been placed before this Committee, because it would unduly complicate the process and delay the delivery of a report. Our concern was not to introduce new policy issues into that committee examination, but to take the legislation as proclaimed as a raw document and to say to the community, 'Here it is, we are off and running, but are there some bugs in the system that need to be ironed out fairly early in the piece?' So, that is what is happening.

The whole matter of a complete review of the environmental impact system that this State operates under is one that we will address between now and the next election. When one makes a commitment like that, it is understood that one has at least three years in which to carry it through. Therefore, the specific answer to the honourable member's question is 'No', that matter will not show up in the report of the committee, although there may be one or two minor problems about the specific operation of sections 49 and 50 of the Act that will be mentioned in the report.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I take it that at a later stage we will see amendments to the legislation, bearing in mind what the policy indicated about the review. My next question relates to a question that I asked in the House a week or so ago. When is the Government likely to determine its policy on development south of the Onkaparinga River? I was amazed with the Minister's answer to that question in the House, when he said that that matter was yet to be reviewed. It is an important matter as to where a future development is to take place, and whether it will take place south of the Onkaparinga River, or at Morphett Vale East, or wherever. If the Government has no policy on that, or has not determined where it is going on that matter, when will we know, because it is an important matter.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: If I used the word 'reviewed' in the House, then I apologise to the honourable member, because I misled him and the House. The word I intended to use was 'finalised'.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: 'Yet to be reviewed' was the answer you gave.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I apologise to the honourable member and perhaps I can take the opportunity when the House is back in session to clarify the position. What I meant is that the matter is yet to be finalised, because we have been reviewing the whole question of the staging study for some time, and I hope to be able to clarify the whole position.

The announcement was made last evening on Golden Grove in one of a series of four or five announcements which will be coming out over the next month, and which

will indicate the full extent of the initiatives the Government intends to take in relation to broad-acre development. I can assure the honourable member that this matter will be addressed in those statements. The Committee will understand my concern to express myself properly at that time, because if the Government had not even considered the matter (which would be the literal interpretation of words 'this matter has not been reviewed') there is no way we would be able within the next two to three weeks to announce a decision on it.

We are concerned in our examination of the way in which broad-acre development should proceed to take into account the way in which the public sector, as well as the private sector, will operate. As far as I am aware, the South Australian Housing Trust owns no land at present at Morphett Vale East. It has substantial tracts of land at Seaford, although not all of those tracts of land are where I would ideally like them to be from a planning point of view. As I understand it, the Urban Land Trust land south of the Onkaparinga is the northern land which is immediately east of Commercial Road at Port Noarlunga South going down towards Seaford, and the Housing Trust land is south of that again in the southern part of Seaford and east of Moana. To develop the area east of Moana at this stage I think would be quite premature.

It would be unfortunate to place many people at that end of that broad acre. However, this is not in any way to rule out the possibility of some development south of the Onkaparinga on the land that is now owned by the Land Trust, and that a swap of parcels of land may well be the appropriate thing to happen in order for some of that development to occur. I understand that the Housing Trust is concerned that it should do some development south of the Onkaparinga, and the Government would like to be able to accept that proposal. I think I can promise the honourable member that within the next two or three weeks there will be an announcement from me that will address the whole question of the staging study, including whether we should modify what we inherited from the previous Government and allow some development south of the Onkaparinga.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I should like to ask about another review that I understand is taking place that relates to a question asked earlier this year about the situation of the Urban Land Trust to which the Minister replied that the role of that Trust was under review. Has that review been completed and, if not, when will it be completed? Does the Government intend to have the Urban Land Trust resume the development role as was the case with the Land Commission, or is there an intention that the Urban Land Trust will have a closer liaison with the Housing Trust in the development role?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The statement last evening and again this morning indicated that it was our preference that the Golden Grove area (perhaps we should take that as some representative sample of the undeveloped land that is owned by the Urban Land Trust) should be developed as some sort of joint venture arrangement between the Urban Land Trust and a private developer or developers. That model does not imply a restoration of the powers that were exercised by the Land Commission before the restructuring which took place under the Government of which the honourable member was a part, but it may well imply an amendment to the Act because it seems to me that at this stage the—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Golden Grove Act?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, the Urban Land Trust Act, because it is not clear to me at this stage that the Urban Land Trust Act would allow the Urban Land Trust to be a joint venturer. As far as I am able to ascertain, all it can do under its present charter is to sell land to private devel-

opers who then in turn play their traditional development role. If much of that continues to happen as some of the rural A land is rezoned as appropriate for development, then the Urban Land Trust will sell its stocks in those areas to private developers to allow them to proceed. It is critical to the financial gearing of the Urban Land Trust that that should occur. There is no way that we can keep substantial quantities of that land off the market without sending the Urban Land Trust broke, but in an area like Golden Grove we think it is appropriate that there be some sort of joint venturing arrangement, and we are examining the position to see whether an amendment to legislation is appropriate. That will be the subject of another of these announcements that I canvassed in answer to a previous question from the honourable member.

Mr KLUNDER: I understand there has been a significant addition both in terms of the number and the size of national parks during the term of this Government. Can the Minister assure the Committee that this extra area can be adequately serviced and staffed despite the fact that the proposed budget is about \$113 000 lower than the actual payments made in 1982-83?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The question as to whether it is realistic to acquire additional reserve areas without substantial additions to the staffing and the contingencies budgets to manage these areas is one that has been a lively issue in the environment community and indeed in the wider community for some time. I hope I am not misrepresenting the member for Murray when I say that I think his general position was that it was probably unrealistic and it was better to add areas to the system once one had the additional staffing and other facilities to properly manage them.

If that was not the position of the previous Government, I apologise to the member for Murray. He has his opportunity to set me right soon. That is not the position of this Government. I am as keen as anyone to see some additional resources and staffing placed into the national parks system, but times are tough and the Committee is well aware of the overall configurations of this Budget today, and that one has to scratch deeply to find any Ministers who have had any additional subventions to their areas at all. Given that we have not in this Budget the capacity to significantly add to our reserves, do we pass up opportunities as they arise to add to the parks system? I do not think we can afford to do that. If I thought that, it would make nonsense of many of the things I said in a reply I gave to the member for Eyre earlier in our deliberations.

Those areas have, of course, managed themselves for a long time, and the management problems really arise from the intrusion of Europeans into our local environment: left alone they can manage themselves extremely well. There have been considerable additions to the parks systems and, in a formal sense, we have added 62 768.7 hectares to the system in the past 10 months, ranging in size from the 30 000 hectares that we added to the system when Coffin Bay was proclaimed a national park, through to the 1 400 hectares that were added to Flinders Chase when the Gosse lands were transferred, down to some rounding off of boundaries such as the one hectare added to the Katarapko game reserve some time ago.

The information is available to the Committee or to the member if they so desire. There was an additional small area added to the Coorong National Park that enables some buildings that were there to be used as a base at the northern end of the park. Also, an additional area was added to Deep Creek Conservation Park that is significant I think, because I hope that eventually this park will be upgraded to become an additional national park in our system. One has to be careful about proclaiming willy-nilly national parks, otherwise we will end up debasing the coinage. I think it is

appropriate that Deep Creek should be proclaimed the national park for the lower Fleurieu region.

With what has been added at this stage, I am given assurances that we have the capacity to be able to extend our management to those areas without unduly straining our limited resources. I would be the last one who would want to argue that the resources that are available to the national parks systems at this stage are adequate. We still have a fair way to go.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am concerned about Budget allocations for national parks for this year. I believe there are going to be massive problems to which I will refer later. Will the Minister indicate where we are with the proposed amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act? This matter was being considered during the term of the previous Government. I am wondering when we are likely to see those amendments before Parliament and when they will be made available for public comment before they are introduced into the Parliament.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A document is soon to come to me for approval. Obviously, there should be some public consultative process. I am never sure whether it is more appropriate to release a report for public comment before one legislates, or whether it is better to get the draft, bring it into the House and let it lie. The advantage of having a settled Bill is that it focuses the debate. People can see what one is on about and can say whether they like it or dislike it.

When it is still a document to be translated into a Bill, the debate becomes somewhat more diffuse. The disadvantage, on the other hand, in coming in with a settled Bill is that people fear that the matter has been set in concrete and that that is the end of it. I do not see it that way. I do not believe that it is embarrassing, but rather it is the proper procedure for a Minister in the Committee stage of a debate to move a series of Government amendments as a result of public or Opposition comment. I assure honourable members that, one way or another, there will be plenty of opportunity for public debate and comment on either the basic document that will form the Bill or on the Bill itself.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister indicate the Government's policy in relation to mining in national parks?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government is opposed to mining in national parks. The honourable member will be aware of the *Nationwide* comment on our decision to allow the Department of Mines and Energy to undertake a low-level impact exploration programme in the Flinders Ranges National Park. We are keen to establish the location of further deposits of minerals such as silver, lead, and zinc, which have formed the basis of the Broken Hill operation for many years. Localised deposits, of at least some of these minerals, exist in the general Flinders Range area.

It is perhaps fortunate that the mineralisation lode runs out of the park. It outcrops on the western boundary of the park and then runs under the embayment towards Lake Torrens. Any significant discoveries beyond those small localised deposits of no economic significance are almost certainly likely to be in off-park locations. I add that mining operations are occurring in national parks. These operations are usually barytes operations occurring at the time of proclamation. They had a sort of (to use a planning term) 'existing use', and it was thought reasonable to allow such operations to continue. Mr Nichols could give further information.

Mr Nichols: Examples would be the existing B.H.P. lease at Coffin Bay, leases of a smaller nature in the Flinders Range National Park, and also the B.H.P. lease in the Gammon Ranges National Park.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The previous Government put high priority on the preparation of management plans

for national parks, and I presume the present Government has the same priority. Will the Minister indicate whether that is the case? The Government's policy indicated, prior to the election, that a Labor Government would provide that management plans for reserves would include specific recommendations as to the staffing levels appropriate to the proper management of these areas. Is that happening with the plans now being prepared?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As to the second question, yes, that is now happening. The plans that have been prepared or finalised over the past few months spell out the labour and manpower implications. That becomes a target at which we should endeavour to aim in our future budgeting. As for the preparation of management plans, I may have to slightly disappoint the honourable member. I am a little concerned at the amount of time being consumed on the preparation of management plans. There are many in the course of preparation, and they will continue. I have signalled to the Department that I believe that, in a time of a good deal of tightness in our resources, we may have to slow down the flow a little to release some resources for other purposes.

I understand the philosophy of management plans. I understand that, where we have a park under high visitation pressure, it is important that rules be spelt out. The other aspect of a management plan is that it is a biological inventory of the park that forms a prime scientific document for what is to happen. It is a declining task. We are not adding land to the system so quickly as to lengthen out the number of plans that have to be produced. We are adding land more quickly than we can prepare management plans. It is a reducing task, because we are catching up with the backlog from the mid to late 1970s. Against that, and against the resources problem we have, I have signalled that there may have to be some slow-down in the preparation of these documents.

Mr GUNN: I refer to the situation at the Calpatanna Conservation Park. I know that area as well as I know the floor of this building, as I have been associated with that part of South Australia all of my life. The Roberts family sold the land to the Government for it to become a national park, but a mistake was made. Under normal arrangements, when a mistake is made, common sense prevails and action is taken to rectify it. It is a small community. A tennis club there has been in existence for a long time. The first that the tennis club became aware that it did not have title to the area was when it tried to raise finance. Unfortunately, a number of people who have nothing to do with the area became involved, including a group of cranks from Port Lincoln who have been making all sorts of statements in the Port Lincoln press about proposals to allow the tennis club to reasonably develop the area.

The residents of Port Lincoln have every recreational facility they want right on their doorstep. However, the people in this area live some considerable distance from any town and get little help from Governments. They only want to develop a reasonable set of tennis courts. There are now two concrete courts in existence and a third one is required, and if it cannot put in a third court the tennis club may not continue. I do not play tennis, but I understand that three courts are needed to get through the required number of sets on a Saturday afternoon.

However, they also want to develop an oval, because the old oval is on private property (and I have spent many Saturday afternoons there), and there is a road, and it is not very good to have children running across the road: it would be far better to consolidate the area. I understand that the district council was quite happy for the roads which run through the park to be closed and, therefore, to become part of the park. That seems to me to be a reasonable swap.

It has been brought to my attention that I have been accused of heavying the previous Minister. I make no apology: I certainly made representation to him, and I thought that the matter was completed, because I received a letter from him. I always try to be a very reasonable person, and that is what I am doing.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: We are well aware of that.

Mr GUNN: I am pleased that the Minister appreciates that, but I have a responsibility to represent those people who have been fooled around and not given a fair go. In a letter dated 22 February 1982 (docket number MEP 212-81), the then Minister said:

I refer to your letter of 18 December 1981 concerning the proposed lease for the Calca Tennis Club. I apologise for not replying sooner but negotiations with the tennis club have taken longer than expected. I am now happy to advise that agreement has been reached on a 99-year lease at peppercorn rental for an enlarged area which covers not only the tennis court area but also sufficient area to establish an oval.

The Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning, will be arranging for officers of the Department to contact the Secretary of the tennis club to establish the exact area required for the oval to enable the lease document to be drawn up without delay.

Yours sincerely,

David Wotton, Minister of Environment and Planning

Everyone thought that the matter was resolved and everyone was very happy. What took place? The next contact I had in relation to the matter was when I was advised by the District Council of Streaky Bay of a letter dated 24 November 1982 from the new Minister, which stated:

I am informed that negotiations were in hand with the previous Government in regard to leasing a large area of the Calpatanna Waterhole Conservation Park. Since this matter has not yet been resolved and a lease has not been signed, I wish to advise that it is not my intention to allow the leasing of a section of a conservation park of such size as to be able to develop an oval and associated facilities. I am willing, however, to agree to the leasing of the tennis courts which existed before the dedication of the conservation park.

I make these comments having given the matter great consideration. I and other people know that there are people within the Department who did not want that lease to take place, and they were very angry because the previous Minister had agreed to it. It is my considered opinion that people within the Department deliberately held up this arrangement to deny those people what was their justice until after the election, hoping to prevent this small community from having a fair go. I know that these are serious charges to make. However, I have been associated with this matter for a long time and my constituents cannot understand why they should be discriminated against and selected for such treatment.

I do not know how much longer I will stay in this Parliament. However, as long as I stay here this matter will be raised and, if necessary, a Bill will be brought into this House, and I intend to fight until those people are given a fair go. I am not making idle comments: I regard this matter as a direct attack on a small isolated community which just wants a fair go. If a similar thing happened at Port Adelaide or somewhere in the metropolitan area, all hell would break loose.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): Order! The honourable member now must be some two-thirds of the way through a second reading speech.

Mr GUNN: I am not interested in a second reading speech: I want to see justice.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has also to some extent started to reflect upon members of the Minister's Department. I have let the honourable member go on in the hope that he would very soon get to the actual question. However, I am getting a little

impatient. I would like the honourable member to get to his actual question as soon as possible.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Mr Acting Chairman. I am pleased that you are getting impatient, because I have been getting impatient for about 3½ years or more in relation to this matter. I have gone into the background of it, and there is more material to which I could refer. I merely want to bring it to the attention of the Minister and advise him of the situation. I and the people involved in this tennis club want to know when will the agreement which the former Minister entered into with them be put into effect so that they can have a reasonable set of tennis courts, a reasonable oval, and reasonable sporting facilities in a small country area. That is all I want to know.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I totally reject the attack that the honourable member has made on my officers. However, in the spirit of goodwill that has so far prevailed in this Committee, I say no more about that. Instead, I will ask the honourable member whether my letter to him of 9 June 1983 at least goes part way towards meeting the requests that he has successively made of the former Minister and me. For the benefit of the rest of the Committee, I think that I should read this letter so that the Committee members know what we are talking about. I should explain that the honourable member did canvass in the House last week that this matter would arise and, of course, as was requested by him at that time, I made sure that I came here briefed on the matter.

Mr GUNN: I thought that that was a reasonable thing to do.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: It was indeed. In a letter to the member for Eyre on 9 June 1983, I stated:

I refer to my letter to you of 24 February and your further letter of 1 June concerning the Calpatanna Waterhole Conservation Park. Having considered the matter following examination by the Eyre Peninsula District Consultative Committee—

and I do not think that that is the group to which the honourable member referred earlier—

I have resolved to continue the lease on the tennis court area and at the same time will arrange for the Department of Environment and Planning to resurvey the boundary of that section of leased land so that the tennis courts can be extended.

However, with regard to the leasing of the much larger area required for the development of an oval and associated surrounding areas, it is my intention that a draft management plan be prepared for the area and that it be released for public comment. It is envisaged that by rearranging priorities on the Department's schedule of draft management plans for parks such a plan for Calpatanna Waterhole Conservation Park would be ready for comment in the latter part of 1984.

I would like to comment briefly on that. It seems to me that that letter does two things: first, it makes clear that the local tennis club can have the additional court (I did play a little tennis and I am aware that one can easily run out of light if one does not have sufficient courts to be able to carry through), and, therefore, I would have thought that that met the immediate needs of those people. Secondly, it may well be (although there is no commitment, I readily agree) that we can do something about the oval. However, that is contingent on whatever is reported to me and the rest of the community in relation to that draft management plan.

In the past few days I have reiterated this general point. I do not know whether a copy of this letter has been sent to the honourable member, though, of course, he will certainly get it. I refer to the letter to Mr Amey (the Clerk of the District Council of Streaky Bay). I suppose that I am in a sense in the hands of the honourable member. In his remarks he did not refer to that letter or indicate that at least a portion of that request had been conceded by me. Therefore, I cannot add much more at this stage.

Mr GUNN: I thank the Minister for his answer. I acknowledge that I have a copy of the letter, and that matter has been discussed with the council, which in my judgment is still not happy. It would like the matter clarified once and for all. I point out that the first contact I had in relation to the matter was on 29 October 1981, when I received a letter from the Secretary of the tennis club. The matter had been discussed with me before and I told the Secretary to put it in writing, and it has now taken a considerable time. The Minister is talking about 1984. The council and the local residents cannot understand why someone cannot go there and say, 'Look, there are a few acres (and that is all that is required) in a very large area of land. Fix it and let us get on with it.' It is such a simple matter. If there was a shortage of land, then we could understand. However, there is no shortage of land: a large area is involved in that waterhole.

If it was unique, it would be different, but it is not. It is a very large amount of land. The member for Chaffey, as Minister of Lands, took action on the spot on the West Coast one day to fix up a problem. I find it hard to believe that someone cannot sit down with the tennis club, on the spot, and determine what it wants and where the boundary will go, and thus it would be all fixed. That is all I am asking the Minister to do. I understand that a councillor and the Clerk of the council met with the Eyre Peninsula Advisory Committee, had a lengthy discussion, and agreed that this should take place. The only people who will kick up a fuss about the matter will be a few people in Port Lincoln, but it is not their concern anyway. It is those in the local community who will be affected. They should be given the piece of land that they want to allow them to get on with the project.

Let us not be bogged down with any more plans, reports and considerations. They should be given that piece of land to enable them to get on with it. To me that seems to be very reasonable. If the Minister does that, I will be the first to acknowledge that he took the right decision. The last thing I want to do is to reflect on decisions taken by the Minister or his officers. We are elected to this place and we have a responsibility. If we do not carry out that responsibility we are not worthy of being here. I have been patient; I took up this matter with the Minister soon after he was appointed. I have tried to be reasonable. I had lengthy discussions with the previous Minister and his officers. I could say many other things, but I do not want to put officers in. All I am saying is that someone should go over there, put the pegs in the ground and let them get on with it. If these are the sorts of bureaucratic delays that take place, no wonder the economy is deteriorating. This matter relates to a small group of people who just want to get on with it. They have been stopped for no good reason, and they cannot understand it.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: If the honourable member is talking about the third tennis court, there is no problem. I understand that the recreation resources available to that community are an oval and two tennis courts. But there is a road down the middle. Ideally, the local community would like a third tennis court and all of the facilities on one side of the road. There are various ways in which the matter could be addressed. One way would be to build the tennis courts on the other side of the road; shift the tennis courts rather than the oval. I appreciate that that is probably not realistic because paving tennis courts is an expensive exercise.

On the other hand, the honourable member must realise that conservation parks are there for conservation purposes. Recreation reserves do exist in the national parks system, although it is a point of some minor controversy whether they should be in the national parks system at all. However, they are there, and, historically, they have been placed in

such locations. I guess they will stay there. The area of land referred to was not acquired with public money basically as a recreation reserve, but as a conservation reserve. I think I have some responsibility, in determining whether a significant recreation component should be added to that area, to have the whole thing properly checked out on the basis of a management plan.

I have already indicated to the honourable member's colleague that I have suggested some slowing of processing of management plans to free resources for other areas, but I am quite happy to arrange that the management plan in respect of this area be given priority so that we can get on with it. Those people will have to walk across the road for a while yet. They will get third tennis court, but if there are problems on the ground about that we will work to ensure that they are removed. Ministerial approval was given for this in June of this year.

Mr LEWIS: My question is in relation to the line concerning native vegetation clearance controls. I am uncertain about the exact purpose and operation of those regulations. I will begin at the beginning by asking the Minister if he would please clarify the statement he made about the supplementary development plan having been gazetted: he knew that the matter had been through Cabinet, but we did not know that. Can the Minister tell me when the supplementary development plan was gazetted or when public notice was given of its existence?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: My officers recall that it was in June—that roughly squares with my recollection. We do not have an exact date. I am sure that over the lunch break we can obtain the exact date and the necessary reference.

Mr Hodgson: There may be some misunderstanding about the nature of the gazettal of that plan. I understand that the plan was given operation under section 43 of the Act, which means that it will have interim operation for a maximum of 12 months during which time it can proceed to gazettal by the normal processes set out under section 41 of the Act. If that process has not been completed, the plan lapses. The reason for the plan being given interim operation was to prevent any further clearance of native vegetation without adequate policies being available on which to base decisions. The gazettal which occurred in June was purely a gazettal of a notice to the effect that the plan had interim operation for up to 12 months and that it was on display and available for public comment. So, it has not been gazetted in the traditional sense of having full force under the Act.

Mr LEWIS: It has been gazetted, but it has not?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: When the regulation was brought down I agreed with U.F. and S. that a joint working party would be set up to examine the operation of the regulation. I made it clear to the U.F. and S., because I did not want to raise false hopes or expectations, that two things were non-negotiable on that committee. One was the fact of the regulation, and the second was the issue of compensation. I said that they were political matters that would have to be raised with me, and not with my officers. However, where there were specific questions about the impact of grazing and whether that could amount to clearance or not (lots of these other questions had come up), and where on proper examination it was clear that some further clarification should occur, it seemed to me that the exercise we were entering into was reasonable. Against that background, it seemed only reasonable that the supplementary development plan, which had to be brought forward so that where a matter was referred to the commission it was not making decisions in a vacuum, would be interim, to enable us to take on board some of those matters that were being canvassed on that committee and in the community generally.

Mr LEWIS: The Minister has missed the point. I have asked two questions but one was seeking clarification of the

first, so in effect I feel that I have only asked one question. I do not know when the public was advised of that. I have searched the records and cannot find any notice in the *Gazette*. I want to know how the public was advised and when it was advised, because the Minister told this Committee that it had been advised by notice in the *Gazette*. I left the Committee and I have gone through the *Gazettes* in the Library, helped by a research assistant there, and to the best of our ability we cannot find it. Either the Minister is mistaken and has misled the Committee or I have overlooked some other form of procedure in law which would indeed give the imprimatur of law to these regulations under the aegis of the supplementary development plan. I want the Minister, if he could, to tell me how the public was notified of the existence of the supplementary development plan, whether that was according to the way in which it should have been done, how it was done, and when it was done.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: At this stage I do not know that I can add to what I have already said. I have indicated to the Committee that we can take that on notice and, as we will be here for a while yet, we can obtain more specific information for the Committee and the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister say how many applications have been received for heritage agreements since the regulations were brought down, and as far as the incentives that are provided, about which we all know, how much is being set aside to pay for fencing, etc., and those other incentives that were provided? In the yellow book under 'Vegetation retention scheme' there is an allocation, but I wonder how much has been set aside for heritage agreements, apart from the general vegetation retention programme.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I will seek advice from my officers about the number of applications; I do not know whether we have that precise information available, and I may have to take it on notice. The proposed expenditure under the land-owner agreements is \$140 000. These agreements and the expenditure on them are a bit like a capital budget; the expenditure is lumpy, because it is legal matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There must be a certain amount of money set aside to be used for that purpose.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Yes, \$140 000 but we cannot guarantee that \$140 000 will be spent. It is a difficult area from a Budget point of view, because one is never quite sure when the negotiations and the legal documents have been finalised.

As to the statistics that the honourable member has requested of me, as at 31 August this year there were 430 applications received, 352 were inspected, 22 are awaiting inspection, and 44 were rejected without inspection. The approvals were 186, covering 15 952 hectares, and another 111 are being finalised. Turning to finances from heritage funds, the approved commitment from January 1981 to the date that I have just quoted was \$458 803 (that is not adjusted for inflation). The actual expenditure from January 1981 was \$536 993, but that includes the salaries of contract staff employed to assist in the processing of the applications. I will try to obtain more specific information on the expenditure for the past two financial years which will give the honourable member a better basis on which to evaluate what is being set aside this year. The figures I have in front of me must be subject to some correction.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister referred earlier to the present Government's policy relating to the on-going purchase of land for parks. Has the Minister a criterion, or can he suggest what needs to happen for the Government to decide that it needs to determine a piece of land under compulsory acquisition? There must be some criteria before the Minister decides that that needs to happen.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Obviously they relate to the criteria we normally apply for the transfer of land into the national parks system. There has been this sort of broad-brush approach that at least 5 per cent of the State should be covered by the national parks legislation, but that is not of very much assistance to a person when evaluating whether a piece of land on the Eyre Peninsula or in the Mallee or elsewhere should be acquired. We are concerned to ensure that the national parks system has within it representative samples of the native flora and fauna of the State. To consider a piece of territory much closer to home, the Aldinga scrub was reserved and purchased under the old State Planning Authority system, and it may not have been reserved and then purchased had there been, on other parts of the Adelaide Plains, significant samples of that scrub cover, which once was a feature of what is now the metropolitan area. It was the last remaining sample of this vegetation and was therefore acquired. That is one of the important criteria that we apply.

As for compulsory acquisition, that is something we would entertain only where it was critical that we got a piece of land, that was the only way in which it could be obtained, and that clearance might otherwise occur. Now we have the clearance regulations it is perhaps less likely that these crises might arise.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding this afternoon, I understand that the Minister now has the information that the member for Mallee was seeking, and it might be advisable for the Minister to reply now.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The specifics of the question were: what public notice was given of the supplementary development plan?

Mr Hodgson: The notice of the plan being available for public inspection appeared on page 9 of the *Gazette* on 7 July. Subsequently, a notice appeared on page 127 of the *Gazette* on 21 July giving the planned interim effect under section 43 of the Act. On 7 July also an advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* notifying the public that the plan was available for inspection by local councils and also at the Department and calling for any public representations on the plan.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On page 27 of the yellow book, in relation to 'Flora, Fauna and Park Management', under 'Capital', \$607 000 is allocated for land purchase. Does that mean that \$607 000 has been allocated for land purchase, or can the Minister indicate how much money has been set aside for land purchase for national parks?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The specific sum is \$546 100.

Mr BAKER: In relation to the line for the Conservation Programmes Division, what is the Government's policy on preservation of the remaining sandhills along the Adelaide shoreline and, in particular, the land abutting Marineland at West Beach?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: We would want to preserve the remaining dunes system on our beaches. It has been extensively eaten away over the years, and that was one of the reasons for the sand replenishment programme having to be carried out, at some cost to the public, at present because, as the honourable member knows, the dunes system provides a reservoir of sand. We would be concerned to not only ensure that no further development occurs which would adversely affect what few dunes are left but to undertake works to stabilise those dune systems.

Mr BAKER: I understand there is a proposal to put a \$25 million villa-type development on land north of the Marineland development. Is the Minister aware of that proposed development, and does the Department intend to support it?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: There have been several propositions floating around in relation to the general area to the north-west of the Patawalonga. I am not aware of any of them having an impact on the remaining dunes system, but perhaps I should seek advice.

Mr BAKER: I am sorry, I meant north of Military Road and south of Marineland.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I have no specific information on that at all. It would obviously be subject to assessment by the Department if and when it came forward, but we know of no such proposition at present. It may be that someone has spoken to the local government authority about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Minister will investigate the question, and if any information is available, bring it back to the Committee in a form that will enable it to be inserted in *Hansard*.

Mr BAKER: Is it the intention of the Government to continue with the policy stated in this House that when people who actually apply for vegetation clearance do not receive a reply within three months it is deemed to have been rejected?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: It is not policy; it is law. There would have to be an amendment to allow us to resile from that position. There is no intention at this stage to introduce such an amendment.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under the 'Pollution Management' line, in relation to beverage container legislation I note that the policy of the Labor Party is to extend its provisions to class as a beverage container containers which do not have a high return rate, while preserving the existing voluntary deposit and return system for soft drink containers. Does the Government intend to amend the beverage container legislation and, if so, how?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: There is no specific proposition at this stage for an amendment to the legislation. I am having the regulations examined to determine whether they are really meeting the objectives of what we have announced, but I do not at this stage have a proposition from my colleagues in Cabinet for an amendment to the legislation.

The policy statement should be seen as a broad statement of policy which we will look to from time to time where problems may arise. The honourable member will be aware of a situation which he faced during his time as Minister (and I think I have previously congratulated him on the action he took at that time) and which threatened the integrity of the whole system. For the Government of the day to have given way on that matter would, I believe, have thrown the whole system wide open. That is the circumstance in which we would be addressing that sort of problem. When a manufacturer comes up with some new approach to the packaging of beverages which creates problems and threatens to drive a hole through the legislation, obviously we would want to look at it then, at the level either of the Act itself or the regulations.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister indicate the financial resources that have been allocated for fencing of national parks over the next 12 months and say which parks will receive priority?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: To save the time of the Committee, I might give the overall total for the honourable member, and I will undertake during the afternoon to get it together. We can do it between now and when the Committee adjourns. The total is \$153 000. We have it listed on a regional basis, but we will endeavour to get that information together whilst the Committee is proceeding so that, hopefully, we will have the complete answer before we rise.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask that the information, when presented, be in a form suitable to be inserted in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister indicate the Government's policy on sales of plants at Black Hill? During the term of the previous Government we had a policy relating to a certain production for both wholesale and retail. Does the present Government have a similar policy?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I have taken no initiatives in relation to that matter, so the position is as bequeathed to us.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has any control been placed on the amount of propagation that can take place for sale?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: There has been no change at all. The nursery is running at about the same level as during the time of the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: He said earlier that he did not want to pass up the opportunity to purchase land for national parks when it became available. Have all areas to be dedicated suddenly become available for sale or is compulsory purchase involved?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: There has to date been only one compulsory acquisition, namely, the mallee land (Bakara). The other parcels of land that have been purchased or are in the process of being purchased have been as a result of negotiation. Sometimes the initiative has been from the Government, and sometimes the land has been offered to the Government. I am not ruling out the possibility of compulsory acquisition in the future but, for the most part, we find that we can acquire the parcels of land necessary by voluntary arrangement. We are not always able to purchase land offered to us. We have had to refuse some offers of land because resources simply are not available or because the parcel of land is not seen as being of sufficient priority as against other areas at which we are looking for purchase.

Mr BAKER: Since it would appear that most purchases have been on the initiative of the Government, has the passing up of opportunities made money available? To what extent has the Government's purchase programme been as a result of increased moneys made available for that item and of the fact that the Department will use the Budget allocation to the fullest to buy land?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Is the honourable member asking whether, in the land purchase programme to date, we have kept within budget or whether we have had to transfer resources from other programmes in order to meet the commitments to those land purchases?

Mr BAKER: Has the Budget allocation been made with a specific programme in mind? Was a target involved, or did the Government say it wanted more land and that therefore it would have so much allocated for the process and buy up what was appropriate?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: No, there is a specific list of land purchases which have arisen from decisions based usually on surveys. The report which my colleague the Minister of Water Resources and I released recently on the South-East wet lands recommended, on the basis of evidence collected by these people, specific purchase of areas for wet lands and their transfer into the reserve system. That is basically how we operate. There is a series of recommendations based on that sort of evidence. We form a priority list and then see how much of that priority list can be satisfied. It is certainly not the other way round—we do not pluck a figure out of the air and ask what we can buy with the money.

Mr BAKER: I refer again to the Botanic Garden line, as the wrong answer was given previously. The Auditor-General's Report shows a free grant of money into the working account of the Botanic Garden Department, involving some \$323 600. That was for bushfire reconstruction. When we look at payments for that year, we find that the capital operating expenses were of the order of \$210 806—some \$113 000 short of the free loan made available. I asked

whether there has been a misuse of resources, as a specific grant was made available for that purpose but was not taken up. We get into difficulties in that area because of the Commonwealth Government moneys made available.

Mr Phipps: Because of the damage at Mount Lofty Botanic Garden, and having regard to the State's arrangement with the Commonwealth which placed an emphasis on a reimbursement formula for money extended to 30 June, it was important, in the interests of State finances, to proceed with due speed on the bushfire reconstruction. We made an estimate of the amount of money that should be transferred into account to cover the expense. The difference between the amount of money paid out and the amount transferred in was of the order of a few weeks work. That money stayed in the account for utilisation this financial year. It was merely a matter of transferring in a certain amount based on the estimate of the sum to be spent. Work proceeded slightly slower than anticipated and the outgoing amount was less, although that money would now have been taken up.

Mr GUNN: I refer again to compensation for persons prevented from clearing all portions of native vegetation. All people connected with agriculture recognise that certain portions of their land should not be cleared—it is common sense and good farming practice. Up until a few months ago, the people to whom I referred were obliged, by the laws of the land and by their leases, to carry out clearing of native vegetation. In good faith, many borrowed money and bought properties with the intention of clearing them. In addition, they had the necessary equipment to carry it out.

If these people are placed in the situation where suddenly overnight someone determines that they may not be able to clear all they originally envisaged or, in some cases, are prevented from clearing any of it, in my mind that is not fair or reasonable. The people concerned will still have to pay their council rates. Some may say that that is not a lot, but if a person has a few thousand acres the council rates could be considerable. Other charges are also involved. Obviously, one cannot sell the land that cannot be cleared, because no-one except for a few people, who perhaps want to own native vegetation would want to buy it. It has really lost its commercial value.

I remind the Minister that, if the people in this State want large areas set aside and land held in private ownership, unfortunately they will have to pay for it. If we were to place the same restrictions on other areas of industry, all hell would break loose. I know of a few cases involving people who borrowed money to buy their land. I believe that some consideration should be given to adequate and proper compensation. I am not one who believes that the Government is there to play Father Christmas with the taxpayer's money and throw it around as if it were going out of fashion. I was told only recently that in Western Australia some compensation payments have been made, although that information was not first hand, and I intend to check it. Are the Minister and his Government prepared to consider the matter of compensation? The Minister has indicated clearly to the Committee that he is hopeful that more than 30 per cent of the State will be retained and, in some cases, some people will be able to clear very little of the native vegetation on their properties. Will the Minister give this matter some consideration because, in some cases, people could be seriously affected financially?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I can understand the honourable member's concern. I pick up a couple of specific points, but I cannot add much more to what I have already said. First, the honourable member referred to conditions applying to leases. Of course, it is true that this Parliament formally repealed those conditions only earlier this year. However,

former Minister Casey gave directions in 1978 that they should no longer operate and there would no longer be a requirement on leaseholders to follow that clause. I do not know why the Government of the day (of which I was a part) did not go further and actually repeal that clause.

Mr LEWIS: They didn't have the guts.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: We had no problems in relation to it earlier this year, so I cannot see how pertinent that interjection is. However, former Minister Casey made the point that the requirement (though it was still on the Statute) would be inoperative. Therefore, I find it difficult to believe that in the past few years people have been making investment to clear land under that clause.

In relation to the commercial aspect of land, I would assume that in future people will not be making speculative purchases of agricultural land, because they will well understand that these conditions will apply. Of course, there are many farming properties (they would make up the bulk of the agricultural area of the State) which have been in the same family for a long time. These people have cleared to what they perceive as the limit and would have no further desire to clear, for the reasons advanced by the honourable member—that they understand the importance of standards of native vegetation.

The area of vegetation that one might want to retain because it is good farming technique is probably considerably less than what is desirable as native habitat in that region. However, maybe that is a little off the point. As for people who are in this situation, there are some moves open to them. Under the legislation they are able to appeal, and I understand that only one appeal has thus far been lodged with the Planning Appeals Tribunal. They are also able to apply for incentives under the heritage agreement scheme and, as the honourable member indicated (I suspect that there may be more people in this category than he thinks), there are those people who these days want to buy native vegetation to put beyond doubt its continued existence. Therefore, I would not want to suggest that all possibilities for the further marketing of that land have been removed, but the Government that gets itself in the situation in which it has to offer compensation, where a planning decision (whatever that planning decision might be) may put a proponent at some commercial disadvantage, will be up for a lot of money.

I understand that the Western Australian matter was rather different: it related to legislation which protected certain native plant species and, although compensation was paid, it is no longer being paid. However, the Western Australian system was not part of a planning system. The disadvantage of the planning system from the viewpoint of the people on whose behalf the honourable member is speaking is that it offers no compensation. The advantage is that it does offer rights of appeal.

Mr GUNN: I think that we would all want a system whereby it may not be necessary for people to attempt in the future to chop the regulations around. I would have thought that that would be the ultimate desire of the Minister and his Department. Problems will arise. I hope that the Minister's Department will look at the example that I mentioned in relation to Ceduna, and there are others coming up. It appears to me that, if the regulations are enforced as the Minister has indicated (bearing in mind that he wants large areas of the State left), in future these regulations will go or be greatly modified. It is far better when breaking new ground to reach agreement and make arrangements so that, if one wants to protect native vegetation, it can be done on a long-term basis, otherwise the regulations will not stand the test of time.

What concerns me is that people could be placed in difficult circumstances, because a lot of people are just

starting to understand what is involved. I think that the regulations have done something else: they have frightened people. There was panic clearing in 1976 and 1977. I must admit that I warned people over the past few years that this was likely to happen, because I foresaw that these sorts of regulations would eventually come in. People who have had a programme of development for a few years are very concerned that that programme will suddenly be cut off. However, if the Government wants these regulations to stand the test of time, a compensation arrangement will have to be brought in, or future Governments will come under tremendous pressure to alter these regulations considerably.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: With the member for Murray's permission, I seek to ask the Minister some questions. Does the Minister recall that after 12 May 1983 (the date of lodgment of the regulations being discussed) I asked him in this House whether those regulations were subject to modification? The Minister replied that the Government would insist on land clearance regulations but that he was prepared to carry out some fine tuning of those regulations. Will the Minister say what fine tuning has taken place, in view of about 600 applications and numerous complaints from the community, as people have become subject to those requirements?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Following gazettal of the regulations, I entertained a deputation from the United Farmers and Stockowners Association that proposed that a committee be set up comprising some of their officers and some of mine to examine the various queries and complaints coming forward. I accepted that advice, and that committee has been meeting. I will eventually receive a report as a result of those deliberations and, on the basis of that, the Government will determine what amendments, if any, are needed to the regulations.

I mentioned before the lunch break that I made the point to the deputation that two things were non-negotiable; one was the fact of the regulation, and the second was the matter of compensation. I indicated that beyond that I was quite happy to receive advice on any anomalies that may have been shown up in the wording of the regulations and about the way in which they are operating in practice. The report will be placed before me in due course, and will form the basis of any amendments that we might want to make to the regulation.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Has the Minister received any reports about alleged threats and/or blackmail tactics by officers in the field at the time of discussing applications to be lodged and which are subject to inspection?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I am not aware of any. I am sure that my officers would not have been involved in that process. It is true that a discussion occurs. The Committee must understand that many of these applications do not have to go before the Commission for detailed discussion if agreement can be reached between the departmental officers and the applicant. I imagine that all that would happen would be that the Commission would be given notice that satisfactory agreement had been reached.

I suppose that it is possible that from time to time some heat might enter the discussion: I hope that it would not be initiated by any of my officers. Before the lunch break I explained, in part, the criteria involved. An officer might say to a land owner, 'We would not be prepared to recommend your application to the Commission, but we are prepared to recommend this sort of application.' If the land

owner does not like that, further discussion may take place, and they may have to finally agree to disagree on the matter.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Several reports have been brought to my attention about threats in the area that the Minister has just been talking about and which have in fact occurred to the point where the applicant, in sheer frustration, has accepted the opinion of the officer, rather than bow to the threat that if he does not accept it no agreement will be given to clear any of the land subject to the application. In those circumstances, discussions cum negotiations on site have caused frustrations that have led to the reports to which I referred.

In one instance several hundred acres of a property were the subject of an application for land clearance. After a considerable period an officer from the department went to the site and physically viewed the ground areas that were the subject of the application. Following that on-site inspection he returned to the homestead of the applicant and set about describing the area that he would recommend for clearance, which, in that instance, was significantly less than the area subject to the application.

However, during those discussions I am led to believe that an offer was made by the officer to support the clearance of a portion of the total area applied for (about 40 per cent), and that in response to that the applicant allegedly said that that was not acceptable. Then came the threat, 'If you don't accept what I have outlined as being my recommendation, then I will not recommend any at all.' I am prepared to provide to the Minister more detailed information about this and the applicant's name (which I am sure will be provided to me). If even a thread of this alleged situation is true, then the officer or officers involved should be withdrawn from the field. The sort of discontent and frustration which has developed and which can be expected to develop further, over the Minister's announcement will not calm down if that sort of approach to the matter is taken.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The formal decision is made by the Commission. The interpretation that I put on the events just described by the member for Alexandra is that the officer would have said, 'I am going to have to report to the Commission that no agreement could be reached in relation to the application, and you will have to take your chances with the Commission.' It does not follow because that sort of report is made to the Commission that it will not be in a position to make any sort of decision at all. The honourable member has suggested that he can obtain more specific information for me. Perhaps that might be the best course of action. I would not want to put too sinister interpretation on that sequence of events as described. I would hope that an officer would attempt to come to some sort of compromise. He may be in a position where he would say that he would have to report to the Commission that no agreement was reached.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: That sort of compromise should not be the intent of the regulations in regard to their operation in the field. The department should ensure that new land clearance is carefully monitored and that salient and important factors are taken into consideration with a balance of regard being shown for environmental impact and impact on the applicant. To suggest that applicants in the field are in a position to negotiate, whether by threat or otherwise, or that they can reach a compromise should not be part of the deal.

The Minister's officers should approach the subject in a more practical, straightforward, and objective way. I hasten to add that some of the reports that I have received have been most favourable, and I refer not only to discussions held in the field but also to the overall concept of the

monitoring of land clearance. However, there are some problems. Over a period of weeks we have attempted to bring those problems to the Minister's attention. We have waited impatiently for an identification of the fine tuning that the Minister referred to, but today we learn that the matter is still in the melting pot. In the meantime, many people are disturbed, and some landowners, who are dependent on their properties for their livelihoods, have their backs to the wall.

The subject of compensation has been raised by the honourable member for Eyre, and I have noted what he said, but this is an area for great concern or ought to be, by the Government. I hope that the Government gives more attention to it and to the pick-up areas associated with this overall project than appears to have surfaced so far.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable Minister replies, the Chair informs the Committee that that is the last question that the member for Alexandra will be able to ask at this time.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The honourable member has suggested that he will get more specific information for me about a particular matter, and I will examine that when it comes forward. I do not know that I altogether agree with his admirably succinct description of how he sees the system operating. Obviously, vegetation control regulations are primarily about protecting native vegetation. The philosophy with which we have approached this is that we believe that the State has been overcleared. There is little that can be done in the short-term to regenerate some of those areas, which perhaps should never have been cleared, but we can minimise the amount of clearance to occur in future. That is the basic thrust of the regulation.

Mr LEWIS: My question relates to the native vegetation clearance control regulations. Do officers of the Minister's department make an assessment of the likely effects of erosion by the removal of native vegetation from the soil and, in doing so, make a judgment about whether or not it should be removed?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I will ask Mr Harris to answer that question, as he spoke on criteria before the lunch break.

Mr Harris: The short answer is 'Yes'. Several soil erosion matters are included in the criteria outlined in the supplementary development plan. It is also worth mentioning that there have been discussions between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Environment and Planning in relation to the future takeover by the Environment and Planning Department of section 12a inspections under the Soil Conservation Act. Under the provisions of that section, scrubland proposed for clearance is inspected to ensure that any potentially erodible areas are reserved from clearance.

It is the belief of the Department of Agriculture that those section 12a inspections could be carried out as part of the work associated with these vegetation clearance control regulations. We are in a transition period where joint inspections are being commonly carried out between agricultural soil conservation officers and environment and planning vegetation clearance control regulation officers. The object is to eventually phase out 12a inspections by the Department of Agriculture, and to have them included in the normal inspection process under these clearance control regulations.

Mr LEWIS: Acknowledging that the reason for my asking it was that I saw a duplication of effort, and I saw also a lack of competence in the job specifications of those people from the department, in relation to the question of judging whether or not soil erosion would be a problem, and given that it is now intended to go that way, I think it is fair to ask: first, will the job specifications of the officers of the Department of Environment and Planning be altered to ensure that they have qualifications to make an assessment

as to the likely consequences in relation to erosion of any clearing of native vegetation and, secondly, what happens to the Soil Conservation Control Board, which is presently established and operating within the Department of Agriculture, and has been for decades, and is a body of farmers and other people from various localities in which a variety of soil erosion problems arise, who are known to be expert in the area in which they live and experienced over several decades in the practice of agriculture that prevents soil erosion and ameliorates its effects where it occurs on other people's farms?

Mr Harris: There is no intention in transferring responsibility for section 12a inspections, to transfer the whole responsibility for soil conservation work from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Environment and Planning. The transfer relates only to inspections of scrub for any soil erosion hazard following that clearing activity. Soil conservation boards and all other provisions of the Soil Conservation Act will continue to be looked after by the Department of Agriculture. In terms of the suitability of the Department of Environment and Planning officers, we have been assured by the Department of Agriculture people that they consider that, through a training programme, it will not be difficult to give the environmental and planning people the necessary expertise and training to carry out adequate and proper inspections.

It is not a difficult job they assure us. In sandy country it is a matter of determining the depth of sand over clay, and in hilly areas, where water erosion is a problem, it is primarily the degree of percentage slope involved. The Department of Agriculture people feel that these biologists, who have in fact a fairly broad training, can be trained to a point where they will be able to do section 12a inspections quite adequately. All other aspects of soil conservation work will remain with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr LEWIS: Where in the Budget Estimates has an allowance been made for the cost of training?

Mr Harris: The Department of Agriculture has undertaken to provide that training, so any costs would be inherent in the operating costs of that Department.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Before the honourable member for Murray gets the call, I have more specific information in relation to a question he asked earlier. I could read that into the record and, if the honourable member wants to ask further questions, he can do so. He asked me about the cost of fencing of national parks. I have a breakdown as to regions, not as to specific reserves. In the central region it was \$29 000; in the Murraylands, \$25 000; in the Northern region, \$26 000; and in the South-East region, \$73 000, making a total of \$153 000. Also \$88 000 has been set aside for bushfire repairs.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will ask another question on that later. Turning to page 14, I notice that under specific targets for 1983-84, there is the divestment of selected reserves acquired under the Planning and Development Act. I wonder how the Minister intends doing that, and where are they going.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The Committee would be well aware of the history of reserves. The 1962 town plan identified a hierarchy of reserves it called regional parks, minor district open spaces, and major district open spaces, and recommended that funds be generated for their purchase. Initiative was taken immediately after 1970 by placing a surcharge on land tax, and honourable members will be aware of the provision whereby in lieu of the 12.5 per cent open space provision, for subdivisions, there is money paid into the planning and development fund.

As far as I am aware, those areas have been substantially acquired over the years; that is, the areas to which the honourable member is referring. It is our intention to do

what one might call a three-way split with about one-third of these areas being transferred to local government (these would be areas which have obvious potential for recreation purposes and perhaps in fairly small parcels of land); one-third of the areas would go to the Department of Recreation and Sport (these would be rather larger areas, which might be a considerable administrative burden on an individual local government authority), and the remaining one-third would go to the National Parks and Wildlife Service for gazettal as a conservation reserve.

A specific example is the Onkaparinga Estuary, which as I recall is called a major district open space, to use the old verbiage. The area to the north of the river, the so-called township park, which has been extensively modified over the years (part of it was a dump for many years and it has been covered over but it is not suitable for building), we see as being appropriate to be transferred to the city of Noarlunga. The sandfly swamp and the meanders in the river, the mud island, and so on, we believe is a significant wetland, and is almost, apart from the Port Estuary, the only remaining significant wetland on this coast, and that would be proclaimed as one of the areas under the parks system. The area to the south of that would be transferred to Recreation and Sport for larger scale recreation use. These matters are still being negotiated with local government and the Department of Recreation and Sport, but that is our intention and that I imagine is how it will turn out.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will it be necessary for some financial commitment to be made to those other departments when that transfer takes place?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: With the Department of Recreation and Sport, we would transfer that portion of our budget that has been applied to the maintenance of those areas.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On page 21 of the yellow book, under the heading '1982-83 Specific targets/objectives', reference is made to the off-road vehicle proposals approved by Cabinet and handed over to the Division of Recreation and Sport to implement. Can you give more details of what was approved by Cabinet and what the division is implementing?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It has been difficult to identify appropriate areas of land for this sort of activity. We are looking closely at an area of land in the Port Gawler area. The honourable member would be aware of a conservation park in that area, but we are not talking about that. We are talking about an area of land near that conservation park. I have recently had discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Recreation and Sport, about some joint development of that area. Some fencing would be necessary and probably a toilet.

If one looks through the general Budgets of not only this Government but the previous Government, one gets the impression that Australians are better provided with toilet facilities than is any other race in the world. I do not know what that says about us, but these things seem to be necessary. Perhaps a shelter shed should be provided for people who go on a picnic as well as using their off-road vehicles. I am not aware of any specific Cabinet decision of this Government. I wonder whether that refers to previous policy brought down that we are following through, but in any event I have tried to give the honourable member the flavour of what we want to do.

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister release the priority list of purchases that his departmental officers have prepared in relation to future national parks, and will such fencing as has been detailed keep vermin off farming lands?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is always difficult to release information in relation to purchases or areas to be purchased except where negotiations are well in hand, because people

tipped off will want to take us to the cleaners, human nature being what it is. If we are talking about a straight swap of information, that would be kept confidential. I have no qualms about that concerning the honourable member or his colleagues. As for the public release of information, there are problems about making this available. As to our interface with the surrounding farming community, we would want to do what we can to ensure that the problems we encounter from time to time on our land are not shared with them and that the problems they encounter on their land are not shared with us. The fencing programme is done with a view to controlling vermin.

Mr Phipps: The type of fence is decided by agreement with the owners. In relation to the control of vermin, we have an experimental electric fence between the border of the Ngarkat Park and the adjacent property. We have been pleased with the results so far, but we do not want to make any rash decisions, as we believe the project should be evaluated for some years.

Mr BAKER: In relation to North Haven, can the Minister confirm the selling price for the North Haven land and say what contractual agreements were reached as to payment of that sum, and into which Budget line that money will be paid?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The sum is about \$6 million, but I might be \$100 000 out either way. I will get that information for the honourable member. We expect payment on 17 November. I am not aware that it will be paid into any specific line. The honourable member will be aware that there have been significant housing initiatives that have been financed in this Budget, and that is further to the commitment that was made at the time of the sale that much of the money would be turned over to housing initiatives.

The mechanics of this, as is always the case with these things, is that the money will be paid to Consolidated Revenue, and it will be an overall Government decision as to how those resources should be allocated. I invite the honourable member to examine the overall Estimates, and to consider the extent to which that has flowed into housing.

Mr BAKER: Is it going to Consolidated Revenue, or to the Capital Account, where it belongs?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is going to Consolidated Revenue. I am not able to comment on the assumption made by the honourable member in his last few words.

Mr BAKER: It was a point I wanted clarified.

Mr LEWIS: I still have difficulty in understanding the legitimacy of the Committee to appropriate funds for the purpose of the implementation of the policy relating to native vegetation clearance control regulations. The real reason is quite simply that the Minister acknowledges the relic value of the residual stands remaining. I join him in lamenting the loss of almost complete micro-environmental ecologies in this State, which were largely unique to South Australia in some instances. In so doing, I must, nonetheless, differ from him in that, because we have lost the red gum and blue gum forests, the open Savannah woodland of the Adelaide Plains, and the casuarina woodlands in various places—gone for ever—I find it difficult to accept that someone else must now pay and that the native vegetation that remains is to be kept, as though it were in compensation for the sins of others in years gone by, in other locations from where that vegetation presently stands. The poor silly sods who own it are going to have to pay for it—cop it sweet, and too bad. That is the way this policy is working.

Men and their families have bought uncleared land and have begun clearing it as part and parcel of a lifetime's work so that it will be available for their families. They have bought land-clearing equipment and will now find

(and, indeed, do find) that no-one this side of the border wants such equipment or wants their land. Who wants to buy some native vegetation at going market rates which their mortgagee sales, imposed on landholders by banks, would have to recover? Nobody would want it—certainly not the greenies, who are quite unrealistic in their regard for the necessity to retain appropriate stands of native vegetation for not only the sake of the vegetation and flora that is there but the fauna that depends on it. They do not understand ecology.

The tragedy now is that this Government is expecting the farmers and individual citizens who happen, by some quirk of fate, to possess that land to bear the entire cost burden of so doing. The Minister has done nothing. He has not even asked the valuers in the Lands Department to take into account the fact that there is no longer a market value for uncleared land. With no bid and no offer, such land was passed in at Lameroo five weeks ago. How can the Minister justify saying, "Stiff" to those landholders when, in all honesty, for the benefit of the rest of us in the community, for the benefit of posterity and for generations yet unborn, they are being required to maintain, at their personal expense, the remnant stands of native vegetation as relics, quite out of any proportional regard for the necessity to repay them to ensure the survival of endangered species or anything else. Because they happen to be there, they will have to stay there.

Why cannot the Minister see that it is unfair, given that, if I or the Minister were to require, for the sake of the retention of our heritage, a fifth or a third of the workers of General Motor's-Holdens or a fifth or a third of the land at Woodville, to be retained under the Heritage Act as a remnant of the industrial past of South Australia, thus preserving all the old-fashioned lathes and presses intact so that we would still have a part of our heritage, given that any worker forced into that situation would find it quite unacceptable to the extent that there would be massive industrial unrest, can the Minister understand that that is exactly how the farmers and their families feel, those who have been hit by the sudden and complete imposition of these regulations and the freezing of their assets? It is affecting their livelihood in the same way as it would affect the livelihood of a wheelwright who, in the 1920s, was required to go on making wheels with wooden spokes and steel rims for the sake of having something of our heritage of the 1920s still functional today, with no compensation.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The honourable member really invites me to embark on a sermon, which I would relish but which I do not believe would be relished by the honourable member's colleagues or other members of the Committee. Therefore, I will endeavour to be brief. Certainly, there are serious themes which invite address in what the honourable member has had to say. It boils down to members of the Opposition asking the Government to withdraw the regulations. People are quite prepared to say that they are alarmed at the amount of clearance that has taken place, but when one comes up with a practical resolution to the problem, they say that it is not good enough. If the Opposition is able to come up with a piece of machinery which will secure the objective, whilst not breaking Treasury, I will be more than happy to examine it.

The honourable member gave one illustration which was singularly inapposite. I refer to his likening of the preservation of natural heritage in the Mallee to the preservation of European heritage at Woodville. It is possible for European heritage to be replicated. In fact, if one wants to build a functioning replica of a lathe of the 1890s, one can do so. However, if the potaroo, the nail-tailed wallaby or the orange-bellied parrot became extinct, that is that. Until such time as microbiology enables us to replicate those species (and

that may never be, and there may be moral objection to that technical innovation), we are faced with the question of whether we want to protect native flora and fauna. I do not see any parallel between the two situations to which the honourable member referred. Certainly, there are parallels between that sort of planning control and other planning controls exercised. The plain fact is that successive Governments have set their face against using compensation where people believe they are disadvantaged under planning controls. We all understand why that has happened.

Mr LEWIS: I explained to the Government, in response to the request from the Minister, what should happen and happen very quickly, namely, that an inventory of endangered species of native flora and fauna should be prepared along with an assessment of the necessity for the retention of a given area (whether in one lump or several lumps) of such species habitat (their micro-environmental or biological niche) to ensure their survival. In that equation we could establish the total area of the remnant vegetation left that must be retained to ensure the survival of those species. Because we are doing it in the name of public interest and civilised behaviour, it is legitimate for all of us to pay, and is not in the least bit fair to expect those coincidental citizens, families who happen to own the land now, to cop it all, the way the Government is currently advocating.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I do not see any point in my proceeding further with an argument in relation to the matter of compensation. However, there are a couple matters to which I should perhaps address myself. First, I refer to a matter raised by the honourable member which was also the subject, in part, of a Question on Notice to me about endangered species. My belief is that (and I think that it could be backed up by objective evidence) the point which probably pushes many of our species over the edge has already been passed. It would take only some adverse seasons or destructive fire regimes in certain areas to wipe out some of the species which are on the edge of extinction. Mr Harris might like to explain a little further (in the broad) what information we have in relation to just how slender is the hold that many of these species have.

However, I want to refer to the honourable member's earlier question. He talked about my giving directions to the Valuer-General. Of course, there is a statutory system of valuation and revaluation in this State which follows market forces. He also mentioned the case of land being passed in at auction. Obviously, that will affect the price on the market of other land which, of course, in time will be reflected in the valuation placed on those properties. If the honourable member wishes, I am happy to have a word with the Valuer-General (who, of course, is one of my officers wearing another hat), but I assure him that forces like this will always reflect in the bulk valuation that is eventually placed on the property. Perhaps Mr Harris can comment specifically on endangered species and their relationship to the remnant habitat.

Mr Harris: We have quite an accumulation of information on the remnant vegetation of the State. Over the past five to six years we have invested quite substantial amounts of State and Commonwealth money into biological surveys of the remnant vegetation throughout the agricultural regions of the State. In fact, with the assistance of various outside individuals and research workers within the Government we have surveyed virtually all the significant remnant areas within the agricultural regions of the State, and certainly there is no cause for complacency in the picture which emerges from the data we have gathered.

The vegetation remaining in most parts of the State is scattered, broken up and isolated. There are very few large substantial blocks remaining, and there is certainly cause for concern in relation to the remaining vegetation. In rela-

tion to the wildlife (the species which exist within the various vegetation formations), it is a fact that quite a considerable number of species in the State have become extinct, not only in the early years of settlement but rather more recently than that. Almost certainly the main cause of extinction has been habitat modification or total loss through land clearance. Of those species that remain, in some cases relatively few cases seem to be secure. Other species of animals have a fairly precarious status, and it is predicted that a number of them will become extinct in the future. The reasons for that lie in the field of island biogeography theory. It is a biological fact that species remaining in some of the existing remnant patches of vegetation will not continue into the future. The vegetation in which they presently remain is simply too small for them to survive. There will be genetic drift, genetic impoverishment, general inbreeding, and species will decline to the point of extinction. That we can confidently predict. Therefore, in short, the picture that we have, based on fairly intensive work over the past few years, is certainly not a comforting one.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Murray.

Mr LEWIS: How many questions am I entitled to? That is the third time I have been lopped off at the ankle.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair recognises the member for Mallee. There is no need for him to go on as he is.

Mr LEWIS: Given the information that the Committee has just received, that it is acknowledged that regrettably what has happened in the past has meant that a large number of species have become extinct and yet another group (and even one would be too many) will inevitably become extinct, why the hell does the Minister require private citizens to meet the cost of retaining stands of native vegetation which are retained in no way proportional to any scientific evidence to ensure the survival of any species in any methodical fashion other than that a percentage of what is there must stay? How can he justify imposing that burden on so few people for the sake of so many and simply say, 'To hell with you: you will not be compensated.'? There is no benefit in it that I can see, and there is certainly a great deal of injustice and heartache, especially given that (as he has already indicated), once the market forces demonstrate that this land is virtually worthless on the market, then and only then will valuers reduce its value in assessing it for the application of taxes (that is, local and whatever other Government agency taxes). It seems so unjust, so unscientific, and so unreasonable, and I cannot understand how the Minister can ask us to appropriate funds to perpetrate such injustice on so few people for the benefit of so many.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In relation to the accusation of being unscientific, I wonder where the honourable member was before the luncheon break, because we talked then about the criteria (it was predicated against a question from one of his colleagues, namely: was it a fact that the basic criteria was that 30 per cent should be retained?). I rejected that. I said that it may be that that is sometimes the eventual outcome of an application of a set of criteria. However, nonetheless, that was not one of them, and I then invited Mr Harris to explain those criteria in the broad to the Committee. The point was made that one criterion for the retention of a stand of native vegetation was the presence in the stand of native vegetation of endangered species. Therefore, no figures were plucked out of the air. It is related to an ecological assessment of the area, which is a subject of the application.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that, under 'Pollution management', on page 30, one of the specific targets and objectives is the preparation of legislation dealing with hazardous chemicals. How far advanced is that, and has the

Minister given thought to what I perceive as a very real need for a rationalisation of pollution legislation?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The hazardous chemicals legislation is now the subject of a good deal of exchange of information and a degree of agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. However, I invite Mr Inglis (Director of the Pollution Management Division) to give the Committee a little more specific information on how we intend to proceed.

Mr Inglis: There are two streams of activity going on: one at the national level and one at the State level. There has been agreement at the Australian Environment Council that there will be the introduction of an assessment and notification scheme nationally. The target date for that is 1 January 1985. This would require people introducing new chemicals into Australia, either by import or manufacture, to notify a statutory authority of that intention and to have them assessed. The results of that assessment would be passed to the States to implement the appropriate controls and regulations. The South Australian Cabinet has recently agreed to set up an inter-departmental committee to prepare for the reception of those recommendations from the national body. The aim is that all agencies involved in the administration of chemicals (and there are about 13 of them) will co-ordinate their efforts so that these controls are applied effectively.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that there has been a 1.5 reduction in the employment level in regard to air quality management. How has that come about? I would have thought that an increase would have been more likely, rather than a reduction.

Mr Inglis: The reduction has occurred because of the particular skills of some members of the Air Quality Branch. Some have specific training in chemical engineering and in chemistry, and they are being asked to prepare the basic plan for the introduction of the hazardous chemicals scheme. The ability to deploy people from the air quality area has resulted from the finalisation of the reduction of emissions from motor vehicles work and the completion of an assessment at the national level of the degree of air quality control that needs to be imposed. This has freed some staff who have been placed in the priority area of hazardous chemicals. We have also been fortunate in acquiring a redeployed employee from Amdel with specific skills in this area.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister outline how things are going in the Noise Control Unit? Is it keeping up with complaints? Is there a backlog? Are there any problems associated with that section? How are things progressing in providing local government with a bit more say than it has had in the past?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I have not had people writing to me saying that they have had problems with getting service from that Noise Control Unit. Perhaps Mr Inglis can comment further.

Mr Inglis: The complaints at this time of the year are running at about 40 a month. To service the first inspection of those complaints takes about two weeks. We have managed to set ourselves a target of two to three weeks for the first contact of a complainant. By and large that target is being achieved. There are some particularly difficult types of complaints which require us to set up sophisticated plants to deal with them and so it takes a little longer. We have not received angry complaints from the public concerning any serious degree of backlog.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the deployment of funds for various site surveys. Did the Department get permission from the Commonwealth to spend certain funds from the Urban Regional Development Financial Assistance Act? Generally funds are provided as non-repayable grants. Were funds

received for surveying the Kokatha Aboriginal site area or the Oodnadatta Aboriginal site?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Is the honourable member referring to the National Estate programme, where the initiative comes from the State and is approved by the Commonwealth Minister?

Mr BAKER: It appears that a very large sum of money is still left in that fund, so I would assume that funds are not approved on request but rather that a certain sum is allocated.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: What is the specific question?

Mr BAKER: Has agreement been reached with the Commonwealth to fund the Aboriginal site surveys from the relevant lines?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Yes.

Mr BAKER: In regard to pollution management, there has been some conjecture over a period of time about who is responsible for the various aspects of it. This occurs particularly in regard to the area of marine pollution and air pollution; there are health regulations and various other regulations. Has the Minister instigated action to bring all these bodies together to provide for one body which could at least report to a centralised body and thus overcome some of the problems that have occurred over a number of years in this regard?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: This relates in part to a question from the member's colleague, which I am afraid I left partly unanswered, concerning consolidation of all pollution legislation and surveillance. This is a matter that is a fair way down the track. At this stage our concern is to bring before the House, and have passed, clean air legislation, and to continue work that has already been described on the hazardous chemicals area, and to get that into some sort of order. We have an amendment to the noise pollution legislation coming up as well. Mr Inglis might like to comment further.

Mr Inglis: I should like to give a little background in saying that the consolidation of pollution legislation can be achieved legislatively although it does not have to be administered by one body. For example, the administration of the clean air provisions is carried out under health regulations delegated to the Department of Environment and Planning. Therefore, the question of whether a consolidated Act is the appropriate way to proceed, or whether consolidated administration is the way to proceed, is the question to be answered; that has not yet been addressed.

Mr BAKER: I note that point of view. However, a number of public servants are running around South Australia doing similar things. I realise that powers can be vested within one organisation to take on board regulations that actually pertain to another Ministerial area. The problem still relates to the fact that we do have competing areas of interest, and that has occurred for many years. When the former Minister of Environment was in office I thought that we had something in train to get some action taken on this matter. However, it seems that we are now no nearer to reaching an outcome than we were in the past.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Pollution can be a very broad term. Certain common themes are involved, because someone must measure it, determine its source, and someone somewhere must decide what is an acceptable level of whatever the thing is and what statutory controls shall apply. So, obviously, there are some common themes. However, it seems to me that noise pollution is in a different category from marine and air pollution. In the case of air and marine pollution we are talking about something with a chemical origin, whereas noise pollution has a physical origin.

Mr BAKER: Those different areas are managed by people with different expertise, but those with common areas of

interest should be brought together, irrespective of the fact that noise pollution, say, is a fairly homogenous item.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: There is probably not too much difference between the way that the honourable member and I approach this matter. I wanted to head off any suggestion that it is the Government's view that all forms of pollution, as commonly understood by people, should come under the same umbrella. The Environmental Protection Council has had this matter under its purview for some time and no doubt it will in time make recommendations to me. The subcommittee system of Cabinet at present does allow for some inter-agency review of these matters, so that my Resources and Physical Development Committee encompasses the concerns of the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Transport, each of whom have quite substantial responsibilities and concerns in this area. So, we are able to have some sort of overview by that means. So, we are able to have some sort of overview through that means.

Mr LEWIS: My question relates to the same matter as that raised by the two preceding members of the Committee: pollution management. What is the department's opinion and proposed course of action in relation to the raw sewerage, faeces, and so on, to be found on the beach near Finger Point from time to time where it is discharged into the sea by the pipeline from Mount Gambier?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Our advice to the Government would be that, as soon as the resources can be found to do the job, it should be done. They are not presently available.

Mr LEWIS: Acknowledging the rather indifferent—that is the kindest term that I can think of—attitude of the Minister to the problems that that therefore poses to the marine environment around Finger Point and the damage that it is doing, not only to that eco system but prospectively to the fisheries, I will leave that matter and let the Government be accountable for its indifference in other ways.

I now turn to the question of disposable napkins which are soiled and disposed of in the same way, for instance, as people have used other packaging of convenience in the past prior to the imposition of deposits on soft drink bottles. For example, the napkins in question are left where they are finished with. Classic locations that cause a great deal of discomfort and problems are: (1) in the litter bins, in parking bays along the highway, which then become naturally fly blown and have to be cleaned out by somebody (and that is not a very salubrious task); and (2) into the Murray River where they are being disposed of by picnickers and houseboat people. We drink that water here in Adelaide and also at Tailem Bend, but the difference is that water supplied through the Tailem Bend to Keith pipeline is not filtered, and there is no plan to filter it (there are other people of course who do not have any water to drink, but that is by the by).

It causes, therefore, not only a potential hazard to the health of the people who may drink the water in an unchlorinated or unfiltered form, but also a pollution problem in that it might infect or result in the infection of fish who might then be consumed (such fish including not only scale vertebrates but also crustacea such as yabbies). It further poses a problem for water skiers. Imagine the discomfort and revulsion of coming off the skis only to find that on rising to the surface one is confronted with one of these things freshly disposed of. In terms of pollution management, what solution or action does the Government believe it ought to adopt in connection with these disposable napkins?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Our view, and that of the E. & W.S. Department, is that these things should be washed thoroughly before they are disposed of, but people do not always take that course of action. I believe that some sort of education campaign should be undertaken by the industry,

because it is their particular product which causes this problem. I would be very loath to recommend to my colleagues, at this stage anyway, some sort of statutory control which should be exercised here. I am not prepared at this stage to extend the ambit of the beverage container legislation to that, but certainly I believe that people ought to be educated to a responsible attitude in the disposal of these things.

Mr LEWIS: I presume that the Minister would recommend to his colleagues that something be done in that regard, or that he would call together the distributors of these convenience devices and let them know of the growing and serious problem that arises in certain parts of the State as a consequence. If that is what the Minister indicates by nodding his head, well and good.

I wonder whether, under the line relating to national parks administration, the Minister could comment on the use of national parks, such as the national park in the Flinders Ranges, by people who want to gain access to these parks in a way that causes only very minimal damage, by either walking through them or, more particularly, by riding on camels through them. I am referring to such large parks as Ngarkat, which has some very interesting features and which would greatly benefit if something like camel trekking (not four-wheel drive access) were allowed. This would not smash up the fairly fragile sandy soil structures in the same way as would other cloven hoof animals or especially four-wheel drive vehicles. Will the Minister consider allowing that kind of activity in an organised way to develop in conjunction with the promotion of tourism, of which we are all conscious this week?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: From time to time I remind my colleague the Minister of Tourism that we are part of the servicing arm of his department: without an environment to show off you have no tourism. We would want to address this in terms of the management plan that is brought down for each particular park. For the most part, exotic species (other than that represented by the honourable member and myself) are not encouraged to enter these reserved areas. However, I concede what the honourable member says, that the impact of different species tends to be different and, although I do not know too much about camels, I am prepared to accept what he has to say, that maybe they have less impact (although it is a large animal) than some other animals because of the different hoof formation. I know that in some parks horse-riding activities have been banned, following the management plan. I rather imagine that there have been others where, following the management plan, horse trails have been set up and are used. Perhaps Mr Nichols, Director of National Parks and Wildlife, would like to comment.

Mr Nichols: I do not think that I can add much to that. Obviously proposals of this sort might be put forward too after the management plan has been prepared. However, during the course of the plan, those sort of things are considered. Tourism is addressed as a particular issue within the management of each park, and recommendations are made. Like the Minister, I am not sure about the impact of camels. I know that when they become feral they become pests in the northern part of the State, but under controlled conditions I am sure we would consider it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As I have a continuing interest in the Adelaide Hills, I would be interested to know what the complete review of the policies for the Adelaide Hills is likely to take in. I am referring to the significant initiatives referred to on page 46 of the yellow book under 'Development and Planning'. What type of consultation is taking place, particularly with local government, on these matters? When are we likely to see the final preparation of the s.d.p. incorporating amended policies?

Mr Hodgson: The principal elements of the review of policies for the Adelaide Hills relate to the importance of large parts of the Hills as a metropolitan water catchment and, secondly, to the all too evident bushfire hazard that prevails in the Hills. The s.d.p. which we propose to eventually prepare will be addressing the development control aspect of both those issues.

The E. and W.S. Department has been doing quite a bit of work for us in identifying particular development problems as they relate to pollution of the catchment areas. We are also consulting closely with the C.F.S. and other relevant Government agencies in regard to the sort of control measures that we can apply to reduce or in some instances eliminate the bushfire hazard as it relates to urban development in the Hills. I could not give a very accurate estimate of when that work will be completed but I think we would be hopeful of having the s.d.p. in draft form some time late this financial year. In the course of the preparation of the s.d.p., there is a requirement to consult with all affected councils, and that would of course take place. We are also consulting closely with councils in relation to likely amendments to the development and control policies in the watershed areas and also in relation to bushfire hazard measures.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Reference is made under 'Outdoor Recreation Facilities' to the establishment of the Tourism Liaison Committee. Could some information be given about that committee?

Mr Nichols: My division is represented on that committee. The committee, which comprises five members, is chaired by a man well known in the tourist industry who also has knowledge of national parks—Mr Kevin Rasheed, of Flinders Range Tourist Services. The members are the head of operations of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the head of Programmes of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and their counterparts from the Department of Tourism. The committee meets monthly.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I notice that there is planning for the new kiosk on Mount Lofty to replace the kiosk that was burnt down. Has anything been done in that regard and, if a significant application came along for a large building, what would the reaction of the Government be to such a proposal, or are there strict limits to the type of development the Department would want on that site?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We would want to put limits on it. I would not want to be seduced by dollars. Obviously, the area is very significant to South Australians and we want to see that whatever is built there harmonises very closely with the surroundings.

Mr Nichols: I do not think I can add much to that except to say that it is a difficult decision to make. The proper thing to do would be to take our time and to think of all the possible things that could be done up there. Obviously we could just charge ahead and build something that provides the same amount of accommodation that was burnt down, but it may not be the right decision. We also have to look into problems involved in the siting of it.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I think it is fair enough for me to say that as a matter of policy the Government would not want to put out of hand the possibility that a substantial private investment might be allowed there. In other words, it might just be as simple as the Government building a facility and finding a concession, providing some sort of agreement and finding someone to run it. If a person came forward with a proposition to build which would involve some investment on that person's part, provided the public interest could be secured we would obviously want to look at that closely to see whether it could save us some money.

Mr BAKER: I refer to a matter that has concerned me for some time, namely, the Mickey Mouse way Governments

have approached computerisation and the application of computer techniques in the various areas of need in Government. There was some criticism in the Auditor-General's Report about the management information system. Can the Minister tell the Committee the total cost of all computer applications with which his department has been associated and the cost of both computer hardware and software? Which areas of computer software have required remedial attention, and which areas of hardware have failed to produce the desired result? I can evidence the management information system. I am not sure how well we have been going with Landsat and other devices available to the Parliament.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: It is a wide-ranging question and involves a great deal of detail which I will be happy to obtain from the honourable member as I do not have it right now. We regard computer applications as very important. Specific reference was made to the Landsat inventory. It is important in building up a biological inventory of the State in the broad, in any event. Already it is proving a considerable boon to us. We would want to further those sorts of innovations. I am happy to obtain specific information on this matter.

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister indicate when he intends to bring the marine pollution legislation before the House? I note a specific reference on page 30 to this legislation. Which areas will involve marine pollution, and which areas will be land based? I presume it is related to industrial, commercial and household waste as it flows into the sea and the inland rivers.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I ask Mr Inglis to comment.

Mr Inglis: There is an active programme within the Pollution Management Division to prepare detailed briefings for the Government on the way in which legislation can be framed (there are several ways that it can be put together) on the organisation necessary to implement that legislation as well as cost estimates. The planning for it is that the information would go to Government for inclusion in next year's Estimates. The costing included in this year's Budget provides for that planning exercise.

Mr BAKER: I refer also to the Clean Air Act. The same information is required, except that we have a difference of venue: specifically, we go from water to air. Is there any intention to look at backyard incinerators under the Clean Air Act?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Domestic incineration will certainly be covered under the Clean Air Act. I would anticipate being able to bring down legislation to the House this session.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note, under 'Outdoor recreation areas and facilities', that the reduction in capital is represented by the Thorndon Park completion and divestment and a pause in the further development of the Belair and Para Wirra national parks. Can the Minister provide information on this matter?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I ask Mr Nichols to answer.

Mr Nichols: Belair and Para Wirra are the main concerns. We believe that those projects needed at Belair can be divided into two categories: first, those absolutely essential to prevent degradation and cope with visitation; and, secondly, those which are desirable but do not have to be done immediately. In the past couple of years we have been undertaking the first category. We are now at the stage where we can legitimately pause and allow the management plan to be made public in its draft form to get some public reaction and comment before we proceed further with major development works at Belair and Para Wirra.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note under 'Botanic Gardens' that a feasibility study was commissioned and received for the construction of a major new tropical conservatory garden. Does the Minister see a need for such a conservatory? I see a need but wish to hear the Minister's viewpoint. What

plans does the Government have to commence construction on that conservatory?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Detailed plans exist for a tropical conservatory, and we believe it is important that it be built. The honourable member may have seen a statement from my office about this matter a fortnight to three weeks ago. At this stage we are getting more detailed costing and looking candidly for a possibility of private sponsorship which might go into its construction. It would be good to see it as a Jubilee 150 or, slightly further down the track, a bicentenary project. It is unclear at this stage whether funds would be available from either of those two sources to assist. Unless it is possible to tap into those sources of funds, we are looking at the normal Government building programme along with some private sponsorship. Funding is yet to be sorted out. We know what we want to buy but we are unsure whether we can afford to buy it. It would be a marvellous facility for this State from both a scientific and tourist viewpoint.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is anything being done about the reorganisation of Botanic Park? Suggested plans have been around for some time advocating the inclusion of Botanic Park in the Botanic Gardens.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The major problem with Botanic Park in recent times (apart from a degree of vandalism which has occurred) has been the whole problem of car parking and the amount of space sometimes illegally taken up by cars. Extensive negotiations have been undertaken with the Adelaide City Council, the Zoo and the State Transport Authority for the provision of adequate parking spaces which, at the same time, will not impact on that very pleasant environment of the Botanic Park. I believe that a resolution is now on paper and is being carefully negotiated which will allow for the area along the Hackney Road boundary of the park to be made available for parking for casual visitation to the park. As to the other question the honourable member raised, it is not one that has been specifically placed before me.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The question was that, a major part, if not all of the botanic park, would be included within the gardens.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: As I understand it, before this matter could be further considered, there would have to be extensive consultation with the Adelaide City Council, and I would imagine that community groups would have some possible concern about any suggestion of what they would see as part of the parklands being somehow alienated. Therefore, I would want to be satisfied on all those matters before giving my imprimatur on what would be seen by some as the locking-up of part of the parklands. Of course, the responsibility of the Board for the care and control of that area is understood, and I will continue to talk to the Board about it.

Mr BAKER: I refer to bushfire prevention. The Auditor-General suggests that the department cannot keep an inventory of its assets in terms of its firefighting equipment, etc. Allied to this question, I have a Question on Notice (to which I presume I will receive a reply shortly) that relates to what measures are being incorporated into future development plans to perhaps isolate the national parks from bushfires and, in turn, stop the spread of bushfires should they start in the national parks.

It is a two-point question. The first relates to the fact that the Department has kept inadequate records. Has the Department got its act together in that regard? Secondly, in broad terms what bushfire management procedures are being incorporated now, given that we will probably have a prolific amount of grass and growth available for fire in the forthcoming season?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I refer to page 116 of the Auditor-General's Report, which states:

A review of accounting for fire-fighting operations of the Division revealed that—

the administrative and accounting records did not permit the ready identification of the total cost of fire-fighting/fire-prevention activities in each of the parks or reserves;
the records maintained for plant and equipment were inadequate for information and control purposes.

As I understand it, the second part of that paragraph is directly related to the first part. Information is available in relation to fire-fighting and fire-prevention activities in major parks and reserves. The total picture is not known, and my officers are further discussing with the Auditor-General machinery in relation to that. I do not think that the Auditor-General makes a major point of it. However, we are having further discussions on that.

The honourable member referred to planning issues in the parks and to fire. We heard earlier of measures being taken to consider possible supplementary development plans in the Adelaide Hills area in relation to the watershed areas and fire. As to fire amelioration measures, these are undertaken. For example, coal burns are undertaken where they can be. The circumstances of the Ash Wednesday fire were such that virtually no prevention measures would have stopped what occurred. In the past week I have looked at a couple of our parks that were badly affected by the fire and in some cases it is not possible to distinguish from what is left what areas had coal burn treatment and what areas had not. However, having said that, that is not to suggest that one should not do what one can to control the outbreak of a less intense fire. Therefore, these measures are carried out along with some fire breaks. Some fire breaks had been burnt in Cleland, and I understand from my officers that they were holding that fire until the wind change occurred which swept the fire right across the South-East freeway which one would have thought was—

Mr BAKER: There were other areas that were not.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I am not trying to suggest that we have a system of fire breaks throughout all our park areas. Of course, it depends on which park you are talking about. There are parks in remote areas where these sorts of controls are not necessary, because there is no significant danger to life and property as a result of an outbreak because the area is so remote, and also because as a result of the remoteness of the area, the ignition of a fire was probably not related to human activity and, therefore, will not be as frequent as would otherwise be the case. We will bring to bear what resources we can on the problem. Work is also being done by an officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service (Mr McKew) and an officer of the C.F.S. for the development of a fire management plan.

Mr BAKER: I contest the Minister's point that it is not of importance to know that one has a certain amount of equipment available in a certain park to fight a fire. My next question relates to 'Wildlife Conservation'. Under 'Capital Expenditure' the outcome for 1982-83 was \$284 000 against a proposed \$640 000. The proposed actual expenditure is \$557 000 which is a doubling-up of the amount expended in 1982-83. Can the Minister detail what items will lead to the doubling of capital expenditure on that item?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Before answering that, I refer to the comments by the member for Mitcham following my earlier remarks. The information is available as to the capital equipment and where it is. The Auditor-General was not able to obtain from my officer the total costs of the whole operation. However, information as to the location of men and equipment is available. We have a sophisticated network operating, and I would invite the honourable member to

come to Greenhill Road for a grand tour, and we might take him up the tower at Mount Lofty as well.

Mr BAKER: Obviously, someone cannot add up all those individual items.

Mr Nichols: The key point that the Auditor-General was making was that we attend hundreds of fires a year. The exact cost of fighting that fire is difficult to ascertain where a piece of equipment was used on several fires. The problem was how many of our valuable reserves of people could we put into keeping those sorts of controls on literally hundreds of fires as opposed to fighting fires. That has been negotiated in discussions with the Auditor-General, and my information is that his Department is happy with the way that we are managing those things now. That was the key point.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: As to a dissection of the cost of wildlife conservation, I ask the Director-General to report but could the question be repeated.

Mr BAKER: The proposed expenditure for 1983-84 is \$557 000, representing about a 90 per cent increase. Why such an increase.

Mr Phipps: That is a capital expenditure item. The difference is due to the construction of a fauna management complex at Monarto that was previously scheduled to be constructed at Para Wirra. As a result of the Government's decision to proceed with the development on an agistment area for the open range zoo at Monarto, it was considered that there would be an advantage in combining the needs for the agistment area of the zoo and the fauna complex at Para Wirra. So, they have been combined, which is the reason for the additional expenditure.

Mr BAKER: Proposed capital expenditure for 1983-84 for the vegetation retention scheme (referred to at page 28) is \$342 000. I understand that the purpose of the scheme was to exhort farmers to retain areas of bushland. I am unsure whether that came under the Heritage Agreement or some other item. What does that amount of \$342 000 represent?

Mr Phipps: That line refers to all aspects of vegetation retention: it covers both the professional assessment costs associated with vegetation clearance control regulations and the Heritage Agreement programme. The voluntary heritage agreement scheme and the assessment of clearance applications are both funded by the Heritage Fund, which in turn is funded by a transfer of money from the recurrent expenditure line. A special allocation from Treasury is made for the recurrent expenditure line. The money goes into the Heritage Fund. The Minister has authority to apply that money for the purposes of conservation of natural heritage. That includes the voluntary scheme and the protection of heritage through the Planning Act.

Mr BAKER: If it includes the voluntary scheme, why is the amount as high as that which was spent in 1982-83? I imagine that the vegetation regulations have now superseded any voluntary effort made by farmers.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The measures are complementary. The member's colleague was looking for specific information about the heritage agreements themselves, and we now have that information. The amount allocated to the Heritage Agreement Scheme this financial year is \$140 000; last year actual expenditure amounted to \$223 000. There were a series of applications. I mentioned earlier the lumpy nature of this sort of expenditure. Legal documents and so on must be drawn up. There was a series of applications moving through the system that all fell into the 1982-83 financial year. It is anticipated that that volume of traffic will not occur this year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister say what is in the State Heritage Fund?

Mr Phipps: As I mentioned before, the amount that we expect to come into the fund in the course of a year is

based on the transfer from expenditure from recurrent lines plus revenue received in the course of a year from repayments of loans made from the Heritage Fund. In broad terms, the amount that will be transferred from recurrent expenditure, which is the main allocation, will be about \$700 000, with the balance being receipts from repayment of loans.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Therefore, that represents a reduction in that the amount last year was \$830 000 whereas this year it will be \$700 000.

Mr Phipps: Because of the backlog in the amount of money to be paid out across the board for voluntary heritage agreements last year, after negotiations with the Treasury, the funds were built up to a certain extent. Treasury agreed to a one-off transfer of \$330 000 into the Heritage Fund for vegetation retention purposes. Those conditions do not exist this year, but we will still have the cost of assessing applications for clearance, so Treasury agreed to transfer an amount of \$230 000, about \$100 000 less than was transferred previously. That explains the deduction. In total expenditure terms there will be reduced expenditure on the vegetation side as distinct from the European heritage side. That will be where the reduction of \$100 000 will be borne. Given the fact the items are similar, the end result could be that similar amounts could be spent on vegetation and European heritage.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have previously expressed concern in the House about the backlog of work in regard to historic shipwrecks. What resources are being provided in this regard? How many people are on the staff dealing with this matter? As a result of the present Budget, how many will there be for the next 12 months? Has any financial assistance been received from the Commonwealth Government to help administer the Commonwealth legislation?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Yes. The position remains much the same as I found it, with one officer working full time on these matters. I am afraid that this Budget does not improve that position at all. Mr Jeffrey will remain the sole officer working on it, but I would certainly like to do something about this matter as we go along. There are inadequate resources to meet the problem, and I readily admit that. I again make the point that I made this morning, namely, that times are tough and it is difficult to get much in the way of expansion in budgets for these sorts of things. On the capital side we have provided for a boat. I think if the honourable member searches through the papers, he will find an allocation of \$45 000 for this purpose that will enable a good deal of surveillance and investigation work to be carried out.

We have a system of voluntary wardens, and about 60 people have accepted appointment under that particular system. So, I share the honourable member's concern and I do want to do something about it as we go along, but at this stage the provision in this Budget, apart from that additional capital item that will be useful, is for the provision of the same level of resources as occurred in the last Budget.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I suggest to the Minister that there is a need to look at priorities. If the Budget does not allow (and I understand that) for extra staff, there is obviously a need to look at priorities within that area. I would seek more information, but I appreciate that the Minister will not be able to provide it now, about what I am led to believe is quite a massive backlog of work to be carried out in this area. There is no way that one officer can do it. I understand that if that officer is away on leave, or anything like that, there is no-one able to do it. The fact that we have legislation, we are continuing to declare historic shipwrecks, and we are putting money towards the provision of boats, etc., when we have only one person to administer that responsibility, is quite farcical.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I can give the honourable member an assurance that I am concerned about this particular matter. I will be looking to resources. I apologise for the fact that I ignored part of his earlier question about Commonwealth assistance. There has been no worthwhile Commonwealth assistance. At this stage there is an application before the Commonwealth for assistance.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When was that application made?

Mr Harris: The Commonwealth has assisted to some degree over the past 12 to 18 months, but within the past four to five months we sent a submission to the Commonwealth asking for special consideration in the way extra funding is given. The State inevitably looks after, for the Commonwealth, a number of shipwrecks that lie in Commonwealth waters off the State, and on that basis we have submitted and argued to the Commonwealth that we should be given extra assistance with funding.

Mr BAKER: Going back to the item I was previously asking about, and either I am missing the point or the figures do not add up, we compared that item of \$323 000, and the Minister pointed out that the cost of the vegetation retention programme was about \$140 000. Therefore, we have allocated almost as much for 1983-84, therefore, some other item under that vegetation retention line must be receiving an extra allocation, or have I got the story wrong?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Overall the amount of money appropriated is about the same.

Mr BAKER: That is correct.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: But since the heritage agreement money is reduced by about \$80 000, that \$80 000 must flow into one of the other subcomponents of the programme.

Mr Phipps: It is flowing into the assessment of clearance applications.

Mr BAKER: This is a capital item, is it?

Mr Phipps: It is a capital item to the extent that the Heritage Fund is a capital fund, and the Treasury has transferred money from the recurrent line into the Heritage Fund, and that Heritage Fund then has the same controls applying to it as applied to the Loan Fund. Expenditure from that Heritage Fund can be approved by the Minister in the same way that normal capital projects can be approved. However, the Heritage Fund does not have the same constraints: it does not have to apply to capital projects only. A reading of the Act will show that it can apply to surveys and all the actions necessary to achieve protection of heritage, and the assessment of clearance applications is one of those.

Mr BAKER: That leads me to the next question. There have been some items that I have found from other portfolios that we are using capital items as recurrent revenue. There are some reasons for it, because the funding arrangement in some cases can be quite complex. Do the manpower figures then reflect the actual manpower on recurrent or on recurrent and capital manpower?

Mr Phipps: Manpower?

Mr BAKER: That is the total manpower available. Therefore, with no increase in manpower, where is the increased cost of assessment? Are you getting contractors in or what?

Mr Phipps: I ask which manpower figures are being referred to because there are various categories under the total presentation of figures in the programme papers that include, for example, contract employment as distinct from Public Service.

Mr BAKER: I can separate that question a little later when I get some individual information. Referring to page 24 of the yellow book, 'Coastal management policy and research' has gone up again. There was \$102 000 spent in 1982-83 and there has been a 90 per cent lift in that item, and one extra person employed. Can the Minister say what

has caused that increase of 90 per cent in that coastal management policy and research?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We can fairly quickly get that information. Perhaps we can go on to another item, and we will return to that as quickly as we can.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under heritage conservation there is assistance to the Jubilee 150 Board's History and Conservation Committee in developing Jubilee 150 projects. I am interested in what that means for Port Adelaide and Fort Glanville (referring to page 18 of the yellow book).

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I am not sure that it means anything.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It was under '1982-83 specific targets'. I am wondering what has resulted in that Fort Glanville project.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The Fort Glanville project, as approved under the Jubilee 150 scheme is, as I recall, one of the Commonwealth-funded projects.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is entirely Commonwealth-funded is it?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: As far as I am aware, yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What about Port Adelaide, is there anything happening there?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There is the maritime park, again that is one of the Commonwealth's.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Supplementary to that, I understood with the heritage precinct that was established during the term of the last Government, there was specific action taking place in regard to the 1986 celebration in that area. Is the State involved in that particular programme?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes, there is the decision by ETSA to underground the services in the precinct. There has recently been money made available, and one of my officers will have to assist me here, in relation to the restoration of the sailmaker's loft immediately opposite Lipson House restaurant. I am not aware of the exact source of that grant, whether it is the Commonwealth or Jubilee 150.

Mr Harris: The restoration work on the old sailmakers building is being funded from the State Heritage Fund.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My next question relates to the regular liaison of the History Trust with the Department of Tourism. When we were in Government consideration was being given to the possibility of some buildings presently under the National Parks and Wildlife Service being given to the History Trust, and Fort Glanville is one of those complexes. I would suggest. Have any further negotiations taken place in regard to that transfer?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In regard to Fort Glanville there is a consultative committee which operates in the same way as consultative committees did for the various parks. It looks a little odd in the national parks system, since we are talking about a piece of European heritage rather than natural heritage. My understanding is that it is the strong desire of that consultative committee that it stays where it is. I have taken no initiative on that. There are no initiatives in that direction because I understand that that is the strong desire of the members of that committee and the group who operate the fort.

Mr LEWIS: My question relates to the Pollution Management Division or other lines. It relates to my concern about the necessity for the way in which the Murray River is regarded by Government to be given some alteration to what it is now. I share the concern expressed by Mr Moore, the Executive Manager for the Murray Valley League in South Australia. He claims that multiple use planned for the Murray does not exist anywhere in South Australia, or anywhere else for that matter. Departments within Governments and academie have been preoccupied with their own specific goals and concerns such as agriculture, irrigation, water supply, environment, limnology (the study of large

bodies of water, such as lakes), recreation, tourism, etc. Whilst our awareness of all these things is increasing (I share Mr Moore's view in this respect), we are doing nothing to ensure that they are considered in a co-ordinated way and that there is an overall plan for the management of the river. Our approach to date has been largely predicated by the preoccupation with irrigation, and not enough concern, in my judgment, has been displayed for those matters to which I have referred such as environment, recreation, etc. I have given examples of how that indifference can cause concern even within tourism from one user to another.

Is the Government then responding to a request or recommendation from the Murray Valley League, which represents all local governments which are end users of the system as well as those associated with it, including the District Council of Whyalla, and who speak with one voice through that organisation? That organisation is asking whether the Government will set up a Cabinet committee of the four most important Ministers involved in this matter to consider it. Does the Minister regard that as a realistic way of coming to terms with what to date have been the disparate elements of the deteriorating condition of the river?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I thank the honourable member for that question. I agree with him completely as to his analysis of the problem, and the fact that there has been an over-emphasis in the past on the river as a resource for irrigation purposes only. I believe it is the single most difficult problem we have to address. There are perhaps those who say that market forces are largely addressing it for us. I am not so sure; maybe if we have to wait for market forces to do all that they can do we will be waiting a long time and the problem will become well nigh insoluble.

I have had discussions with Mr Moore, who earlier this year had a meeting with several Ministers who, through their various portfolios (Water Resources and Tourism), would be concerned with the Murray and would have certain machinery available to them to do something about it. We undertook to take the matter up at a high level. The member asked whether I believe that a Cabinet subcommittee is the appropriate way of addressing this matter. There is in fact already a Cabinet subcommittee in existence which has been examining the problem, and that is the Resources and Physical Development Committee, of which I am Chairman. One of the things the committee has had under its consideration is the designation of one agency or Department as a clearing house for action in this area or at least recommendations which will lead to action, the putting together material which is available within the various agencies, and the like.

The question has been: which is the most appropriate Department to act in that capacity? The two obvious departments are the E. & W.S. Department and my Department. I understand that the Directors-General of those two Departments have conferred with their officers and with each other and that a recommendation is coming forward to the effect that the Department of Environment and Planning should have the overview and should use the Planning Act and the mechanisms under the Planning Act as the appropriate machinery to get the sort of overview that the honourable member advocates. I cannot pretend that all of the matters that Mr Moore has raised with this Government, or indeed that the honourable member is currently raising with this Government, have been fully resolved, but I can say that there has been a good deal of Government activity and concern about this matter right up to the sub-Cabinet level.

Mr LEWIS: My next question relates to another matter altogether, and I will not waste the Committee's time by commenting on the answer the Minister has given, other

than that I am pleased to learn of his perception of the problem in an overall context. I trust that the representations which the Murray Valley League makes on these matters can be taken quite seriously in future.

My question relates to fire breaks around national parks in general and around Gum Lagoon in particular. I refer the Minister to a question that I put to him in correspondence on behalf of individual constituents and the Willalooka C.F.S., as part of the Tatiara complex, about their view that the present break to be established and maintained by the Department around Gum Lagoon is inadequate. I worry as much about the fact that, without adequate fire breaks, fires can not only devastate the park by burning into it from outside as they can cause devastation to adjacent landholders by burning out of the park into the landholder's private property.

Indeed, good housekeeping in a neighbourly fashion in any rural environment requires people to respect the integrity of their neighbours' property and establish breaks in a fashion that will give them reasonable protection from whichever direction the fire is coming. In all sincerity, does the Minister believe the break to be established and maintained by the Department around Gum Lagoon to be adequate?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I will ask Mr Nichols whether he has any specific information. Is it envisaged that as part of this piece of machinery which will protect the parks from surrounding agricultural areas, or vice versa, there will also be firebreaks undertaken by landholders on their side of the boundary? That aspect must be looked at but sometimes it is overlooked.

Mr LEWIS: I agree with the Minister.

Mr Nichols: I am not in a position to give details of those firebreaks as it concerns one of 204 parks. We are in the invidious position of having to protect native vegetation within the parks system, knowing that whatever we do by way of protection will be criticised. There will be a large vocal section of any community opposing what we do. If we do something else, we will also be opposed. If we create firebreaks with controlled burning we will be supported by some local interests and strongly criticised by others, and vice versa. It is a matter of degree. It is difficult to say who is right. If we carry out certain fire protection work and adjoining owners do likewise, we believe it is the best that can be done.

Mr LEWIS: You believe in getting value for your dollar?

Mr Nichols: We do—for the dollars we have got.

Mr LEWIS: In regard to the management of national parks, I refer particularly to Mrs Noyce's correspondence to me about her home at Noonameena. I have an acknowledgment dated 5 July to my letter written to the Premier and the Minister in this regard. What is the Minister's attitude to the problem with which the Noyces are confronted? I will briefly outline the case to refresh the Minister's memory. The people concerned pointed out to me the present policy concerning existing shacks in national parks. They were informed that they would have to leave. They have built a small cottage in the Coorong area known as Seven Mile, or Noonameena. At the time it was built it was not a national park but has since been proclaimed as such. They are both pensioners and do not have the means to establish themselves elsewhere. The Department calls their dwelling a shack even though it is their only residence. They built it themselves and have limited finances. There is no way, at their age, by which they can find alternative accommodation.

They believe it is hardly fair to be kicked out of their home just because a particular date passes. Even though they spoke on 11 May to the Minister's secretary, in this letter they point out to me that the possibility exists of their being moved within five years. They are in a terrible dilemma, and naturally are very agitated at this stage of

their life. They seek an assurance that they will not be dispossessed and thrown out on the street—in this case, turned out on to the road like travelling stock. Their property will have no value if they are dispossessed. They have no money and have lived there all their lives. They are not irresponsible. I wonder whether their few remaining years could be lived in peace.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: At present, the policy that applies to a shack site in what is called a 'non-acceptable area' is that life tenure is available to the people who occupy that shack, under whatever arrangements. That policy, I believe, was first publicly enunciated by the present Minister of Mines and Energy in the 1979 State election. It was one that was brought into being by the last Liberal Government, and is a policy currently in force. It is true that the Labor Party has expressed concern about shacks in national parks but, at this stage, no decision has been made by this Government to treat shacks in national parks any differently from shacks on non-acceptable sites elsewhere in the State.

I apologise to the honourable member if he has not received a final reply either through the Premier or me. I can only say that, in the event of a discussion occurring at Cabinet level on the possibility of a more stringent policy applying to shacks in parks, I would certainly keep in mind the problems that such policy may cause for people in circumstances to which the honourable member referred. I now ask Mr Phipps to answer the question previously asked by the member for Mitcham.

Mr Phipps: Mr Baker requested information on the increase in expenditure for the item 'Coastal management policy and research'. For the total programme the level of manpower resources remains unchanged and the proposed expenditure for the total programme for 1983-84 under recurrent expenditure is only marginally above the outcome in 1982-83. In regard to the line 'Coastal management policy and research', an increase from \$102 000 to \$191 000 is shown—a difference of \$89 000. I also draw attention to the proposed figure of \$156 000. The difference is made up of two components: first, the manpower allocated to that item being increased by one person; secondly, the expenditure component containing about \$90 000 for an item known as 'Beach Profiles'. Therefore, the \$30 000 difference relates to salary. The other \$60 000 is due to a cash flow implication. The figure of \$90 000 each year in a lag in payment for the 1982-83 component combined with the programme for 1983-84 makes up the difference.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am anxious to know how the work being done on cleaning up the Onkaparinga is progressing. I have a very new and personal interest in that section of the Onkaparinga now, as I understand that the electorate in which I am very much interested adjoins the Minister's electorate, and we share the responsibility as far as the Onkaparinga is concerned. I am particularly keen to know how that work is progressing and when it is likely to be concluded.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I understand that, provided that the honourable member and I are able to successfully negotiate the next State election, we will be neighbours, and he has pinched my old Noarlunga district from me. The programme has not finished. There is still \$50 000 to be expended, and I understand that we were able to do more work in terms of the amount of river that was worked on than had originally been envisaged, because the contract was for a certain volume of material to be removed. In some parts of the lower river in the vicinity of the footbridge we encountered rock bars which one cannot move without gelnite, or something of the sort. Therefore, the contractor was not able to move a great deal of material from that area. In any event, there had not been a great deal of siltation in the area and, therefore, the contractor was able

to do more work upstream. Of course, the river has been flowing very strongly in recent times. In fact, there were some fears of flooding in the estuary area only about three weeks ago, and it will be interesting to see the combined effect of the dredging programme and the surge of water that has come through.

The general comments from local residents are that the river is now looking very good and is in a much better condition than it has been for quite some time. I think that we can assume that that is as a result of the programme which was initiated in a policy sense by the honourable member, although, of course, the expenditure did not begin until I came in as Minister. However, in part, it has been the result of a flow of water through the river which has not been seen since the early to mid 1970s.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What resources are being provided in this Budget for the continuation of the Greening of Adelaide programme, financially and in relation to manpower, in the next 12 months?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think that the amount provided is \$80 000.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: How does that compare with last year?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is up from \$60 000 to \$80 000. We will obtain those specific figures.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: And in relation to manpower?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We will obtain those figures as well. It is the old problem of marrying the line and the programme together.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am happy for the Minister to provide that information later.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can provide immediately some of this information, and I will quickly go through it. I refer to the item 'Greening of Adelaide'. The amounts of proposed increases for this financial year included preparation of seedlings, \$6 000; secondary greening projects, \$20 000; employment of additional consultant, \$9 000. I will try to get the other figures.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under 'Conservation policy' in the 1982-83 specific targets, the environmental overview study was commenced. Can the Minister provide more information about that study, whether it has been completed, or whether it is to be completed?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A series of papers has been prepared by Mr Lothian, of the Department. I have read the papers that have been produced and have found them to be stimulating reading. I will ask Mr Harris to explain the programme overall.

Mr Harris: As the Minister has indicated, Mr Andrew Lothian is responsible for this overview study, with some assistance from within the Department. He has written a series of discussion papers, which, in turn, have been put to a smaller advisory committee, which includes people from inside and outside the Department. He has been producing those papers on a regular basis and indeed has worked very diligently. However, it is quite clear that the original time frame proposed was too optimistic and he will continue to work on that study until the end of this year. We hope that the report will be substantially finished by the end of this year. Originally it had been hoped to have it completed by now.

Mr BAKER: My next question relates to the NESA programme, which appears on page 16 of the yellow book. First, what is the relationship between the +5.7 manpower and the total programme receipts of \$195 000? Is that amount forthcoming from the Commonwealth for that programme, and what is the commitment to retain these people beyond 1983-84?

Mr Phipps: The funding of the NESA trainees is from the Commonwealth, and the Department is providing the

full cost of supervision of the people and has appointed a special supervisor. We have been able to secure a further nine-month extension, going well into this financial year, for most of the people. We are hopeful that we can achieve that for all presently engaged.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the programme receipts item. How much of that \$195 000 belongs to the NESA scheme?

Mr Phipps: Of the \$195 000, \$120 000 belongs to the NESA scheme, and the balance is normal Botanic Gardens funds: it is State money as distinct from Commonwealth money.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the training scheme for Aboriginal rangers. In checking through the document, I could not get specific detail of how many were employed under this scheme, where they are employed, and how that scheme is being financed at present. Can the Minister give details of that?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There are four men employed in the Gammon Ranges at present. They are Adnamathna people. The funding from the Commonwealth runs until March next year. We have given assurances of continued employment to those men provided that they are able to satisfactorily complete their course of training. I have visited the Gammon Ranges and met the people there. I was impressed by what has been achieved with that training programme under Mr Peter Taylor. There have also been exchange visits with Aboriginal people from Arnhem Land who are involved in a similar training programme in the Kakado National Park, in the Northern Territory. I should explain also that as Mr Taylor is a Commonwealth employee the Commonwealth pays his salary.

Mr BAKER: That is until March 1984. What does the Minister envisage happening beyond that time?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We have given an assurance of continuing employment. We have done that not only because of the intrinsic merits of the scheme but also because of the public commitment that was given by the member for Murray when the scheme was first begun. Of course, it will be necessary either to appropriate additional resources or to have some reallocation of resources, if that is possible. Also, we are discussing with the Commonwealth the possibility of its continuing to provide funds.

Mr BAKER: What is the status of the consultative committees for national parks set up under the previous Government? Does the Minister consider that they are of assistance in this area, and what does he foresee as being their future?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I would say that their status is healthy. I believe that the committees have been very useful as a means of educating the public as to what we are on about in the parks system, and also I guess they have been useful in educating us in regard to some of the expectations that the public has about the way in which the parks system can satisfy their needs. The substantial matters discussed by the consultative committees are made available to me on an ongoing basis, so that I can determine what action I should take relevant to the matters that are being raised. Therefore, I believe that it is working extremely well, and I have no intentions of modifying the system. I believe it has a strong future.

Mr LEWIS: I have some other outstanding matters that seem to me to have been lost somewhere in the Minister's offices. I would ask whether the Minister could give his attention to a letter that I wrote to him on 31 July. The letter was acknowledged but not otherwise replied to. The letter is from the Betts family, which is in the same predicament as are the constituents to whom I referred earlier in regard to vegetation clearance control regulations. In particular, the difficulties being experienced by the Argents at Wanbi (as I have been constantly reminded, also as has

been Mr Brian Argent, by an officer of the Minister's department) have been referred to higher authorities. However, there is still no answer. This matter dates from 6 June. Mr Argent is a landholder at Wanbi.

Another matter drawn to my attention recently, which has long been outstanding, comes from a Stanley Glen Evans. Mr Evans lives at Galga, in the north Mallee. He is waiting for a reply from the Department so that he can tell his woodcutters, who have been there for years, whether or not they can go on with their work. They are not articulate people and find it very difficult to engage in correspondence. They do not have access to good telephone communications. The manual exchanges in the area are not open all the time, anyway. Indeed, they are not people who in any sense would perpetrate a mischief. They live fairly frugally and humbly and yet they are now being knocked around by the indifference of the Department to their honest requests for information about the processing of their applications and what to do next. The Minister would understand the people to whom I refer, in terms of the subculture they come from and the mores they have, and I am sure he would be prepared to give them a prompt response so that they can go on being independent of the need to rely on welfare.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will certainly undertake to find out where each of those pieces of correspondence may be. It was not clear to me whether the gentleman from Galga had in fact written to me.

Mr LEWIS: He put in an application almost immediately when it was necessary for him to do so. It has been lost; it may be that his handwriting is hard to read, although I do not have much difficulty reading it as it is similar to my father's.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will investigate the matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In regard to coastal management, actual capital expenditure for 1982-83 was \$671 000, whereas proposed expenditure for 1983-84 is only \$500 000. Also, there is to be a reduction in expenditure on the community awareness promotion from \$58 000 to \$36 000. I think I understand the reason for the reduction in the community awareness programme, but I would ask the Minister to comment on the reduction in the coastal protection programme.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: A reallocation of resources has occurred. An amount of \$49 000 has been transferred to the coastal areas and facilities programme, which is the major component of that reallocation of resources. I will endeavour to get more specific information on that matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: So, overall a reduction in the commitment to coastal management has occurred?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: No, because there is more than one programme in our total effort.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Page 24 indicates a significant reduction in the coastal protection item.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: For the most part an accounting shuffle has occurred because, in fact, \$97 000 has gone to the coastal areas and facilities programme. One must refer to those two programmes in regard to our total effort in the coastal protection area as administered by the Coast Protection Board.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister provide some more detail at a later stage in regard to exactly what is happening in this matter?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Sure. It is a matter of considering the two programmes together.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The specific targets for 1982-83 refer to implementing the recommendation for the Patawalonga outlet approved by Cabinet. What were the recommendations, and what improvement of the Patawalonga has resulted from those recommendations?

Mr Phipps: The proposal was that the responsibility for managing and funding the Patawalonga outlet be transferred from the Department of Environment and Planning to the Department of Marine and Harbors.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is all those recommendations involved?

Mr Phipps: There was one other item which involved the carrying out of an investigation into a suitable long-term management measure. There are various options: it could be dredging, just by the normal conventional dredging procedures; an *in situ* operation involving a jetty and crane; or a fixed excavation. However, assessing the feasibility of the various operations and funding, Cabinet decided that would be the responsibility of the Department of Marine and Harbors. Essentially, the achievement was really more one of transfer of responsibility, and knowing the Patawalonga that was quite an achievement.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand that the review of alternative protection strategies has been completed. Were recommendations associated with that review?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: A series of strategies were outlined.

Mr Harris: The consultants who were retained to produce a preliminary report on the alternative strategies completed their report some months ago, and the department has been in the process of assessing that report in-house and providing its own comments on that report, and the department's internal assessment will be completed soon.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: What the report addresses is the cost in both financial and environmental terms of a series of options. One is to do nothing, and another is to continue with the present programme of carting sand to those beaches from which it is disappearing rapidly and allowing the longshore drift to spread it along the beaches where accretion occurs, while yet another is to provide a groyne field, and a further option is to provide off-shore bars of some sort or possibly, a mixture of these options—the possibility of perhaps one or two groynes but still carting sand for some replenishment associated with those groynes.

The report evaluates each of those options in terms of short-term and long-term costs and the environmental impact of each of those options. For instance, one of the costs we face if we do nothing is the disappearance of Brighton beach since it has become virtually an artificial beach maintained by the sand replenishment programme.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is that a public report?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Not as yet, although it is intended that it should be.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call the member for Mitcham, I point out to the member for Murray that the Chair is of the opinion that what is being asked now of the Minister would come under the line 'Department of Environment and Planning', which deals with certain expenditure on coastal protection improvements, and so forth. Bearing in mind the last few questions, when we come to that line we will merely be going back over the same ground, and we should not be doing that.

Mr BAKER: My question relates to heritage conservation, referred to at page 20 of the yellow book. The 'Community Awareness Promotion' allocation seems very strange, and I can only presume it came from a particular trust fund. Under 'Capital Expenditure' there is a \$58 000 outcome for 1982-83, when nothing was actually set aside. Can the Minister enlighten me?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We have a listing here of the specific items. There is the heritage interpretation master plan (I will give round figures) of \$19 000; heritage registration certificates, \$2 000; the publication *Illustrated Heritage of South Australia*, \$19 000; a reprint of the built heritage guidelines, nearly \$6 000; Gawler heritage guidelines, \$4 000;

Port Pirie heritage drawings, \$1 500; heritage materials for schools, \$1 000; and plant alliance report, \$4 500, giving a total (in exact figures) of \$57 344.

Mr BAKER: Does that come out of the Heritage Fund? Otherwise it should have been under recurrent expenditure.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It was a charge against the Heritage Fund.

Mr BAKER: My next question relates to the intra-agency support services and a fairly massive increase in the total allocation for 1983-84 (page 45 of the yellow book). I can only assume that most of that increase is made up of the costs of accommodating administrative services, but I would be pleased if the Minister could tell me what actual impact that has had, and whether any specific item has caused such a significant leap.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The major item in this is a charge which was previously met elsewhere in the State Budget, I assume under one of the P.B.D. lines, and that is \$919 000 for accommodation costs. There is also a provision for inflation of \$15 000. There is a full year effect of price increases, goods and services, \$38 000, although on the other side there will be a decrease in the provision for terminal leave payments of \$24 000. However, the major item is simply a transfer of an expenditure previously funded through the P.B.D. to the Department.

Mr BAKER: The purchase of motor vehicles (on the same page) involves a massive increase; in fact, by more than 100 per cent (I am referring to capital expenditure on intra-agency support services). Why do the intra-agency services require so many cars?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: This is a total figure, and it relates to cyclic maintenance and replacement. In fact, the total amount of city-based vehicles available to the Department has been decreased by 26. However, because a vehicle may have a particular life (and for reasons I do not quite understand—I guess it is buried in the Department) many of these vehicles lives move in phase. The expenditure has hit us this year, but that is against a decrease of 26 in the total fleet.

If the member is still on-call, we have specific figures relating to the greening of Adelaide which we can give now, or we can have them inserted later. In 1982-83 expenditure from State resources on the greening of Adelaide was \$27 000; from Commonwealth resources, \$42 500, making a total of \$69 500. In 1983-84 expenditure from State resources, as I mentioned earlier, was \$70 000; and from the Commonwealth, \$20 000. There is one additional person to be employed for six months of the year.

Mr LEWIS: I would ask the Minister if he would add to that list (which, I have no doubt, he will compile of those constituents who find themselves in awkward situations in relation to the native vegetation clearance control regulations and their impact upon them) the name of one Reg Lowe, who applied for consideration of his application about 12 weeks ago and is still waiting. Regarding those regulations, will the Minister ensure that a copy of the supplementary development plan, upon which the public is being invited to comment presently, is placed in the Library for members who wish to consult it?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The answer to both questions is 'Yes'.

Mr LEWIS: The other question I would like to ask relates to the effect which the Minister's Department has, quite properly, on applications involving the development of employment opportunities, self-employment particularly, in South Australia. There is a new industry which could be established, worth about \$20-30 million a year, and which would provide people with a substantial chance of becoming self-employed—small producers of crustaceans and other aquatic species. I refer to the industry of aquaculture. Aqua-

culture can be divided into a number of sub-sets, and I am particularly concerned with freshwater, mariculture and salt water aquaculture production of a variety of crustaceans, whether yabbies, scallops or oysters.

I ask the Minister to acknowledge that that industry ought to be encouraged, as it will expand the State's economy. There will not be substitution employment involved, but there will be an increase in actual jobs. Where applications by individual citizens are made to the Department for the use of land adjacent to the Murray River, Eight Mile Creek in the South-East, or somewhere around the coast, they should be given earnest and reasonable consideration to acknowledge that they are not illegitimate pursuits in any sense. It will help these people to become independent if the Department expedites its consideration of those applications, some of which have been hanging around for months, and I am anxious that they be dealt with so that this industry gets going, if possible.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Are we talking about applications specifically to my Department or to Government departments generally in respect of which the honourable member believes we could have some input? The burden for these matters usually lies with either State Development or the technology people. We continue to have discussions and an exchange of information with the technology people. Technology does not necessarily imply innovations in purely the electronics or hard mechanical fields. I know that Dr Ellyard's people are particularly interested in innovations that are biologically based. We would certainly be interested in that, because, for the most part, what we are talking about here is environmentally benign technologies. We would want to assist wherever reasonable with such applications and we do have channels of communication for that to happen.

Mr LEWIS: The bottleneck seems to be in the Department of Environment and Planning.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will take up the example that the honourable member has mentioned, find out what I can, and enlighten him about this matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to the heading '1982-83 Specific Targets/Objectives' listed under the programme title 'Heritage Conservation'. What is meant by the words, 'Completion of two further regional heritage surveys'? What areas do they cover? How far advanced is the Government in declaring further heritage precincts as it did in Port Adelaide?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In view of the time, I will take that question on notice. The information is available and I will get it for the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: How is the Minister getting along with the Anglican Church with regard to heritage matters, particularly in relation to churches?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I am not aware of any point of controversy with that church. Has there been one around the place for a while of which I am not aware?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Obviously the Minister is not trying to put too many Anglican churches on the heritage list.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We have produced a discussion paper on this matter which will be sent to all major denominations shortly for discussion. We will ensure that the Church of England does not miss out.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous,
\$2 433 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
Mr S.J. Baker
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr G.M. Gunn
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Mr I.P. Lewis
Mr K.H. Plunkett
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr E.J. Phipps, Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr M.D. Madgan, Deputy Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr B.J. Hill, Director, Management and Administrative Services, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr L. Djordjevic, Senior Finance Officer, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr C.R. Harris, Director, Conservation Programmes, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr G.R. Inglis, Director, Pollution Management Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr R.I. Nichols, Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr J. Hodgson, Director, Development Management Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I request information on the proposed allocation for assistance to councils and boating facilities on inland waters, which shows a decrease from \$29 000 to \$20 000. What is the reason for that reduction?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It relates to the approaches we had last financial year for assistance. As the honourable member will see from the vote, not all moneys appropriated last year were expended. We believe that the amount now in the line is realistic in terms of the approaches we will get this year.

Mr BAKER: The Premier announced that he is restructuring all State debts to bring in an average interest servicing cost. Such a move would have significant ramifications for instrumentalities such as ETSA. We have shown in the miscellaneous line a number of trusts, etc., which are run on capital grants, which I presume have to be repaid and which have an interest burden associated with them relating to the debt services that we have seen in the Budget. The figures shown are exactly the same as those for 1982-83. Has the Department of Environment and Planning and its miscellaneous trusts stayed free of any increase in service charges as a result of the newly announced policy?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is the position. These debts relate to expenditure provided for Cleland Conservation Park Trust and Black Hill Coast Protection Board some time ago. There is no additional usage of this mechanism to raise funds so one can anticipate that these items will be appearing in this form in the Budget for a few years yet.

Mr BAKER: That seems contrary to the Premier's announced position. Would it be possible for the Minister to provide details of the debts outstanding on each item as

well as interest rates appropriate to such items as it appears, on face value (and there may be a good reason for it), that the Department of Environment and Planning has some privileged position. On these items, which are more or less discretionary, and on items such as electricity (which is one of our most fundamental needs), we see escalation clauses because of the new servicing arrangements. Will the Minister undertake to provide this information?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will undertake to obtain that information for State Treasury and supply it to the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: The Conservation Council has had its allocation lifted from \$27 500 to \$33 000 for 1983-84 and the Australian Environment Council has had its allocation doubled. Will the Minister advise why these organisations have had a lift in their allocation while the zoo has suffered a decrease of some \$15 000 in the amount allocated for its operations in Adelaide.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The total allocation for the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia for its purposes both in the city of Adelaide and for the open-range zoo at Monarto has increased. However, there has been a reallocation of resources between the two. As I understand it, that is seen as a reasonable reallocation by the Zoological Society. Maybe, if there was no open-range zoo, some of the activities being funded up there would have to be funded down here and would therefore appear in the first of those sub-lines. The Conservation Council of South Australia has been operating on a shoestring budget for a long time. It occupies quite unsatisfactory premises so I have been looking around to see what assistance the Government might be able to give it in finding new premises in a reasonable location, but it is not an easy task.

However, if this is a recognition that the Conservation Council has been under-funded for some years then I hope that in the future I may be able to assist it a little more. The Australian Environment Council is the annual meeting of environment Ministers. An agreement was reached in Alice Springs about an increase in subventions from the States for a budget to study certain items of environmental concern. We can obtain that information for the honourable member if he wishes.

Mr LEWIS: This question follows from the question asked by the member for Mitcham. Will the Minister tell the Committee the names of the various organisations listed under the heading 'Grants' which will receive \$59 000 listed under 'Proposed expenditure' in an area where we spent \$4 less than \$50 000 last year?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Under this heading are the following organisations: the Australian Conservation Foundation, \$10 000; the Conservation Council of South Australia, \$33 000; the Australian Environment Council, \$5 000; the CONCOM Conference and workshop, \$7 000; and an amount of \$1 000 not presently allocated. The Kesab grant is separately listed.

Mr LEWIS: Can the Minister confirm whether or not such madcap, fringe, leftist organisations like CANE are affiliated with and in some part financed by any of those funds?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I understand that CANE would have some affiliation with the Conservation Council of South Australia. I am not sure about the specific relationship between the two bodies, but there would certainly be some form of affiliation.

Mr LEWIS: Is the Minister concerned that those funds could be used to print literature to encourage people to do what some people did recently at the Olympic Dam site in South Australia? The Government had to spend \$600 000 or \$700 000 on that occasion to send police to a place they would not otherwise have gone.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In view of the almost paltry nature of the amount we are talking about, I doubt very much whether any of this money found its way into the programme to which the honourable member refers. I would be concerned if money which had a public origin was used to exhort people to break the law. On the other hand, I believe that CANE has a legitimate function to carry on. It has a particular viewpoint which may not be shared by the honourable member but it has a right to express that viewpoint.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister say what the Budget allocation for the open range zoo relates to and what it planned in regard to future staffing at that zoo either this year or the following year?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Mr Madgan is on the committee responsible for the planning of the open range zoo and I ask him to answer the question.

Mr Madgan: The zoo presently employs a farm manager and an animal keeper in the agistment area. It is planned to employ a manager for the fauna management facility when it is built. At present no other employment is envisaged because the Monarto open range zoo proper, as opposed to the agistment area, is still the subject of a feasibility study.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When is it intended that that feasibility study will be completed and that either the agistment area or the zoo proper will be open to the public?

Mr Madgan: We are currently calling for tenders from consultants to undertake the feasibility study. Based on the tenders we have received so far, we imagine that the study will be completed in about six months. As to the opening of the zoo itself, that will be the subject of one of the items of the study.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Finally, I refer to the Royal Institute of Planners World Congress in 1986, for which I am pleased to see the Government has allocated \$5 000. Is the Minister or the Government taking any other positive action to ensure that the Congress is held in South Australia in that year? Has it been finalised that it will be held in Adelaide in that year?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I think that it has been secured. A report was made to the seminar held by the Jubilee 150 Board about a fortnight ago, and I think that we have definitely got it on the hook.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Works and Services—Department of Environment and Planning, \$6 200 000—Examination declared completed.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I take this opportunity to thank my officers from the Department of Environment and Planning for the way in which they have assisted the Committee and to assure the Committee that those matters on which we have undertaken to obtain additional detailed information will be made available to the Parliament as soon as it can possibly and realistically be made available.

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

Lands, \$22 988 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold

Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. W.E. Chapman
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Mr K.H. Plunkett

Witness:

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R.F. Elleway, Assistant Director, Department of Lands.
Mr E.A.R. Mellen, Director, Administration and Finance, Department of Lands.
Mr F.J. Vickery, Director, Outback Management, Department of Lands.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I should explain that Mr Max Scriven, who is the very recently appointed Director of the Department, is within the precincts of the Chamber. I have not asked him to sit at the table with me because, in effect, this is his first day in his job with the Department. As was the case during previous sessions of the Committee, it is my desire to maximise the opportunity for members of the Committee to ask questions directly of my officers, although I will handle any matters that have a strong policy component.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I would like to address two or three questions to the Minister on policy matters rather than begin directly in relation to the financial status of the Department. First, in regard to the arid lands or the pastoral lands of South Australia, what is the Government's present policy in relation to that part of South Australia, particularly in view of the fact that there is a very detailed report that is available within the Department, commonly known as the Vickery Report, which contains a wealth of information about this matter? Some months ago there was a great deal of controversy in South Australia generated by certain groups in the community. As a result of that, legislation proposed by the former Government was defeated.

Since that time we have heard no more of the dire straits that the pastoral lands of South Australia are in; nor have we heard any more from groups within the community that were very active at that time. I cannot help wondering whether the dire situation concerning the pastoral lands that was evident some 12 months ago has suddenly disappeared overnight with the change of Government and whether the desecrated parts of South Australia were suddenly fixed up overnight. What is the Government's policy in relation to the pastoral lands, and what tenure does the present Government envisage should be applied to the pastoralists, bearing in mind that some 30 per cent of pastoral properties in South Australia are on freehold titles?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will endeavour to be brief, because time is limited this evening. I wish that it were the case that magically with the change of Government much of this concern had disappeared and that that which was seen as the basis of the concern had disappeared. I can assure the honourable member that in fact many of those groups who were active and vocal previously, though they may be less vocal on the public scene, are still making their concerns known to me. Indeed, there could be an argument that the drought conditions that prevailed over much of the North throughout the whole of the 12-month period since that rather interesting period to which the honourable mem-

ber referred may have in some places exacerbated that concern.

Upon election to Government I undertook to take up and run with the recommendation in the Vickery Report for a five-year review of the arid lands. The thrust of that report was to make certain recommendations, but it suggested that there was a good deal of base-line data required before we could properly address some of the long-term problems. Having examined that matter, and having indicated publicly that we were proceeding with that, we received indications from various people in the community that it was felt that there were other matters that still needed to be taken up more fully by some continuation of something like the inquiry that had previously been entered into under the Ministerial control of the former Minister, the member for Chaffey. So, we drew back a little from that commitment, although it is one that we may reactivate, and instead, decided to have an inquiry. However, it will be rather different in kind to most inquiries. It will involve a committee of which Mr Elleway will be Chairman and which will take an overview in the commissioning of papers on certain matters that we believe are of concern both to the industry and to environmentalists, and indeed, to people generally in the community. It would also involve the holding of two or three public seminars at which some of those matters will be addressed. I should indicate that the U.F. and S. has invited me and my officers (and we have accepted) to go to Peterborough and to have such a forum in that area. It will be one that perhaps will be more heavily weighted towards local people coming in and saying what they think is going on, rather than having the delivery of a paper with people then getting stuck into that.

The third element of the inquiry will be the release, so far as is appropriate, of material that was provided to the earlier inquiry by way of evidence from various groups and also material that was forwarded to the Minister in response to the publication of that inquiry. Members would appreciate that I say 'that which is appropriate', because there may be times when people forwarding material will be a little more frank if it is clearly understood that such material will not be released. In those cases we would be discreet irrespective of the viewpoint that they may hold. That is the way we are progressing. In effect, the inquiry has started. We will be releasing that material shortly. At this stage no definite date has been set for the first of the seminars, other than a date for the regional seminar that is to be held. Shortly, we will be in a position to indicate the nature of the papers that will be commissioned. I could speculate further on that matter, if the Committee wants me to do so. I am in the hands of the Committee if members want to ask other sorts of questions.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Fundamentally, the Minister is saying that the Government does not have any clear policy.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I am sorry, I forgot to reply to the other part of the honourable member's question about whether the Government intends to make any change to tenure. We do not. We would see any legislation that we undertake as flowing from the results of the further inquiry. However, I should make the point (this may be known to the honourable member and his colleagues) that we also have as a separate but parallel exercise a consultation process with the U.F. and S. and the Conservation Council on a proposition that the Pastoral Board and the Land Board will be wound up, that amendments be introduced that will transfer their responsibilities to the Minister, and that there be a consultative committee that will have an on-going existence as a sounding board for both industry and other people who are concerned about the future of arid lands.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know exactly how far the honourable member for Chaffey wants to proceed with this matter. Previously I have allowed the lead speaker for the Opposition to give a general statement. The member's statement should not be too long.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: There are two or three policy matters I want to address before proceeding with specific questioning.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will allow that.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I refer to the Government's policy or attitude towards freeholding, particularly in view of the fact that freeholding is a feature built into the Crown Lands Act; that has been the case for as long as I can remember.

Also, the present Government did support the amendments to the Irrigation Act to enable the freeholding of irrigation leases and, in light of the support that the current Government gave to that legislation at that time (and it is not far short of 12 months since the Government has come into office), the public is still wanting to know the Government's policy or attitude on freeholdings. There are many people who have wished to lodge applications, but at this stage there is no indication whatsoever from the Government as to whether or not it is going to accept them.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The freeholding of the irrigation leases is not in issue. When the Government came to office we felt that we should review the freeholding of perpetual leases, and that has proved a fairly long process. I think it is reasonable to explain to the Committee that one of the things we were concerned about was that, in any system of leaseholds, there are usually certain controls that are built in and these controls usually have been put there by the wisdom of former generations who have had some concern for the condition of the land that was put under these various forms of leasehold covenant. We were concerned to ensure that we were not losing any useful machinery to control environment degradation, for example, as a result of allowing conversion to freehold. The honourable member will know, and of course as one can imagine it was subject to considerable question and debate earlier today under another Committee, that the vegetation controls have, in part, allayed environmental concerns on that score, but they are the matters that we have been addressing in this, I would admit, fairly long review.

In the meantime, any applications which were lodged prior to the change of Government have been proceeded with, so we are talking only about those applications which have been lodged since the election, or any future applications. I would expect that the Government will be in a position very shortly to indicate whether it intends to proceed along the lines that the previous Government proceeded upon and, if so, under what terms and conditions, which may be identical to what obtained before, or it may be modified in some way. That is really all I can say at this stage, because there is no final Cabinet approval, but I can indicate that we are very close to a decision on the matter.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The information the Minister has just given does not really match up with the information provided to me from the Department of Lands on an historical basis at the time I became Minister of Lands. The explanation that was given to me was that, going back to the last century, the initial objective in South Australia was that all land should be issued and sold as freehold land, but because of the economic circumstances in the last century the perpetual lease concept was created as a way around the situation where persons purchasing land from the Government could remain on that land, because they were not in a financial position to meet their commitments. So this is something that was adopted not for the purpose of a tenure with certain covenants applying to it; it was a situation

that developed in the last century purely because the people purchasing the land at that time did not have the resources to proceed with it.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That may well be. I simply make the point that often a piece of machinery in relation to public administration may be put in for a particular purpose, but may have other effects, be they benign or malign, and our concern was to address the question of whether, if in fact we proceed with an aggressive freeholding policy (and I can see some arguments for a freeholding policy—good financial arguments from the Government's point of view), we will be losing control mechanisms which we may repent later.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The other question that follows from that is that if the Government decides not to proceed with allowing freeholding, as provided for under the two Acts I have mentioned, then what does the Government intend to do in the long term in relation to fixed rent perpetual leases where the cost of administration is many times greater than the annual rent received by the Government? Does the Government, if it is not going to allow freeholding, intend to let that situation go on for ever, with an ever increasing loss to the Government?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I would hope not, but perhaps we should wait and see. The Government decision may be such that that matter is addressed in much the same way as it was addressed by the Government of which the honourable member was a part. I accept that there is a problem if we decide to maintain the present form of tenure. There is a problem in any event, because not everybody will take up the option of ownership.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Granted, but is the Government considering the possibility of reviewing perpetual lease rents that were set in perpetuity by some means of legislation and changing what has been a situation ever since those leases were created?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Not at present, but I cannot commit the Government as to what it may do in the future, but there is no present intention.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must now call the Committee to order and say that the Chair believes that latitude has been given, and I think that latitude has now come to a conclusion. I ask the honourable member for Chaffey if he wishes to lead the questioning on the Estimates before us. If not, then I will ask the honourable member for Mitcham, who has indicated that he wishes to lead, but I say to the honourable member for Mitcham that we now must deal with the lines that are before us.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Before you proceed, Mr Chairman, is it permissible that I raise a matter in relation to policy outlined in detail in the report?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has allowed a certain amount of latitude, in fact more than it intended. It will not accept any suggestion of allowing other members of the Committee to then broaden the latitude that was given. The Chair is now saying that, from here on, there must be the examination of the Estimate lines before us and, if the honourable member for Alexandra wishes to pursue an argument about some other matter, then the Chair will deal with that in the appropriate way. I am now calling the member for Mitcham, who indicated that he had some questions to put.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: With due respect, Mr Chairman, I commenced to ask you a question on procedure. I have your answer, but I seek the call now for the purpose of carrying questions related to the lines as you have outlined.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I wish honourable members would come to some understanding.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: We have. The senior member has indicated that we proceed down the line, and I have the next call.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The position the Chair has found itself in is on the basis that the member who normally would have been the lead questioner, that is, the member for Chaffey, desired to take the opportunity of questioning the Minister on policy, which the Chair allowed. It has been the general practice of the Committee that honourable members notify the Chair that they are desirous of asking a question of the Minister. The member for Mitcham has done that and the Chair does not recognise any deals or any other matters. It recognises the member for Mitcham. If the honourable member for Alexandra wishes to ask a question, his name will be put down and he will be called at the appropriate time.

Mr Baker: I refer to page 68 of the yellow book (because the white book is a very gross document and does not tell us a great deal) and the provision of residential land. There is an item budgeted in 1983 which shows the programme expenditure at \$655 000, an increase of some \$130 000 from the previous year. There is an explanation of two items in the major resource variations of \$25 000 and \$630 000; the latter explains where some of the moneys come from. In relation to programme expenditure there is a significant increase, and in relation to the programme receipts there is a significant down-fall. What areas are being developed with residential lands in the country areas, and is the \$514 000 figure relative to the time lag between expending and receiving, or is there some other reason for the programme receipts?

Mr Mellen: A number of developments (about 60 in total) are being carried out in country areas. There is a rather large one at Berri, and I understand that that is where the bulk of the work will be done under this line.

Mr Baker: It was a two-part question. There is a general explanation that a bit more is being expended in Berri, but I have received no details as to the \$655 000 and the short-fall in receipts. Could I have more detail on that?

Mr Mellen: The land at Berri will not be ready for sale, and consequently it will not appear in the receipts this year.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will obtain the specific information, as far as we can, for the Committee. With a programme like this one has to appreciate that, when an area is developed, it goes on the market at about the one time, and there is a considerable accession to the receipts as a result of the operation. One moves through that and stock goes into another area. To use a word I used earlier, it is a rather 'lumpy' sort of procedure; there is not a continuous flow of this stock onto the market showing up in those sort of variations.

Mr Baker: There was an appreciation of that. I want details of the 'lump' and the reason for that 'lump'.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will obtain those details.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Can the Minister say whether the administration and services under the Surveyor-General are incorporated in the land surveying and mapping sections identified on page 72 of the yellow book, or are they identified under some other division? At page 84 the mapping and aerial photography surveys associated with surveying and mapping are also cited.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The member is referring to conduct of State land survey and project drafting, surveying, mapping and aerial photography service? Does the member want to know when those come under the Surveyor-General?

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Yes.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: And is the question whether they represent the total expenditure?

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Or is that separately identified?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: There would be expenditure under other programmes which would be expended through the Surveyor-General.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: In relation to the Surveyor-General's responsibilities, I ask the Minister whether it is the Government's intention to persist with Surveyor-General requirements to have private surveys carried out on land subject to subdivision and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Government to insist on a subsequent fee applied by his Department for what is described as survey review costs. It is my understanding that, if a subdivision of broad acre land is desired by an applicant, the Surveyor-General, before approving of the subdivision, must be satisfied that a recent survey has been carried out, and indeed satisfied with the lodgment material. After his office is satisfied that that work has been carried out, albeit by a privately engaged surveyor (if it is a private subdivision) or a Government employed surveyor (if it is a subdivision or a perpetual lease holding or whatever), there is an additional fee, currently \$44, described as being required for survey review. I, along with some of my constituents, find it quite incredible that in the case of the officer holding the highest position in the survey department—a person being the Surveyor-General—either he or his staff, after approval of a survey, should have that survey subject to further review and hence further charges by subordinate officers within the department.

Mr Mellen: I think what you have said is true. The surveys are carried out either by Surveyor-General staff or by private surveyors and, no matter who carries out the surveys, there is this additional survey done. The original survey is charged by a schedule of fees and the other charge is an administrative cost added to that, and as far as I am aware, that will continue to be the case.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Even though the fee is applicable to review of the survey after the Surveyor-General, the top officer of the State, has carried out his work in relation to accepting or rejecting the surveys.

Mr Mellen: It is the Surveyor-General's officers, not the Surveyor-General himself, who does it. All surveys are carried out by surveyors at various levels, and in all of the Surveyor-General's work there is this level of checking done to make sure that the survey is correct.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Would the Minister look at that? It is my understanding that, where a private survey is required, after it is done and a map and details are lodged by the private surveyor on behalf of the applicant, the lodgment papers either receive approval or require amendments by the Surveyor-General or the office-under him, and, subsequent to an approval, a further fee for a review of the survey by subordinate officers of the Department of Lands attracts apparently a \$44 fee on each such review.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: We will look at that and see whether it is necessary to have the additional work done and the additional charges.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Is it the practice of the Committee—

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not care. It has been the general practice for each member to ask three questions before going on to another member. If the Opposition wants to allow one member to ask 42 000 questions, it is all right with the Chair. Will members please indicate what they want to do?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: With respect, I have asked only one question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is not going to debate the question. If the member for Alexandra wishes to continue, he has the call.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I am aware of comments that the Minister's officers have made in relation to their apparent disappointment if I did not raise the question of

the Forster case. That was stated in a public facility in this place during the dinner adjournment, and on that basis I raise the matter. Is it the intention of the Minister's administration to regard as a binding commitment a letter signed by an officer over the title of Director-General of the Department? I find that, in correspondence directed to the Acting Manager, Central Region, dated 26 September, a report has been sought from the Crown Solicitor, and it has been reported that a binding contract was not entered into even though correspondence was directed and signed over the title of the Director-General. Does the Minister regard a signatory over that title on correspondence citing specific details to be binding on the Department?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: If the Minister is asking whether I am in a position to receive further representations from him on behalf of his constituent, yes, I am prepared to receive further representations. I apologise to the honourable member for the fact that, he having made vigorous but proper representations on behalf of his constituent, his constituent was informed in this way but the honourable member was not. In the circumstances I would have preferred that a letter had gone above my signature to the honourable member or that he was at least sent a copy of my letter to the constituent. That apparently is not what happened but, in the circumstances, if the honourable member wishes to put further information before me, I am happy to entertain it.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I refer to unallotted Crown lands in South Australia. Is the Minister able to identify any parcel or parcels of land under the canopy of unallotted Crown lands for any designated purpose within the remainder of this financial year?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: If we are looking at significant parcels of unallotted Crown land, there is the residuum of land to the north and west of the State once areas are transferred to the ownership of the Pitjantjatjara and, presumably, the Maralinga people (if that legislation proceeds). Some significant land is left to the east of those areas. There is also an area to the west, south and east of the Simpson Desert National Park. There is the Tirari Desert to the east of Lake Eyre, and a large parcel of land to the north of Lake Frome, all of which are unallotted. There is no intention on the part of the Government at this stage to release any of that land for pastoral activity. It may be that the inquiry that I have announced will take up that matter.

Propositions have been put to me that at least some of those areas should be transferred to the national parks system. One of the qualifications I would have in regard to such a transfer is that some of those areas have not as yet been thoroughly explored for mineralisation and hydrocarbons. It would be a pity, for example, to lock up the Tirari Desert (which is not far from the area in the Cooper Basin currently under exploitation by Santos and its partners). Any reservation would have to be on the assumption that exploration or exploitation of mineral or hydrocarbon resources in those areas should continue for some years to come. During this financial year there will be no pastoral expansion. There may be a possible transfer of some of the areas to the reserve system, on the understanding that we would still allow mineral and hydrocarbon activity to continue. Having announced an inquiry into the future of these lands, it would be a little odd if I were to presume the outcome of such inquiry and to jump in and make such a designation.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Does that inquiry approach works in the inside area, the agricultural region?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: No, it relates to range lands, pastoral lands and arid lands of the State.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: My question was in relation to agricultural lands.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not have that sort of detail in my head for agricultural areas as I do for pastoral areas. Those areas stand out on the map in agricultural and pastoral regions. We are talking of much smaller parcels of land, and I imagine they would be represented in the Far West of the State. Mr Vickery may like to comment.

Mr Vickery: There are some unoccupied lands on the West Coast, as the honourable member may be aware. That land is west of Kimba, and in the hundreds of Hill and Peella. They are the main areas currently unoccupied. There may be some lesser areas but, off the top of my head, it is hard to pinpoint all of them. It is the policy of the Government, I understand, to review the whole matter of alienation of lands.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Following further discussion, land also exists in County Chandos, in the Mallee, which is the subject of a joint committee between the Department of Lands and the Department of Environment and Planning. Agriculture is represented on it as well but there have been no final recommendations.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: That covers the matter on behalf of the member for Mallee, who is not present on this Committee.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I note a reduction in the funds available to the Department of Lands for salaries, wages and related payments. The figure for 1982-83 was \$18 308 348 and the appropriated amount for this year is \$18 126 000. Allowing for a topping up for wage increases, it is still not a movement in real terms. The various staff groups have a vital part to play in the release of land for urban development, assuming that the various sub-departments will be playing a vital role in that land activity.

One was announced in the *Advertiser* this morning in relation to Golden Grove which may or may not be an area in which the Department of Lands, or the Surveyor-General in particular, will have a vital role. The Minister, wearing another hat, has on a number of recent occasions indicated that there is a decreasing availability of land for urban development. One of his colleagues has indicated that there is an urgent need for more land so that the Government's housing programme can proceed. It is on the basis of the inter-relationship of all these factors that I ask the Minister whether he will be able to fulfil his obligation to the Government's programmes for further urban development.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. The responsibility of the Department of Lands in development, of course, apart from the servicing function of the Surveyor-General, Valuer-General, and Registrar-General, is in relation to the development of industrial estates in the metropolitan area. Our proposition in relation to Grand Junction Estate is still before the Public Works Standing Committee, as are some residential estates in country towns. The honourable member is right: there has been some shedding of positions in the Department (about 10 in all), but the area that I am talking about (land resource management) has an increase of one in this Budget. The Department of Lands would not have a direct part to play in the development of the land at Golden Grove.

I indicated earlier today to another committee that we would anticipate that the Urban Land Trust would be developing that area under a joint venture arrangement with a private developer or developers. So, the Department of Lands would be serving only its traditional function rather than being the developer. So far as this Department's land development activities are concerned, the manpower to be applied to that task has not been affected by this Budget. Positions have been shed in other areas of the Department.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Having regard to the overall requirements of the availability of land and going beyond the immediate Government responsibility of producing blocks (but for private enterprise to retain the throughput

of blocks), it has been suggested that the time lag has increased in relation to the release of titles. Is the Minister aware of this, and is action being taken to improve the situation? This has an impact not only upon the ability of people to commence developments but also in a financial sense in that those people able to obtain assistance from banks or other financial institutions, which is essential for the on going programme to proceed, are doing so at a time when demand is increasing.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is a pleasing feature that there has been an increase in transactions. I am told that it is something like a 17 per cent increase. So, on a monthly basis compared with the comparable time last year, it indicates some increase in activity which I am sure we will all share. This is putting some strains on the resources in the Registrar-General's Department, and people are talking to Treasury and making it aware that, if the trend continues, there is no doubt that we will need some additional staff in that area to meet the demand. It would be quite unsupportable for this increase in activity if the Government departments responsible for the surveillance of this matter simply were not able to meet the demand placed on them. We are aware of the problem. We welcome the fact that we have this sort of problem, and we are now talking to Treasury about how best to address it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can an indication be given of the mean time associated with the delivery of titles from the Registrar-General's Office so that one can make a comparison or determination in respect of complaints being lodged, for example, through electorate offices? It is a flow system which I would imagine would involve a departmental record.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We can make that information available to the honourable member and to the Committee.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Page 69 of the programme deals with management of unalienated Crown land and Crown leases, and the subprogramme 'Management of unalienated Crown lands' relates to the administration of the shacks policy. First, can the Minister say what is the Government's attitude to the report of the Shack Site Review Committee and, as the report has been in the Government's hands for at least six months, when will the Government make a decision so that people in South Australia who have shacks for recreational purposes will know exactly where they stand in relation to their future?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think that it is important to realise that to this date the Government has not said anything which could be construed as resiling from the position which the honourable member, as Minister, occupied.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It is public opinion that the Government is not doing anything, yet it has an excellent report before it.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There are two matters relating to that: one is the overall policy and the other is the subset of policies addressed by that report. The overall policy is one which I believe is well understood in the community. It provides for life tenure for people who—

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That is the existing policy.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: You are merely carrying on with the existing policy. However, this Committee was established once again as a result of considerable agitation generated within the community to resolve that problem. We have an excellent report, and I think that it is certainly supported by most sections of the community. It certainly meets the requirements of the Local Government Association and the Shack Owners Association, and it obviously meets the requirements that the Government department stipulated. The report has been before the Government for six months,

and the people of South Australia still have no indication as to their future.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): Does the member for Chaffey wish that to be considered as his second question?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: If the Chair wishes.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: When the honourable member, as Minister, set up that committee, I understood that he was in no way resiling from the overall policy. He wanted some fine tuning, to find out whether further categories ought to be established, and also a review of the two basic classifications which had been set down under the policy, namely, the acceptable classification which opened up the possibility of freeholding and the unacceptable classification which left the situation as at life tenure: where there was a change of the holding of the lease, that process ran out at 1999.

The Government has not resiled from that position. As far as the report is concerned, setting aside for a moment the actual classification to which I will refer shortly, it does not place any information before the Government (as the honourable member would know) which suggests a change in those categories, except at one point: it does introduce a third category—the concept of a miscellaneous lease for a species of shack site which lies somewhere intermediate between the acceptable and non-acceptable or life tenure sites, as the committee now suggests we call it.

The report does not open up the spectre of large-scale departures from that policy, except at that one particular point. One of the things that we have been considering is whether that recommendation for a species of miscellaneous lease as an immediate category really assists the situation, and whether it would be an appropriate form of leasehold that would make the administration of the whole system any easier. Within that overall policy, which as I say is not significantly departed from in the report, there is the matter of possible reclassification of shacks between the various categories.

I can appreciate, for example, that where people are in a life tenure situation at present and they have some ambitions to go to a different sort of classification which might open up the possibility of freeholding they want to know where they stand. On the other hand, where people are already in a potential freeholding situation, I guess they have what they want and are not particularly interested in any meddling with or alterations to the existing system. They are the matters that remain to be addressed. I anticipate that I will be going before my colleagues fairly shortly with a set of recommendations that will enable us to proceed.

The report raises some other matters as well. I do not want to unduly take up the time of the Committee, but I simply point out that the report raises the matter of management plans being implemented by local government in some areas which is a matter about which I had some limited discussions with local government. The report also raises the matter of the provision of replacement sites, which is not an easy question to address, because surely there must be at least some initial costs to the community in securing replacement sites. Mr Elleway was Chairman of the committee dealing with this matter, and he is now available to address the Chamber on aspects of the committee's deliberations and recommendations. In regard to the timing of the Government's decision, of course, Mr Elleway has no control over that. All I can say to the honourable member is that we have not been idle during the time that the report has been available. I expect to be in a position to give definite replies in a very short time.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I point out to the Minister that a number of people fall into the category of those whose house or shack is classified by the review committee

as being unacceptable. In certain cases the committee has recommended that such places have more permanent tenure or be made into more acceptable sites. For a number of people these places are their permanent home. At present they have no security of tenure. They have no asset to hand on to their family or future generations, and are living from day to day not knowing what their future holds. For people in that position this matter is urgent.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Of course, they are in a slightly better position than those people who are on a life tenure site for which there has been no recommendation from the committee regarding any alteration. I can appreciate that a decision must be made, but I do not really think that the people to whom the honourable member refers are in any worse position than are those people for whom a life tenure classification was long ago recommended. Of course, the report confirms that particular classification for those people.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The adoption by the Government of the recommendations of the report would be of significant advantage to the majority of shack owners, as compared with the conditions that prevail under the present policy.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It would help to some extent in regard to those wanting freehold title.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Yes, and certainly a better tenure than they have at the moment.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In fact, the only other proposition for better tenure is the miscellaneous lease proposition, about which the Government has made no final decision at this stage. At present that it is not a feature of the system.

Mr BAKER: In regard to the management of unalienated Crown land and Crown leases, I made an observation five years ago that the Government did not have a clue about how many reserves it had or where they were. This causes some difficulties, particularly in the rural sector, where people do not know whether they are using Crown land or reserves. Have all the Crown reserves been fully documented and mapped?

Mr Elleway: The answer to the question is 'No'. However, a programme was initiated by the previous Government which has been carried on wisely by the present Government to validate, which is checking, all those Crown lands, the unalienated Crown lands and reserves. The programme is computer based and has been going on for about a year. It will take until 1988 to complete.

Mr BAKER: People of South Australia find it hard to believe that we do not know the extent and location of Crown land. I have also had an interest in the LOTS scheme. Has it been fully developed to its absolute potential? What has been the total cost of that development? Is the existing computer facility adequate, or will the Government need new computer facilities to handle further development, if that is perceived to be in the best interests of the Government?

Mr Mellen: The sum allocated for the development of LOTS was \$2.2 million (the first phase cost \$1.85 million) and included what was described as the unregistered document system. That has not been developed at present; currently it is in the feasibility study stage. A number of man years work will be involved with that. In regard to the original segment of LOTS, it must be appreciated that the original data collected was not complete in every detail. That which was available was collected. There is still a lot of work to be done on upgrading that part of the system.

In regard to equipment, this year we installed a second B-6800 computer, which has enabled the extension of the system to all our country offices and to many other Government department offices. Over 100 v.d.u.s are attached to the system. It depends entirely on the use made of the system and the amount of data that is subsequently put on

to it as to whether or not we must again increase the storage of those machines, and get new ones in about two years.

Mr BAKER: This must be of tremendous concern. My figures indicate that \$2.2 million was allocated and that \$1.85 million was allocated for the first stage. However, I have still not got the actual expenditure to date unless that is the \$1.85 million figure, although we were told that the phase to which that related was not complete. It must be of tremendous concern to people planning facilities that computer hardware may be obsolete within a very short time because of its being inadequate to handle future possible developments. My next question is: what attention has been to the further development of the land information system?

Mr Mellen: When you talk of the land information system, there are many aspects to that, and in no way will the equipment we have be sufficient to cover what is envisaged for the total land information system. We can get into the digital cadastral data base, and there is a land information system steering committee which crosses a number of departments and which will be looking at the total system. As far as the equipment we have now is concerned, that is certainly not sufficient to cope with the total system.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Picking up the subject of land tenure raised by the Liberal Party spokesman for lands, will the Minister indicate whether he supports the concept of freeholding?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is a very broad question. Is the honourable member referring to the specific matter raised by his colleague earlier in this debate, or just freeholding as a species of land tenure?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Freeholding as a principle for land tenure and, as Minister administering the tenure categories over a vast area of State lands, I am interested to know whether or not you in fact support the principle of freehold tenure.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In the practical world, yes. I own land, not very much, but I do own land. It is something which has become accepted—

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: We will know next week.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member will be in a position very shortly to determine exactly where that is, because of the registration of interests we are handing to the Clerk now, but it is something which has become a feature of our system. In fact, if one looks at the way in which in this State the freehold system and the perpetual lease system operate, there are very few differences between the two. The market operates almost exactly for perpetual leases as it does for freehold lands. A lot of people have shown an interest in the freeholding of the areas that they presently occupy on perpetual lease. It is very difficult to see what tangible benefits they expect to obtain from that process.

That is no reason for withholding it, of course, on its own. If they have a great attachment to the concept of freehold, there may be intangible benefits they can derive from it, but when you have a form of perpetual leasehold which admits of purchase and sale, you have something which is very close to freehold, though under a different name, so in the practical sort of world in which we live, I have no objection to the freehold system. Maybe if we want to go back to 1788 and start again, we may well be in a position to be able to develop a different form of land tenure which perhaps more neatly balances the rights of the individual alongside the necessities of society as a whole, but that is not the scene in which we live, nor is it likely.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: We have inherited a whole range of land tenure systems, and I am trying to ascertain the Minister's attitude to the principle of freeholding: the policy of allowing it to occur at the discretion of the property

owner rather than at the whim of the Public Service, a department or Government.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think the honourable member is trying to anticipate a debate that may not occur. If in fact I return to the House of Assembly Chamber some time in the next month and announce that the Government has decided not to proceed with a freeholding policy, I have no doubt that the honourable member will raise all these questions and will expect answers from me, but that is to anticipate a debate that may not arise.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: In all fairness, I am simply asking a question about a policy approach on a subject of great importance and community interest. I am not seeking to anticipate what the Minister is likely to do in this House in a month's time or whenever. What I am most interested in during this Committee hearing is to ascertain the Government's attitude to this subject because, as I understand it, the Minister and his department have proceeded to process some, certainly not all, of the applications that were lodged with his office prior to the change of Government, but they have given no clear indication that others arriving after the date of gaining Government will be processed under the same previous principle or policy.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: When the Government came to office, it did so with a commitment to review the freeholding policy and not simply roll on from where the last Government had left it, but we accepted that, in all fairness, where people had made an application under a particular policy, that application should be granted, provided it met all the criteria the previous Government had set down; so, where people made an application under a particular policy, that application was granted. On the other hand, where a review was announced, obviously there was little point in proceeding with those applications, as that would cut from under our feet the capacity to make one of the two options available to us as a decision. I am not in a position here to canvass the sort of decision the Government might make in this matter and, as to my own particular attitude on this, I accept the hon member's genuineness in this matter. But neither he nor I came down in the last shower, and I guess that what he is really asking me to do is give some sort of indication of the contents of the Cabinet document that will eventually go forward for approval or otherwise and I am not going to do that.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I think more particularly we would like a decision on precisely what it is.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! It might be a great deal easier for the Chair if the honourable member indicated whether he was asking supplementary questions. The Chair is quite willing to grant those, but the member has spoken five times, and it is very difficult to tell whether he is on his first, second or third question.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Three questions and two supplementary.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In that case, the honourable member has asked his last question. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The results of the valuation process undertaken by the Minister's department were picked up by a large number of local government bodies. Can the Minister indicate which local government bodies—and what percentage, and so forth—do make use of the facility; whether there is a demand by any of those local government bodies for other than unimproved land value; whether some of them are using the annual value; and, because annual valuation reflects changes within the year, whereas unimproved involves a basic five-year span (in an endeavour to give some degree of equity there is a factor applied to the valuation involving unimproved), whether the department is

looking to perhaps upgrading the system so that unimproved value may be more reflective of current circumstances?

I am aware that there have been a number of offices opened in other areas and in the country; also, there is now an officer based at Gawler working out of the Clare office. This is particularly well accepted by the people because they feel that there is a very distinct involvement by the officer or officers with the activities of the area. I do not reflect on the value of this service, but perhaps this is a better reflection of what has taken place in an area. It is in this general area of providing a service to the community that I seek information from the Minister about clients and about any changed circumstances which may have occurred.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I am not aware of any metropolitan local government body that uses unimproved land values as the basis for its rating. There may possibly be councils in the country that use that basis, I will obtain that information for the honourable member. For the most part, it is my understanding that the vast majority of local government areas do use a valuation, be it assessed annual value or unimproved value in arriving at their rate figure. I remember that until fairly recent times metropolitan councils such as Meadows were still using their own systems of valuation rather than adopting the State valuation, so there are councils which from time to time have not used the system. The matter of the upgrading of valuations is a more realistic form of valuation, particularly the unimproved value system, but it is a matter that has not floated in front of me in the past 10 months. I will ask Mr Elleway if he is aware of any changes in that area.

Mr Elleway: No, I am not. To expand on a couple of points made by the Minister, as far as I am aware all council areas now using the Valuer-General's valuation use either annual value or site value. The Valuer-General has been unable to find reliable evidence of unimproved value in country areas upon which he can base his valuations.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I appreciated what the honourable member had to say in relation to the assistance to local communities of our officers based in regions. He may be interested to know that there will be one located in Nuriootpa in about six months. However, we will obtain the more specific information that was requested by the honourable member.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I was interested in Mr Elleway's response that it is now site value and not unimproved value which is being used to formulae rate figures. The unimproved system is certainly in vogue in a number of councils in which I am involved, (I have had 12 within my electorate until fairly recent times). I might be out of date in respect of what is taking place, but I take it that the site value is still on the basis of a five-yearly determination as opposed to an annual one. There is a factor applied which creates some difficulty for local government as time proceeds because disparities develop causing quite a degree of upset in the relativity of valuations until the next revaluation period. This was more so the case with the older unimproved valuation system, which is no longer with us. However, there are still letters to the editor in the country press and upsets involving councils because of the disparity which can develop using a five-yearly valuation basis to determine the rate figures.

Mr Elleway: In response to that, our country valuers, through the country offices (and indeed the city valuers as well) are moving to computer-assisted valuations which will take place every year. This year a few of our country regions are starting on computer-assisted valuations which will give us annual valuations. It is planned that the whole State will be on computer-assisted valuations in two years time.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It already operates in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Finally, the Minister has indicated where a new office is to commence operation in around six months time. Is he able to provide for the record an indication of where offices currently exist, and any new offices contemplated for the 1983-84 year? It is not to be held that they must be in operation by this time next year, but I would like an indication of the spread and the planning within the department.

Mr Elleway: An office capable of doing valuation work exists at Port Lincoln, with a small outpost at Ceduna. That office does not employ a qualified valuer but employs a person able to do simple valuations. Fully-fledged valuers are at Port Augusta, Kadina, Clare, Berri, Murray Bridge, and Mount Gambier; they are the country offices.

In the metropolitan area there is the office referred to that will commence operation in the Barossa Valley in six months time, and offices at Manningham, Port Adelaide, Glenside, city-based in Adelaide, Warradale and Noarlunga. These offices give the Department of Lands extremely good contact with the public that it serves. I do not know whether the honourable member has noticed but lately there have been fewer complaints in the newspapers relating to the subject. Certainly, with our ability to attend upon local councils and to answer queries there should be fewer difficulties now than there have been in the past.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I acknowledge the point that has been made. It is a service which is appreciated. Whether it be a regional education office, a regional police headquarters, or whatever, there is always a tremendous amount of benefit to general communication and an acceptance of the end product from the establishment of such services.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: As a supplement to what we have been talking about, the annual report, which in its non-printed form has been laid before the House (and the printed form is only now just available), contains at pages 38 and 39 maps of the State and metropolitan area giving valuation divisions and the location of those offices. The honourable member will shortly have a copy of that report available to him.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I turn to pages 77 and 78 of the programme papers, which refer to provision of industrial land and buildings. While I am appreciative of what is stated at page 77 under the heading 'Major resource variation between 1982-83 and 1983-84', there is an indication here that there is to be a significant drop in capital expenditure in relation to provision of industrial land. Is this an indication of a fall-off in demand for industrial land and, in fact, have the sales of industrial land through the Department of Lands dropped in the past 12 months? Also, can comparative figures be given for the previous year and the sales of land in 1983?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I imagine that the reduction in Loan funds represents the fact that the Grand Junction industrial estate is presently in an early stage of development. The capital expenditure programme always relates specifically to approved items of expenditure rather than an exercise which reasons that, because a certain amount was spent last year, a 5 to 10 per cent increase will be granted to cover inflation this year. This subprogramme simply reflects the state of activity. Regency Park had a similar history where, in the early stages, there was a small draw down on Loan funds. This increased with increased activity and has now declined with the Grand Junction estate taking over as the undeveloped area. As to programme receipts, the 1982-83 outcome was referred to by the honourable member. That largely reflects the Stony Point project. I am unaware of any major item other than that listed on page 77 being reflected in these figures.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: If no figures are available at this stage, will the Minister provide the comparative land

sale figures to indicate whether there is an increasing demand for industrial land in South Australia or whether there has been a falling off in demand?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Yes, I will get that information.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I refer to page 79 of the programme papers and the heading 'Agricultural Resource Management' in relation to the administration of the Dog Fence Act. The Minister would be well aware of discussions that took place in trying to arrive at a levy across the board for the wool industry so that the cost of maintaining the dog fence could be spread over the whole of that industry. That was accepted by the United Farmers and Stockowners Association. However, as that proved to be unachievable, action was taken to increase the levy from 20c to 55c. I see that as a stop gap. Has any further study or work been undertaken by the Department to try to arrive at a situation which would spread the load of maintaining the dog fence and which would result in the fence being upgraded quickly to a high standard in the interests of protecting the total wool industry?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The effect of the amendment and the consequential—

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It leaves a load on one section.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Yes, but there has been an increase in the public subvention to the upkeep of the fence. I ask Mr Elleway to comment on this matter.

Mr Elleway: There has been considerable debate in the Department of Lands concerning the administration of the dog fence. However, it has been decided that the Dog Fence Board has the statutory responsibility and is the final arbiter in any discussions on this matter. That Board has decided that a charge of 55c per square kilometre is an appropriate rate. I am informed by the Board's Chairman that, by 1986, the fence will be in A-1 condition.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That is fine, but I make the point that it is inequitable that the total load and responsibility for this fence should fall on those rated pastoralists who are virtually protecting the total industry in this State. I believe that it is worth pursuing a method whereby this cost could be spread across the whole industry, because the industry as a whole is prepared to accept that cost if such a method can be found.

Mr Elleway: I agree with that approach. However, the Dog Fence Board, which consists of members of the pastoral industry (people who own properties and are active in the area), decided to do things another way.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I agree that that is the case. They agreed to do it that way as a last resort. They made an approach seeking to achieve a total industry involvement but have fallen back to this method as a last resort because there was no way of achieving the other result.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I am unaware of any further initiative or request having come from that source. I will take up the matter, as I can understand the point that the honourable member is pressing upon us. Whilst not being in a position to concede it presently, I will examine the matter.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The administrative costs of the Department are identified in the programme papers. Will the Minister identify the location of the departments under the portfolio of Lands?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: There are two departments—the Department of Lands and the Department of Services and Supply.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I am referring to the location of divisions within the Lands Department.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Mr Elleway will give the Committee a run-down on this matter.

Mr Elleway: The Director-General of Lands, the Administration and Finance Division, the Assistant Director-Gen-

eral of Lands (now the Assistant Director), and the Land Resource Management Division are all located in the old Treasury Building. The Regional Operations offices are located, as described in our annual report on pages 38 and 39, at Port Lincoln (with a branch office at Ceduna); at Adelaide (with a branch office at Kadina, Clare and Port Augusta); at Berri (with a branch office at Murray Bridge); and at Mount Gambier (with a branch office at Naracoorte). The Management Services Division is also located in the old Treasury Building. The Office of Aboriginal Affairs I believe is located in the G.R.E. Building, although no longer under the Department of Lands. The Registrar-General's office is in the Colonel Light Centre behind the Town Hall and also in the Torrens Building. The Survey Division is located in the old Treasury Building, at Netley and in the Colonel Light Centre. The Valuation Division is located in the Commercial Union Building in Pirie Street and also at those metropolitan and country offices that I outlined earlier.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Having identified the six principal centres in the metropolitan area as divisions of the Minister of Land's portfolio, does the Minister believe that, if they were brought under one roof, the administrative costs of his portfolio might be significantly reduced? Is he in a position to indicate to the Committee whether it is the Government's intention to work in that direction and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: One has to be a little careful when one looks at these matters. An accommodation problem exists currently in the building occupied by the Department of Environment and Planning, which I believe arose from the desire to get all those people under one roof. Some people are involved with field operations and rather resented the fact that they were brought from Greenhill Road into town because of the difficulty they have getting vehicles in and out.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: There is not a problem for too many of them?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: No. However, we have not got the whole building. It is an example of the problems one can run into. I guess there may be some advantages to administration in having all divisions under the one roof, but there are those divisions which are semi-autonomous and therefore large advantages are not accruing from their being physically located alongside other divisions. I am given to understand that representations have been made to Government office accommodation people from time to time but without success. It has been seen as a lower priority than other areas. I can say that the spread-about nature of the divisions does not result in gross administrative inconvenience. However, I would concede that there may be some advantages in them all being under the one roof.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Would you concede that it would be of great advantage to the community seeking service from the Department of Lands if the facilities required under that portfolio and within the ambit of the Acts associated with that portfolio were under one roof?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I call upon the Minister to answer the supplementary question.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Once people got used to it, I guess so. However, they certainly know where to go to find, for example, the Registrar-General's office. They may well have to go somewhere else, but there is an education process involved in all these things. I point out again that when people approach the Department, off the street as it were, for a particular service they are interested in that service rather than the relationship between that service and other services which the Department provides. Therefore, I would see this as being of greater convenience to the administration of the Department than to the public. After all, the regionalisation programme which has been undertaken by govern-

ments for 10 years has meant geographical spreading of resources. This has almost certainly increased the complexities of administration, but it is justified on the grounds of greater convenience to the public.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I have described the old Treasury Building as a rabbit warren. It was recently necessary for me to go to that building to conclude a land transaction. On presentation of the documents I learned that they required further processing by two other divisions under the Minister's portfolio, and that there was no room within the Treasury Building structure to house those other divisions of the Department of Lands (one was the Surveyor-General's office, and the other the Lands Titles office). According to the officer to whom I spoke, the transaction required the physical delivery by the applicant of the documents involved. Bearing that example in mind (if it happens to everyone), I can imagine that members of the public will progressively become very frustrated with the spread of locations that applies over those six centres when they are carrying out such a transaction. I experienced this frustration myself, so this is not hearsay: it is in fact the position. The cost to the public, based on that example alone, over a year must be enormous and the frustration significant. It is against that background and because of that experience that I ask the Minister whether the same costs and the same degree of frustration exist when a Minister has a department scattered around the countryside as widely and extensively as his Department is.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Mr Mellen might like to comment, because he has had much to do with this problem.

Mr Mellen: For some time we have drawn attention to conditions in the Treasury Building and to the spread of the department throughout the metropolitan area. About three weeks ago we put another submission to the Government Office Accommodation Committee requesting that all divisions other than the Registrar-General's office be put into one building. As there was one on the market, we queried whether or not the time was appropriate for that to happen.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: It would seem to be good sense. I am appalled at the structure of the place, the administration of it, and everything in relation to it. It will take me some time to heal up, and it is against that background that I raised that matter with the Minister, because it would appear from my observations and experience that it is about time that a massive clean-up commenced in relation to the whole operation, particularly the relocation of all the various divisions under that portfolio in a place where appropriate control can be applied, and where appropriate facilities will be available for officers to work in (perhaps morale and dedication to the job might lift accordingly with better facilities in which to work).

Mr BAKER: I must endorse the reflection of my colleague. Massive amounts of resources are tied up in mapping. Can the Minister inform me what is the total time it takes to produce a map of the State (I think that it is a 1:10 000 series; it is produced in several series), and what developments he and the Department think will reduce the time taken to produce that map and its cost of production?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Perhaps we can take this as a supplementary question by way of explanation. Is the honourable member talking about from go to whoa, from sending the surveyors out, starting to examine satellite photographs or whatever, to the production of a totally new series from that information?

Mr BAKER: Yes, I am informed that it takes 20 years to produce a map of the State.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I do not have that information immediately available to me. I have no doubt that the technology is available to do it in considerably less time

than that. Again, it depends on the series that one is talking about. It is certainly true that one can go into Mapland now and have difficulty getting some scales of maps for some of the developing areas. I recall some time ago (certainly before I came in to Government) attempting to get a scale map of an area which had been mentioned recently in the press (Hackham West in my district) and being unable to do so. The maps available at the time showed the area still under vineyards. So, some upgrading takes some time and it sometimes depends on the demand from the community for the sort of map we are talking about. It is not clear to me what the honourable member means by a 'public map'.

Mr BAKER: Page 72 refers to 'Maintenance of the Public Map.'

Mr Mellen: The public map is not produced. It is maintained as a result of all transactions that occur through the Registrar-General's office.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It contains no topographic information.

Mr BAKER: I was referring to a map of the State with topographical and cadastral features on it.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I do not have that information immediately available to me in regard to the actual time taken from survey to production of the series.

Mr Elleway: I do not know the time scale. Is the honourable member referring to one map of the entire State?

Mr BAKER: No, I am referring to the 1:10 000 series.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Mr Elleway may be able to assist with this.

Mr Elleway: The production of a map involves a great deal of effort. The maps to which the honourable member is referring involve aerial photography, ground surveys and a lot of stereo plotting work. In regard to part of the series of maps that we produce, we simply do not have the resources to get a total map coverage of the State at a particular scale: neither do we have the demand, so we attempt to pick out those areas for which there would be the greatest demand. Therefore, our 1:10 000 map series at present may have some holes in it, but the bulk of the settled areas of South Australia is covered by that series.

Mr BAKER: I was actually looking for an answer that gave me an indication of whether techniques such as interfacing with lasers, the latest aerial photographic techniques and digital mapping techniques which are available are used to make the process more effective, but no-one seems to know.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is not quite the question that the honourable member asked previously.

Mr BAKER: I asked about developments that the Department may be aware of to speed up and make the process easier, which was a flow-on question which no-one followed up.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will ask Mr Elleway to expand on that matter, because the technology available to the Department is second to none amongst Departments of Lands around Australia.

Mr Elleway: Yes, I can support that remark. I can also say to the honourable member that our Surveyor-General spends a reasonable amount of money sending people overseas to Holland, America, New Zealand, and other places, where mapping skills seem to reside, in order to keep us up to date with technology. As the Minister said, we are the envy of other Departments of Lands in Australia as far as our technology in this area and our ability to apply it are concerned.

Mr BAKER: I want to put a few questions on notice about particular maps available and the way that mapping systems have developed. Sometimes maps are superseded before anything is achieved. It may well be that in the past two or three years the Department may have produced maps

well in advance of everyone else. However, two or three years ago the situation was an absolute mess. Enormous amounts of money were spent on the latest equipment that some people did not even know how to use. I will not say any more about that except to say that it may well be that we have been through a learning process and perhaps we are starting to deliver the goods in that area.

I now want to refer to a matter alluded to earlier, namely, property valuation which referred to the five-year series of valuation. Once again it seems that we are a long way behind with technology in world terms (or perhaps even in Australian terms), in regard to the feasibility of being able to advise the various people who use the valuations as to the likely updated value of properties. At the moment we have a number of pieces of information available to us in various forms. One is on the LOTS system and valuation process. The valuation every five years leaves some very large gaps. Property values can increase by up to 100 or 200 per cent in five years. The same system is not always applied: more recent valuations are associated with sales of properties.

Does the Government have any intention of using a system of interim valuation instead of the once every five year valuation system? The interim system would provide that property values are kept up to date, so that there is not a very large jump in rates when a property is revalued after five years. The same will apply to the Engineering and Water Supply Department in regard to a massive increase in taxes as a result of a property's not having been valued for five years.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: That question was answered in part earlier when we talked about computer aided valuation.

Mr BAKER: The question is supplementary to that first question.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I understand that we are ahead of the other States in the use of technology in this area and that interim valuations are currently occurring in the metropolitan area and within two years that system will be in operation throughout the State.

Mr BAKER: In regard to Intra-agency Support Services, (page 90 of the Programme Estimates), A.D.P. services costs increased quite significantly. What is the reason for that fairly large increase in recurrent expenditure?

Mr Elleway: As we continue to develop computer applications, and in particular over the past year our valuation applications, costs associated with maintaining those systems have risen. The figures given for A.D.P. services reflects that increasing endeavour towards providing more services to the public in this regard.

Mr BAKER: That was a very generalised answer. The increase is quite significant. The amount voted in 1982-83 was \$985 000, whereas the proposed expenditure for 1983-84 is \$1 680 000. That represents a significant increase in costs of A.D.P. services. That cannot be rationalised by simply saying that A.D.P. services have been used more. Is some sort of software development involved, or does it reflect an increase in usage or increase in costs of usage of A.D.P. services? I would like some better explanation.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Mr Mellen has some further information.

Mr Mellen: As I said earlier, this year we have acquired another computer. Since its acquisition we have been able to extend the number of terminals throughout the State to Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier, Berri, and so on. With this additional capacity we are taking work from the Government A.D.P. Centre. A major system involved is the land tax system, which is closely aligned with the valuation system. That is a new system. That system has been rewritten especially for the Burroughs machine. The land tax section

has now gone over to v.d.u.'s., the cost of which is also included in costs associated with that operation.

Mr BAKER: The cost of v.d.u.'s. would not be included under costs for capital equipment?

Mr Mellen: Yes, but by installing v.d.u.'s. it means that more use is made of the central processors.

Mr BAKER: My next question relates to the survey and Government wide support services. I have noticed the statement about the provision of Government wide support services in mapping, and again it appears to be quite a worthwhile service, but I just question whether in fact that sort of service may well be better in the private sector than in the public sector, given the sort of entrenched costs associated with this sort of work. It may well be that the private sector does not have the capacity, but there are some comments made there that we have to perform a public service. Has the Government given any consideration to the wider range of mapping services and whether they are better in the private sector?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: There has been no formal consideration of this at Cabinet level. I would have to defer to my officers as to whether the matter has been addressed at departmental level. I think in the short term the private sector would not have the capacity. There is a considerable element of servicing of the Government's own requirements in this matter, which we are presently carrying through. I understand that the department itself has not specifically looked at that proposition.

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

Works and Services—Department of Lands,
\$2 500 000—Examination declared completed.

Services and Supply, \$6 919 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. E.W. Chapman
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Mr K.H. Plunkett

Witness:

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood, Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J.E. Burdett, Director-General, Department of Services and Supply.
Mr R. Dundon, Director, Support Services.
Mr J. Cambridge, Director, State Supply.
Mr C. Crisp, Director of Chemistry.
Mr D.J. Woolman, Director, Government Printing Division and Government Printer.
Mr M. Jones, Director, Government Computing Centre.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I would like to make a brief comment before asking the Minister questions about policy

matters. We have seen what I believe to be some significant changes in the Department. We have seen transferred to the Department of Labour the regulation of the gas supply and the handling of dangerous goods and substances. We have also seen the transfer of the Data Processing Board to the Minister for Technology. From a policy point of view, I would be interested to know what the Government believes it is achieving with those transfers and whether the transfer of the Data Processing Board from the Department of Services and Supply has been carried out purely to prop up a Government decision to create a Minister for Technology or whether there is any real value in doing that. In making the transfers, there has been a loss of about 16 full-time equivalents, yet we see that there has been an increase overall in the Department of Services and Supply from last year of 716 to 721 this year.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I should also remind the honourable member that I have lost the Explosives Act as well, which was some disappointment to me because I was the one who had to give approval for fireworks displays, and the like. The Explosives and Gas Acts were related to inspectorial functions which the Department of Labour could carry out. As to the Data Processing Board, I do not share the honourable member's implied cynicism about that matter. When it was set up that portfolio was seen as one that should occupy a pivotal position in relation to supply of services which also involves high technology and has the potentiality for additional technological innovation. That was the broad base of the policy. Mr Dundon, who was directly involved in the negotiations which led to these transfers, might like to further enlighten the Committee.

Mr Dundon: The basic rationale for the separation of those functions was that the Department of Services and Supply is strictly a service organisation. That is the basic reason for its being: to provide services to other Government agencies and approved bodies. Regarding the Data Processing Board, the duties involved in the development of the justice information system and those associated with the gas and explosives administrations were more of a regulatory nature and considered more to be relative to a policy area rather than a strictly service provision organisation.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In the last month or two there have been some fairly outright criticisms of the Data Processing Board and the approach that has been adopted to allow Government departments significant computer processing centres within those departments. Although I am not stating a view one way or another in regard to such criticisms, because I do not profess to know anything about computers or data processing, I would be interested to know the Minister's reaction to those criticisms.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I have not closely addressed myself to the question because it is one that is now within the preview of one of my colleagues. So, the matter has been very closely investigated by the Minister of Technology. I am quite honestly not in a position here and now to evaluate the criticisms that have come forward to indicate that they are based on a genuine appreciation of the position as it obtains.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Up until 30 June the Department was responsible for the Data Processing Board.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is true.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The criticism was based on past decisions.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The actual Ministerial responsibility transferred at the change of Government, but administrative support services were provided by this Department up until the date that has been mentioned by the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: It is very easy to be critical about the computing services, because it is a very evolutionary area,

and one never keeps up with the latest technology. As a public servant, I was very critical about some aspects of computer organisation in the Government. I make that as a preliminary remark because every department was in the process of doing its own thing, and then I suppose the light at the end of the tunnel came when the Data Processing Board came into being and people said that we should have machines that were compatible and cut down on duplication efforts.

So, I think things have changed. I see that there is a massive restructuring involved in this Budget. At pages 111 and 112 of the yellow book a 25 per cent increase in the provision of processing and customer services is shown. The difficulty I have with that item is the explanation. Unless there is a massive amount of cost in the movement, (and there may well be), it does not explain the escalation in the recurrent expenditure plan for 1983-84.

Mr Jones: The major increase in expenditure at the Government Computing Centre is due to the acquisition late in 1982 of I.B.M. computing equipment, with a further upgrade of that equipment planned in December this year. We have also restructured our organisation, and are operating in a semi-commercial type of environment to provide computing service to Government and, under the policy of the Government and the Data Processing Board, to be an alternative for provision of computing services to Government departments. It is one alternative that they have to consider.

Mr BAKER: What areas of Government do you think could usefully be brought under the umbrella of the Computing Service Centre?

Mr Jones: We are providing services to all areas of Government, but particularly in the areas of common administrative and support systems such as in the financial, payroll and supply areas. The common systems across Government are not necessarily the specific systems applicable to an individual department, although we are certainly capable of providing such a service and must be considered in the Department's deliberations.

Mr BAKER: We have heard a lot of publicity in recent years about the operation of the Health Commission and its various computers which do not work very well and which have probably been poorly ordered. I do not know whether they have been poorly managed, but I think someone with a big pay cheque has gone out and got them and then said 'They are no good'. What initiatives are in train to sort out this problem? There are computers at the Modbury Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre, and the Health Commission has its own range of equipment. Is there any intention that the computer service centre should embrace some of the applications in the Health Commission?

Mr Jones: We have no direct involvement with computing in the Health Commission. We are offering our services. It is their decision which way they go, apprised by the Data Processing Board. We are operating a bureau to Government.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I suggest that the mechanics at Government level would be that the Minister of Health and/or his officers would take up with the Minister for Technology a question such as this and, where available, a service would be supplied if requested, but the initiative for the provision of that service originates elsewhere.

Mr BAKER: Who will be responsible for putting up a proposition concerning certain areas of government that run their own systems at the moment? I am sure that Cabinet will have to consider this matter at some time. The Minister has described the situation as an initiative from the Minister responsible for his own portfolio to come to the Minister for Technology. I presume that the Minister for Technology had in train the Data Processing Board and that there would be a flow the other way. I understood that the Data Proc-

essing Board was set up to rationalise data processing within the Public Service.

The CHAIRMAN: It should be understood by the member for Mitcham that the Data Processing Board line is not handled by the Minister now before the Committee, but is handled by the Minister for Technology. The Chair intends to allow the questioning to go on on the basis that the Minister now before the Committee was in charge of that area at one time.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The answer to the earlier question was predicated against the assumptions set out in the member's question; that is to say that for argument's sake I accepted his basic proposition that there were problems in the Health Commission and that they were known to the Minister. In those circumstances he may well approach the Minister for Technology for advice as to whether or not those problems could be addressed in the wider spheres of Government, including our Department. That is not to preclude the possibility of the Minister for Technology taking an initiative on the advice of the Data Processing Board and for the traffic to flow in the other direction.

Mr BAKER: I earlier referred to the \$5.551 million proposed for the provision of processing services. Has the Minister a breakdown of that item, particularly the \$1.2 million increase?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Mr Jones will comment.

Mr Jones: The main increases are due to the acquisition of I.B.M. equipment. We are relocating in November from Victoria Square, in the city, to Glenside. An increase is due to the reorganisation of the computing centre. Also, operating on a deposit account, we have to allow for salary increases during the year. They are the three major increases which make up that amount.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: If the honourable member would like a specific breakdown, we will undertake to get it.

Mr BAKER: The purchase of I.B.M. equipment should have gone under capital rather than recurrent expenditure. That was a line allocation situation. There was only an increase of \$100 000 in the capital expenditure line.

Mr Jones: The capital expenditure was \$2.1 million to \$2.3 million. The original \$2.1 million was for the initial purchase of I.B.M. equipment in 1982-83 and the \$2.3 million is for further equipment during this financial year.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the Forensic Science Services. Major reorganisation variations are explained with the provision of a Director at \$46 000 and with the employment of an additional 1.75 full-time equivalents at a cost of \$43 000. Criticism has been made of our Forensic Science Services, particularly in regard to the Splatt case. There have been some areas where we have not achieved the desired level of excellence. What does the Minister envisage are the major developments in this area if something is lacking in that Branch? I have no real knowledge of the situation.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Mr Dundon will report to the Committee.

Mr Dundon: I am involved in a working party which the Government set up to review the report of Dr Alan Curry, who conducted a review of the Forensic Science Services in South Australia. The working party has been asked to address the implementation of the findings of Dr Curry's report. In particular, we are taking some notice of the report and the direction in which the Splatt Royal Commission is heading in terms of criticism made of the Forensic Science Services. Basically, the working party is addressing the question of the separation of certain functions from the Police Department in terms of getting some objectivity into the selection of and searching for physical evidence related to crimes whilst, at the same time, looking at ways of improving

liaison between the Police Department and the Forensic Science Services and reducing the fragmentation of such services around the State. Associated with that is the proposal for improving quality assurance of forensic science activities. The working party is likely to be presenting its report early in the new year. It is working concurrently with the Splatt Royal Commission so that it can take recognition of criticisms or findings which may arise from it.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The sums of \$570 000, \$70 000 and \$2 000 have been allocated for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries. What does that relate to? There was no expenditure in that area last year.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Obviously, this is a transfer from another line. This matter was raised in relation to the Department of Lands lines: \$570 000 is for the cost of departmental accommodation, which was previously charged against the Public Buildings Department; \$70 000 is for purchase of computing hardware and software in the establishment of the Government car pool; and \$2 000 was also allocated for the Government car pool.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In 1982-83, \$51 000 was allocated for the Data Processing Board administration expenses and equipment, but actual payments were \$106 000. Why was there a discrepancy?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The Touche Ross consultancy service was taken out in order to set up a justice information centre, and the cost of that was about \$80 000. The Justice Information System has now been transferred to the Attorney-General lines.

Mr BAKER: The Budget allocation for the Government Printer is fairly significant, and we enjoy the fruits of the Government Printer's endeavours. There has been a reduction in employment levels because of new technology and more efficient techniques. Does the Minister envisage that there will be a continuing reduction in employment and associated costs? At times it is believed that we can do things a little cheaper, but when the costs of manpower and equipment are considered, in many cases new systems are more expensive. Will the manpower and expenditure associated with producing good copy level off or reduce in the next one or two years?

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: In regard to the second matter in particular, I will call on Mr Woolman to assist, but I would like to make a general comment in regard to all lines. Because this is a servicing department to Government, a department that is going on to a basis of direct payment for services, and therefore with a target of becoming self funding in this way, the work force should directly relate to the request for service that emanates from those departments that we are servicing. Therefore, any figures in the documents before us should relate directly to that particular matter. In any event, I will ask Mr Woolman to comment.

Mr Woolman: The Government Printing Division since 1977 has been on a consolidation programme. At that time, a steering committee was formed and it identified the need for new technology within the Division. That technology has been installed, and it was identified that in certain areas the Division was overstaffed. Since 1977, we have tried to get a number of people who can be fully occupied throughout the year. This has taken into consideration the cyclical nature of Parliamentary sitting and the lack of funds in the second half of the year for work to keep the place fully occupied.

We are now on minimum staff throughout the plant and I cannot foresee those staff levels dropping further than they are now. As we get busy through the Parliamentary session, so that we do not have staff idle later in the year, the bulk of work that can be produced by the private sector is let to the private sector. This was identified by the steering committee between 1977 and 1980.

As we go into the future, the graphic arts industry is becoming more and more specialised, and we have identified areas where specialised work has been let to specialists in the private sector, rather than being involved within the Government Printing Division. This rationalisation in staff has meant a reduction in staff in certain areas. The Division has spent a large amount of money in re-equipping and capital equipment, and that process is almost completed. In future, our corporate plan includes replacement and looking at small updates in technology to assist the Division in keeping up with technology, especially in the servicing of the Parliament.

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

Works and Services—Department of Services and Supply,
\$13 650 000—Examination declared completed.

Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation,
Miscellaneous, \$2 065 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. W.E. Chapman
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Mr K.H. Plunkett

Witness:

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Lands, and Minister of Repatriation.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R.F. Elleway, Assistant Director, Department of Lands.
Mr E.A.R. Mellen, Director, Administration and Finance, Department of Lands.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In relation to Monarto land management disposal, if I remember correctly from my reading of the Auditor-General's Report, only about 59 hectares of disposable land remains in the Monarto area. When does the Minister envisage that the input to the extent indicated will conclude, as the operation of Monarto would appear to be very near completion?

Mr Elleway: Much of this area of 59 hectares comprises land which is suitable for rural living but for which at present we cannot discern a market, so we would not be disposing of it in the short term.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: An expenditure of \$1.14 million is proposed for 1983-84, when it appears that the winding up and selling of Monarto is almost completed.

Mr Mellen: The 59 hectares that is shown as sold should have been described as land that had been placed on the open market but as yet unsold.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: If that is so, how will the \$1.14 million be used in this financial year?

Mr Mellen: Much land has yet to be sold, not just 59 hectares.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will ascertain what land still remains to be disposed of.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: For how long is the pension to be paid to the retired General Manager of the Development Commission? A finite time was fixed when the general agreement was drawn up.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: For the term of his natural life.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: At page 146 of his 1982-83 Annual Report, the Auditor-General, referring to Monarto, states that 6 306 hectares has been sold to previous land-owners and 7 885 hectares to other purchasers, making a total of 14 191 hectares. He further states that 59 hectares remains as unsold land. Is that all the Monarto land yet to be sold?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: No. We will get the specific information for the honourable member.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Friday 30 September at 9.45 a.m.