

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 27 September 1984

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 K.H. Plunkett
 The Hon. D.C. Wotton

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Services and Supply, \$9 672 000

Witness:

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, 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 of State Supply.

Dr I. Dainis, Director of Chemistry.

Mr R. Fletcher, Acting Director and Government Printer.

Mr M. Jones, Director, Government Computing Centre

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The Director of Forensic Science, Professor Tilstone, is not here and should the Committee require a more detailed answer than I could give to some questions Mr Dundon will answer them.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I wonder whether it would be possible to examine the vote for the Department of Environment and Planning before that for the Department of Lands?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That could be arranged. Has it been requested that we proceed through Services and Supply then go to Environment and Planning and then to Lands?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a question of whether the Minister has enough time to get his officers here.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will get that into operation straight away.

Mr GUNN: I note on page 100 of the Estimates of Payments that the Government Motor Garage, which was previously under the control of the Minister of Transport, has been placed under the control of the Department of Services and Supply. Can the Minister give the reason for that transfer? Also, will that mean that State Government vehicles will be purchased through this section, or will each department still have the responsibility for servicing and looking after its individual needs?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will call on Mr Dundon to give specific details. It arose out of a review of administrative arrangements. The Department of Services and Supply is a general servicing department for all Government departments, and it was felt more appropriate that the garage should be under its wing rather than that of the Department of Transport, which has as its basic charter service to the

public rather than internal service to Government departments. I ask Mr Dundon to expand on that.

Mr Dundon: I guess the prime reason for it stems from a review done some years ago into the use of vehicles based in the city area. As a result of that review it was decided that economies could be made by pooling vehicles based in the inner city area and, as an adjunct to that because most of the servicing and so on of those vehicles would be done through the Government Motor Garage, it was felt that the whole transport services area could be consolidated most effectively into the one organisation. That is the background to it.

The second question revolved around whether that would mean that all vehicles would be purchased and serviced through that organisation. That is not the case at this stage. Our Department has responsibility primarily for city based vehicles and the management of a pool of those vehicles. Departments that have vehicles based in the metropolitan or country areas still purchase vehicles off their own bat and will maintain and manage them by themselves.

Mr GUNN: I am not being critical of the operation, but merely seeking information. I travel around and see many Government vehicles. What is the policy in relation to who lays down the criteria on what sort of vehicles should be made available for each department? I agree that the Ministerial fleet should comprise the cars that it does—I have no complaints whatsoever with that and never have had. I believe that certain people in the Department of Lands need four wheel drive vehicles. However, I sometimes see people driving around in Ford F100 vehicles. I saw one the other day, but I will not mention the department involved. Having had some experience in country travel and the purchasing of vehicles, I do not believe that those vehicles are either suitable or necessary. Who has the overall say on policy for the sort of vehicles available for each operation? People should have adequate vehicles, but unless we are careful a lot of money could be spent on expensive vehicles that are not really necessary.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I agree with what the honourable member says and will ask Mr John Cambridge, the Director of State Supply, to give details.

Mr Cambridge: The determination of vehicles to suit particular requirements is generally a matter that comes under the auspices of the Supply and Tender Board. Two issues are involved—the policy issue and the determination of the requirement. Previously the Department of the Premier and Cabinet laid down policies, but that has recently been rationalised and the Supply and Tender Board has the responsibility of determining policies to do with vehicles. In the case that the honourable member raised, all passenger type vehicles are determined by the Supply and Tender Board. Tenders are called and contracts let for passenger vehicles. The same is done for a range of commercial vehicles. However, there are occasions when departments require other than vehicles of the nature that are on contract.

It is then the responsibility of the permanent head to put a proposal to the Supply and Tender Board to request the waiving of calling of tenders and to justify his or her requirement as to why they need a specific vehicle. The Board then looks at that proposal on its merits, and where appropriate approves the purchase of that vehicle. I do not know the details in this specific instance.

Mr GUNN: I understand that the Supply and Tender Board purchases on behalf of all departments. What is the policy in relation to the purchase of school buses? The school bus fleet is very large (some hundreds of buses), and I see many in my district. From time to time, I have received a considerable number of complaints about certain buses and in certain isolated communities where the summer is extremely hot I have had requests as to why some of the

buses cannot be air-conditioned. Has the Supply and Tender Board considered this matter, or does it purely let the tender based on a set of guidelines provided to it by the Education Department?

Mr Cambridge: The honourable member's understanding of the guidelines and requirements being determined by the Education Department and the Supply and Tender Board responding to that is correct.

Mr BAKER: In relation to the new transport service, I have received a number of complaints about the use of Government owned vehicles in my area, where a large number of them flow past certain premises and they are very noticeable. It may be that there are a number of executives who live in the area further south and they flow past this area. There have also been complaints about Government vehicles being used for shopping and various other things.

The response to a question I asked about Government owned vehicles (unfortunately, I did not get a passenger vehicle breakdown) was that the total vehicles in ownership of the Government numbered almost 18 000. I presumed that, with the new garaging and car pooling procedures, there would be a diminution in the number of vehicles made available to individual departments for their own use, and that the number would decrease significantly on the numbers that we see here today. I would like some comment on that matter.

Mr Dundon: The Transport Services Branch of the Department of Services and Supply, as I mentioned before, is primarily responsible for city based vehicles. The number of vehicles currently in that fleet is 419, representing something less than 6 per cent of the total number of light motor vehicles (sedans, utilities and panel vans) owned by the Government as a whole. Of the 419 vehicles, a proportion (somewhere near 40 per cent) are on what we call short term hire: they are hired virtually by the hour to client departments based in the city area. The other 60 per cent or thereabouts are on long term hire; they are hired by the month to agencies to use as they are needed.

In terms of reduction of the number of motor vehicles in the city areas, the central Government car pool commenced its operation on 1 November last year, and since that time 473 vehicles have been transferred to Services and Supply from within the city area. We now have 419 vehicles, which represents a reduction of about 12 per cent on the number of vehicles that previously existed in the inner city area as a result primarily of establishing the city based car pool.

Mr BAKER: A comparison of the position that existed for 1982-83 and that for 28 February 1984 indicates that certainly an increase has occurred. I have added up amounts allocated previously for Government cars, according to the Estimates of Payments, and an increase of some 10 per cent in money allocated for the purchase of new vehicles is apparent. The information that has been provided seems somewhat inconsistent with the amount of money that is being allocated for motor vehicle purchase in 1984-85. Is there a reason?

Mr Dundon: I am not really in a position to comment on that, because our responsibility rests specifically with something like less than 6 per cent of the total Government fleet, which is represented by vehicles owned by a number of statutory authorities and Government departments. I really cannot say why an increase in numbers has occurred in areas other than in the city.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I think it is fair enough to say that when one is looking at figures on a sort of global scene there must be an element of rounding in these matters if only because of the timing of a purchase can affect the cash flow. One can budget for a certain amount for a year but

then the cash must be handed over if it is not used and there is an overrun from that financial year into the next financial year. The other point that I can make is that I guess the basic commodity with which we are dealing is getting more expensive all the time, and that will reflect in the Government's accounts, irrespective of the total number of units being purchased. I am happy to obtain more detail for the member for Mitcham along the lines that he indicated. As has been pointed out to the Committee, it is something that spreads beyond our narrow area of responsibility as a department.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask that the information be made available in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard*, and that it be provided no later than Friday 19 October.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will undertake to ensure that the information is correct. Whether we can meet that deadline will depend on the nature of the task; it may be a big one.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: At page 112 of the Programme Estimates book in regard to the programme 'Provision of Forensic Science Services', under 'Issues and trends', the statement is made:

The Division looks forward to responding to the findings of the Splatt Royal Commission and to the Cramond Working Party on implementation of the Curry Report.

Can the Minister provide some information to the Committee on the progress that has been made concerning the implementation of the Curry Report as it relates to the recommendations that have come from the Cramond Working Party?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Mr Dundon has been handling much of this for the department and, again, I ask him to respond.

Mr Dundon: The Cramond Working Party was established to look at the issues involved in the implementation of Dr Alan Curry's Report. The Cramond Working Party met for the last time yesterday to put the finishing touches on the report. That will be forwarded to the Government within the next couple of weeks. It will then be up to the Government as to how the recommendations will be accepted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Recognising that the recommendations are still to come forward, can the Minister say what the plan is as far as the Government is concerned? Obviously there is a need to address this matter as quickly as possible.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Both the Attorney and I have responsibilities to the Government here. We expect to discuss the matter very shortly with a view to coming up with a Government position which we can recommend to our colleagues. Generally speaking, the forensic science discipline has had a fair working over because of two or three extremely well reported cases in the press that have really put to the test our traditional forensic science programmes.

The discipline has responded quickly to those demands. The Committee would know, of course, that the Government has recruited Professor Tilstone (who is a world authority) to head our Division. I believe that we are already seeing positive results from that recruitment of someone who is an acknowledged world expert.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that members of staff have visited laboratories in other States and overseas. Can the Minister indicate some of the gains that have been made from those visits and how they can be implemented in South Australia? Was it purely a fact finding mission?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Mr Dundon has some details.

Mr Dundon: There were perhaps three major overseas or interstate visits that have particular benefit to South Australia. I refer, first, to a series of visits to the Victorian Forensic Science Laboratory to study arson residue collection and identification techniques. We have quite a problem in

South Australia in terms of collecting evidence from scenes of suspected arson. We have had a very good working arrangement with the Victorian Forensic Science Laboratory for some of our people go over there for training.

The second major benefit occurred in the area of paternity testing. One of our forensic biologists went to North America and Europe, first to present a paper at a conference there, but at the same time to study more advanced techniques in paternity testing. Thirdly, there was an overseas trip to North America (partially funded by the Department, by the individual concerned and by racing authorities in South Australia) to study details of swabbing of racehorses and greyhounds and techniques in that area.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I also note that under the same heading it states:

A pleasing trend has been recognition from outside the State of the quality of the Forensic Science Division.

I note the recent award of a Federal police grant, with which I am sure Mr Dundon would be pleased. It further states:

These several trends also indicate the pressing need to revise the chosen performance indicators for the work of the Division.

Would Mr Dundon like to comment further on that?

Mr Dundon: As a Department, we have put a special effort into developing performance indicators for all our programmes. Generally speaking, they cover the fields of workloads, level of service, efficiency, effectiveness and quality of service. The major areas for refinement in forensic science are concerned with the level of service, the need to be responsive in a timely manner to requests for information and the quality of service that we provide. We are looking at establishing some form of external quality control benchmarks so that we can work towards a comparison of our performance with acknowledged standards.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Further to that, I note that one of the specific targets for 1984-85 is to establish a multi-disciplinary working team. Could we have more detail in regard to that?

Mr Dundon: The Forensic Science Centre has three major disciplines involved in its current operation. This is largely a traditional approach to organisation there. We have a forensic chemistry area, a forensic biology area and a forensic pathology area. The forensic pathology people, for example, will often take specimens or samples from cases that are referred to it for further examination by, say, the chemistry area. Likewise, the biologists and chemists often work closely together on body fluids, hairs, fibres, and things of that nature.

We are looking at whether the traditional breakdown of those disciplines is the most effective way of getting quick, accurate and comprehensive responses to the needs in the forensic area and feel that perhaps a multi-disciplinary approach would be a little better. One thing I should say is that that will not mean any additional staff. It simply means a reorganisation of the working teams within the Forensic Science Division.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Further, I note that the arson section has been established and is now working on some scene investigations. We had a rather lengthy discussion with the links in this area, the Metropolitan Fire Service, when it was before the other Committee. Could the Minister give us a little more detail about the establishment of this section, its main responsibilities and the directions that it has taken?

Mr Dundon: Although we talk about a section, it is not a specific section. Some of the forensic chemists have been schooled in arson techniques, the recognition of arson, accelerant, residues, and so on. Concern has been expressed in a number of areas in South Australia—from both the private sector and the public sector—that there was a need to get a more knowledgeable resource at the scenes of suspected

arsons to assist the Metropolitan Fire Service and indeed the Country Fire Service in determining the causes and likely behaviour of fires. So, the people who were trained in this area in the Forensic Science Division work with both Metropolitan Fire Service investigators and the Technical Services Division of the Police Department to bring scientific expertise to the investigation of suspected arson scenes. Generally, they rely on the Technical Services Division to call them to the scenes of fires if arson is suspected.

Mr OSWALD: Has the working party reviewing Government procurement policies reported and, if so, can a copy of that report be made available?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The working party was set up by the Ministry for Technology, so technically it is my colleague's report. I will be happy to take it up with my colleague or alternatively, the matter can be referred to him next week when the Committee dealing with that matter sits. The report is still in the course of preparation. I thought that it was completed, but it is not. I will be happy to take up with my colleague the early release of the report.

Mr OSWALD: I asked the Minister because it is of interest to his Department.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Indeed, very much so.

Mr OSWALD: In the reorganisation of the Department of Services and Supply and the subsequent drafting of the Bill for a new State Supply Act, does the Government intend to exclude the Housing Trust, the Electricity Trust and the State Transport Authority from the proposal in the Bill, namely, that the control of supply function for the authorities would be moved from the Minister responsible for the authority to the Minister responsible for the State Supply Division?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is no finality on this matter, and perhaps the best I can do without taking up undue time is simply to lay out the principles as I see them operating. Economies of scale are involved in bulk purchase. That goes without saying; otherwise we would not have a Supply Division. The question is how far that should be taken without losing the specialist input of departments. The STA would know its requirements better than my people would.

The question is whether the economies of scale in relation to purchase at their request can best operate at that level. What the Government has in mind is an Act which is wide ranging but which allows specific delegations to certain areas that would enable them to operate in the traditional way but, of course, the capacity would always be there to remove the delegation where it seemed appropriate.

What we are talking about is a situation in which, when we look at the totality of those instrumentalities that are in any way involved with public money, there will almost certainly be certain agencies that will not be covered by the Act; there will be certain agencies which in general terms will be covered by the Act but which will get automatic delegations to continue in the way they always have; and there will be those agencies that will be completely covered by the Act. I can also envisage a situation where, say, the STA may get delegations for certain sorts of purchase but not for others. That is in general terms; Mr Cambridge can elaborate if the Committee sees fit. I do not know whether the Committee wants a general policy answer or an answer in greater detail.

Mr OSWALD: I would like an indication whether those three agencies would be given a reasonable degree of autonomy. I ask the Minister whether he shares the Trust's concern and will concede its argument and go along with it. I suppose one could say in conclusion:

The ultimate impact on [Housing] Trust autonomy, flexibility, efficiency and effectiveness is thus of such magnitude as to potentially emasculate Trust operations and to render the provision of

economic housing in accordance with Government objectives impossible. The Trust, therefore, recommends most strongly to the Minister that in any change to the legislation the Trust be specifically excluded from the ambit of the State Supply Act.

I believe that the Electricity Trust has a view similar to that of the STA. It is of concern that the Government will go half way and give specific exemptions. I am trying to get an indication that the Government will go along with the philosophy that the Trust is asking it to go along with, or will it go only half way down the track?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I have to be completely honest with the Committee and the honourable member (as we always are at these things) and say that no final decision has been made, so I cannot really say exactly what will happen. All I can say is that my approach to it is that the Act should be wide ranging. If the final result was something that was as inflexible as is suggested in whatever that material is that the honourable member has referred to, then I would share his concern. The legislation that will eventually be placed before the House will be of sufficient flexibility to enable instrumentalities, which know far better than we do what their requirements are, to continue in the traditional way but without losing the advantage of the wider ranging purchase, the greater bulk purchases, which we would want to be able to enjoy. I really cannot say at this stage whether specific agencies will be included or not included. My advice at this stage would be that as many agencies as possible should be included but with the flexibility of delegating the responsibility under the Act.

Mr OSWALD: For the record, the document I quoted from was signed by P.B. Edwards, General Manager of the Housing Trust, to give it some form of authenticity. My next question relates to post-implementation reviews and the Data Processing Board.

Mr BAKER: Mr Chairman, may I finish a line of questioning?

The CHAIRMAN: Members of the Committee have priority, and I am trying to be flexible, but do not make me go back on that.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: While wanting to be as helpful as we possibly can in this matter, the member for Morphett said he would like to take up certain matters in relation to the Data Processing Board. Mr Burdett is a member of the Data Processing Board, and of course the Computing Centre is within his Department, but the Data Processing Board technically reports through the Minister for Technology. Although I am quite happy to allow Mr Burdett, or Mr Jones from our Computer Services, to answer questions of detail here in relation to overall policy, it is my colleague's responsibility rather than mine.

Mr OSWALD: I really want to direct my question to the Minister who would claim responsibility for the Data Processing Board. Who is that?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It is the Minister for Technology.

Mr OSWALD: I will reserve my question for him.

Mr BAKER: I would like to put on record that the Auditor-General, in his report dealing with Services and Supply, indicated that there was under utilisation of parking resulting from more home to office travel than anticipated. That encapsulates some of my concern about the way Government vehicles are being used, and it bears on questions that constituents have asked of me. My question relates to the proposed expenditure on an automated procurement system of \$121 000. Is that for equipment itself; is that procurement system being put on the central ADP or Government computing system; and is the cost of development more for software than for other items? What does the \$121 000 relate to?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I am sure Mr Cambridge can assist the Committee on this question.

Mr Cambridge: The \$121 000 is for the provision of development—buying a feasibility study which has been placed before the Data Processing Board and the Supply and Tender Board (it has been generally accepted by those two bodies)—to try to implement a common automated procurement system in phases throughout the Government for those departments and agencies that have a need to access general supply contracts, automatic purchase orders, and so on. The majority of that money is for software development and salaries for the implementation of that system.

Mr BAKER: I would like to ask a question about the security of the vast amounts of equipment and goods that are held by the Department of Services and Supply and about what level of theft has occurred within that Department over the last financial year.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I take it that the question is in relation to all divisions. We will have to get that information for the honourable member. Mr Cambridge may have some information for the Committee in relation to the Supply function of the Department, but in relation to other divisions we will have to take that on notice.

Mr BAKER: More particularly in relation to the goods.

Mr Cambridge: To the best of my knowledge, in the past 12 months two break-ins have occurred in the Supply Division's warehouses (I can get the details of what was stolen and what was recovered), one of which was at the Seaton warehouse, where a whole range of stolen goods were restolen and the majority was subsequently recovered by the police.

In addition, we have recently had a break-in at our Whyalla warehouse. We have still not received the final report on the extent of it, but a verbal report indicates at this stage that there was no theft.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It is fair enough to say that, in relation to areas like chemistry and forensic science, there is not all that much to pinch that could be easily got rid of, and the buildings are very secure.

Mr BAKER: I was really referring to theft and whether any employees had been apprehended in the process.

Mr Cambridge: In none of the cases have any of the employees been involved at all—it has all been outside work.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the Government Computing Centre Division, and I note a small loss was made during 1983-84. There was not an explanation of that loss, given that the services are contracted on a pay-as-you-go basis. Perhaps we can have an indication of how that loss was incurred.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will ask Mr Malcolm Jones to reply.

Mr Jones: Basically, the loss of our operation last year was caused by the recent expenditure on and installation of new equipment in the Centre over the past two years. We are gradually building up a business on that new machine, and it is unrealistic to expect that to break even in its first six months of operation. This year we are expecting another small loss, but in future years we hope to attract enough business at the current rates to show a break-even profit situation.

Mr BAKER: We spent a little time last year on the Government Computing Centre and its relationship with the individual requirements of departments. Perhaps this question lies somewhere between the Government Computing Centre and the Data Processing Board on the policies of the Department. Has there been an erosion of the use of the Government Computing Centre in relative terms as well as in absolute terms *vis-a-vis* the total computing requirements of the Public Service?

Mr Jones: In absolute terms the Centre is increasing its business. In relative terms, as more computing is introduced into the Government, that will depend in the future. I do

not think there has been any loss in relative terms over the past 12 months.

Mr BAKER: What relationship do you have with the Data Processing Board in terms of when the assessment is made of applications to introduce new equipment into a department, either stand alone equipment or equipment linked to other computing facilities outside the Government Computing Centre? What is the procedure followed by the Board in respect of your operations to ensure that there will not be a duplication of effort?

Mr Jones: It is the responsibility of the Data Processing Board.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Maybe Mr Burdett, as a member of the Data Processing Board, could tell us.

Mr Burdett: As a member of the Data Processing Board and as head of the Department of Services and Supply, which has the Government Computing Centre as one of its divisions, I have a close interest in the proposals being forwarded to the Data Processing Board for the establishment of its own in-house services. Through a process of questioning and discussion of the Data Processing Board, the cost effectiveness of those proposals as against the use of a Government Computing Centre is very high on the agenda of the Data Processing Board.

Mr BAKER: Are proposals referred to the Government Computing Centre for analysis in terms of their capability of carrying out the same function, or is it left up to some representative of the Board to make decisions on their behalf?

Mr Burdett: The submissions are not formally sent to the Department for any overview. As a member of the Data Processing Board, that matter is explored in some depth as to whether the capacity exists at the Government Computing Centre to support the specific programmes put forward.

Mr BAKER: Mention is made in the yellow book of implementing staff counselling services, and in a number of the yellow books there appears to be an emphasis on resources for departments to look at staff morale, etc. What specific problems exist with the Government Computing Centre, or is it just a matter of policy to upgrade the relationship between the staff?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I will let Mr Jones answer the question in relation to the Computing Centre. It is important that I point out to the Committee that it is a total Government initiative so far as our Department is concerned. It goes right across divisions and has been evolved in concert with the Public Service Board. Let us not put more on it than it is. It is not a great highfalutin programme that will absorb lots of Government resources. It will use resources already within departments. We see it as a very important matter for Public Service morale and getting the highest productivity possible from people. As to any specific problems that might relate to the work environment of the Computing Centre, I am quite happy for Mr Jones to expand.

Mr Jones: The programme about which we are talking is a departmental one. There is no significantly worse problem at the GCC as far as staff morale is concerned than at other places within the Public Service, but it is a general policy to try to improve things across the board.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Did the honourable member have in mind ergonomic problems that have been identified with people working as key-stroke operators? Otherwise, the work environment is not that much different, but there have been identified physical problems relating to the working environment in data processing generally.

Mr BAKER: A number of problems are specific to computing centres because of the nature of the work involved. My personal observation is that the work is often far more taxing and of less variety than work that one would get elsewhere in the Public Service. There were obviously the

ergonomic issues and also the constraints on the type and variety of work carried out. It all gets down to doing the same thing every day of the week; despite the fact that there may be different projects, it involves the same process. In my experience, some time ago where we had some specific difficulties in the data processing area, particularly with punching in and a whole range of other things.

Mr Jones: There are a number of areas in the Computing Centre. We have had some problems in the area of computer operations in the shift work environment, but I do not think we are any different there from the rest of the industry. In the analysis and programming area we have a wide variety of work and, although we operate in different modes in various departments, there is plenty of variety in that area.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I do not know whether the honourable member will still be with us later in the day when we look at the Lands Department. However, I make the point that these problems also relate to a significant area of work of that Department and he may like to redress the question to my advisers later in the day.

Mr BAKER: I will not be here. My final question relates to security. Security of computers is one of the very often discussed topics particularly in terms of criminal interference and various other things. What specific programmes are being implemented to prevent access from outside sources?

Mr Jones: Physical access or access to data?

Mr BAKER: I am talking about access to data.

Mr Jones: Concerning access to data, the IBM system has a very sophisticated security software package that prevents unauthorised access to data. It is considered to be one of the best in the industry and we certainly have had no evidence of anyone accessing data that they are not authorised to access.

Mr BAKER: Security of data is not a difficulty. However, there are questions as to how one can stop unlawful entry.

Mr Jones: There are the two aspects.

Mr BAKER: I was more interested in the security of data.

Mr Jones: We are certainly addressing that and making more improvements to it but I have no concern about access to data held at the Computer Centre.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note in the expenditure and receipts summary that there is provision for recurrent expenditure for 1984-85 of \$348 000 for the provision of remote sensing services within the Department. I am becoming totally confused as to what is happening about remote sensing. I understand that part of it is still with the Department of Lands and that some of it has gone to the Department of Technology. What is the \$348 000 for?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The honourable member will recall that when he was Minister for Environment and Planning there was a remote sensing unit which was part of the Department of Environment and Planning. That unit has now been relocated to Technology Park and is under the control of the Department of Services and Supply. The reason for that shift was that the Government wanted two things from the unit and it suspected, that by leaving it with the Department of Environment and Planning, it perhaps would not get these two thrusts. There was no dissatisfaction with the service that it was providing through the Department of Environment and Planning for environmental purposes but we looked at two other things: first, to general advice to Government and Government departments about remote sensing.

The honourable member has mentioned the Department of Lands: the Department of Lands is interested in remote sensing in terms of the monitoring of the condition of the arid lands for the pastoral industry. The Department of Agriculture is also interested. There is potential, for example, in the Police Department in relation to significant plantings

of *cannabis sativa* in various parts of the State, and the possibility of being able to detect this interesting vegetation from remote sensing. There is also the E & WS Department groundwater supplies and that sort of thing which also could be indicated, and also the Woods and Forests Department.

Because the Department of Services and Supply of course has, as its basic function, the servicing of other Government departments, it was felt that the services of the remote sensing unit should be more appropriately located, administratively, in that area. Secondly, in relation to the physical relocation to Technology Park which of course was commenced during the time of the Government of which the honourable member was a part we are interested in the technological implications, the innovative technological implications of remote sensing, and it was felt that this was as important a function as simply drawing maps and that sort of thing for the ecological survey or whatever.

So, speaking for the moment as Minister for Environment and Planning, I would anticipate the service of that Department will still be available to me as Minister for Environment and Planning but, in addition, it will have a broader function along the lines that I have indicated. I think, and I can be corrected by my officers, the sum of money to which the honourable member has referred is the total expenditure through that unit. There is an amount of \$159 000, which is the contingency expenditure, and the balance would be the salaries of the people involved. As I understand it, it is exactly the same people.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Do I take it then that the administrative responsibility is now totally with the Minister of State Supply?

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Because it is at Technology Park, there is no responsibility administratively to the Minister for Technology?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: No, the Minister for Technology, just as the Minister for Environment and Planning, will be a customer of the remote sensing unit which is part administratively of the Department of Services and Supply.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister indicated that remote sensing was used in the determination of groundwater. Can more details be given for my colleague?

Mr Dundon: The E & WS Department has been using airborne scanning data for looking at the flows of surface groundwater into larger streams, to measure the flow rate and capacities of the various—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is surface water?

Mr Dundon: Yes, surface water.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I am sorry, we did mean surface water rather than underground water. I can see the honourable member's point. It is even difficult for infra-red radiation to penetrate very far in to the earth's surface.

Mr GUNN: In relation to the Government Computing Centre, can the Minister explain the Government's policy in relation to the introduction of word processors within the Government generally and, in particular, at what range of office level is that word processor being made available? I understand that certain Ministerial offices now have word processors. Yesterday, the Minister of Mines and Energy told us that the only alteration he had made to the office was to get a word processor. Are word processors going to be made available generally to all Ministerial offices (and the Leader of the Opposition would qualify), and, if not, what is the difference between a Ministerial office and say the office of the Leader of the Opposition?

Is it considered likely that in the future all members of the House of Assembly will be provided with what is becoming fairly common in most busy offices, a word processor, at not great cost? If that took place, would the electoral roll, which I understand is on floppy discs, be made available

to members and are they already available to members who may wish to purchase word processors themselves? I hope that they do not have to do so, because they ought to be made available as part of normal office equipment.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The availability of electoral information is a sensitive matter and very much a matter for the State Electoral Commissioner who does not come under my purview. From my personal point of view, I believe that we should have access, as members of Parliament, to the broadest spectrum of data that we possibly can. However, people are sensitive about just how much of this data is made available. Honourable members probably know that there has been media speculation about the possibility of amendment to the Electoral Act which will mean that under certain circumstances a person's home address is not detailed.

I feel that that is something that must be justified, rather than something that would adhere to the elector as a right. Nonetheless, I guess one could imagine circumstances in which it would be proper that that information be not made available. Therefore, as far as word processors are concerned I would be very surprised if there is a Ministerial office that does not have a word processor. Certainly, my Environment and Planning office has one. The departments have word processors. I do not have the details for the honourable member as to how far down in the system this technology extends, or how one justifies that a particular unit should have a word processor and that another one should not. I do not know whether my advisers here can help in that respect. As to the specific matter of the office of the Leader of the Opposition, I think that that is a matter to be taken up with either the Deputy Premier or the Minister of Public Works, who between them seem to have responsibility for rations—if I can use that term—in this place. Traditionally it has been the Deputy Premier, as Leader of the House, or the Minister responsible for the Works portfolio who has been responsible for equipment provided for this place or electorate offices. All I can say is that I am aware that some members of Parliament have made requests for word processors. I am not aware of any of them having been granted at this stage.

Mr GUNN: Can the Minister's officers supply information about the level at which they are available?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Perhaps Mr Cambridge might like to respond.

Mr Cambridge: Basically the departments are responsible for getting funds or for putting up the funds, budgeting for them, and for justifying the requirement to change a particular task that may not be on a word processor at the moment to one which is on a word processor. In past years contracts have been let. There are no general suppliers or period contracts right now for word processors, but there are two preferred suppliers of word processors to the Government from whom we are able to obtain significant discounts: one is Wang and the other is Raytheon. There is no obligation on the Government or the departments to purchase those brands; they are merely the preferred suppliers. It is up to the departments to justify the purchase and to obtain the funds.

Mr GUNN: No criteria have been given to the Committee concerning the use of word processors. Does it depend on the work load? Is it a matter of being able to store more information so that it can be quickly made available when required? What sort of requests are made that would justify the purchase of word processors? I put it to the Committee that most electorate offices could justify without much difficulty the installation of a word processor, although I suppose that they will be the last ones to get them. When we tried to get photocopiers, it was like trying to draw gold teeth, and yet one could walk into Government departments

and see people falling over them. I really want to know, and I will pursue it until I get the information, precisely what criteria and what guidelines are laid down in regard to the installation of word processors in certain sections of Government departments. The Minister ought to be aware of why I am pursuing this matter.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I share the honourable member's concern about the poor old member of Parliament. We have all struggled over the years to obtain facilities in our offices. The opportunity to quiz the Deputy Premier on this matter has now passed, although the Minister of Public Works is yet to be questioned by a Committee and the Opposition might like to take up with him this specific matter of the equipping of electorate offices and the Leader of the Opposition's office with word processors.

As to the criteria, there are matters in Government that are subject to overall criteria and those that are the overall responsibility of the Director-General of a department. As the Committee would be aware, there is a tendency towards trying to ensure that greater areas of autonomy and judgment are left to Directors of departments than has been the case in the past. I think this is generally recognised as being a decentralisation of decision making and therefore something that can bring about greater efficiency. If a Director-General has to decide, in his own budget whether a particular unit is going to get the additional equipment, then I guess he will be just a little bit more careful about the decision that he makes than would be the case if it were simply something that falls into a Government straitjacket because it has been handed down by the Public Service Board or the Data Processing Board.

I am saying in general terms to the honourable member that this is largely a matter for the judgment of the departmental head. I would say two things in qualification of that. The first is that if the purchase of the equipment is in excess of \$50 000, then the request would have to go to the Data Processing Board. Secondly, there is an Office Automation Advisory Panel of the Public Service Board, and it has prepared an information booklet to help departments in decision making. However, I am not aware that that lays down a formula.

Mr GUNN: Some few months ago I understand that *Hansard* was re-equipped with word processors (and I do not object to that at all) and that a very large number of what appeared to be reasonable word processors, which could have been used in other sections, were removed. I am interested to know what happened to those word processors.

Mr Cambridge: The old Raytheon word processors that were being used in *Hansard* were in fact collected by me. I circularised all departments and sold them at a profit.

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

Works and Services—Department of Services and Supply,
\$6 050 000—Examination declared completed.

Environment and Planning, \$22 572 000

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

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

Mr D. Ellis, Acting Director, Conservation Programmes, Department of Environment and Planning.

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

Mr N.H. Johnson, Chief Finance Officer, Department of Environment and Planning.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I begin with a few fundamental questions. It is rather difficult to follow up what is proposed in 1984-85 in comparison with voted and actual payments. I was interested to see an allocation for 1984-85 of \$30 550 for an overseas visit by the Minister. Where does the Minister intend to go? It seems rather a large sum.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I do not intend to go anywhere. It is a contingency item that is usually set down there in case something arises. I do not anticipate going much further than Kangaroo Island in the next 12 months. I think perhaps the accounts for the last financial year have got into this financial year; that could be part of the result of that expenditure. The CON COM and AEC was held in New Zealand, but that is behind us. That \$30 550 covers visits of officers rather than my own peregrinations.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under 'Salaries, wages and related payments' I note that the line 'Authorities board and Committee fees' was voted \$43 200 last year. However, this year they have been split up and have gone in all directions. Can the Minister provide a total proposed for 1984-85 to be paid to authorities, boards and committees?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I call on Mr Hill. I share the honourable member's confusion in relation to this matter; it is something with which we will have to grapple a little later in the lands area. Those two departments were chosen some time ago for the introduction of programme budgeting, and because of that the accounts are shown this way by the Treasury officers.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It will be made very much easier for next year?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It will be very much easier indeed, because we will be able to compare apples with apples.

Mr Hill: I do not have the accumulated total of board and committee fees. There will be no significant variance except normal escalation; they are spread, as the Minister mentioned, among the various programmes because of the change to a programme structure.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Minister prepared to make that information available later?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note on page 85 of the Estimates of Payments that a sum of \$17 850 has been set aside for 1984-85 for purchase of plant and equipment. Is there any significance in that line?

Mr BAKER: That item of \$17 850 for 1984-85 relates to page 92 of the yellow book and compares with \$2 500 which was not spent in 1983-84.

Mr Hill: It represents the cyclical replacement of equipment. In some years items need replacement and in other years, because of that cycling, that does not occur. I cannot say exactly what it would be, but obviously it is a proliferation of minor items.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is confusing: it is difficult to compare that with what was spent last year. Can the information be made available?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Indeed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would like to move on to matters relating to development management. It might assist the Minister if we tried to stay with some of those matters for a while.

Mr HAMILTON: Are we going to go through programmes one, two, and so on?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has used his three questions. The Chair does not want to buy into difficulties that do not exist; I think that commonsense should prevail. I understood that the honourable member had a question that really followed on questions that had been asked by the member for Murray. Is that or is that not the position?

Mr HAMILTON: I have just come into the Committee: I wanted to know whether we go through the pages from 87 and each programme?

The CHAIRMAN: If the Chair is to be placed in a similar situation to that on Tuesday, when I finally had to go through programme by programme, we can do it again today. Are there any questions relating to programme 1?

Mr GUNN: I seek further clarification. I take it that as we go through a member will have an opportunity to refer back to something, as long as we have not actually had a vote?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I am merely endeavouring to have some order and sanity prevail in relation to going through the lines.

Mr GUNN: That is most reasonable.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: We are very anxious to have sanity.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any questions about programme 1?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If we are dealing with programme 1, we will be talking about the Botanic Gardens. The Minister would be aware that on a number of occasions I have brought to the notice of the House through questions to him and the Premier the current situation in regard to the direction of a tropical conservatory.

I am aware that a working party has been established between the Minister of Transport and his Department to try to determine the direction that we can take in relation to the STA's land on Hackney Road. No report has been received as a result of that working party's having met, and I would like to know what the current situation is, bearing in mind, as I have said on numerous occasions, that if the State is to take advantage of the funds that are available as part of the bicentennial fund we should be getting our act together and making very clear that it is a project that we support.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The success of this project is dependent on two basic things: first, to identify a suitable site for the project and, secondly, to identify the source of funds. As the honourable member indicated correctly, funds are now available under the bicentenary. Of course, it is a

project that will have to fight for priority along with other projects, and I would anticipate that the relevant joint sub-committee of the Commonwealth and State that is advising both departments on bicentenary projects would be in a position to make some recommendations to the Government in a very short time as to the priority of this project along with others.

I am not in a position to comment more than that. I await their advice, as does everyone else, and then it will be up to the Government. However, as the honourable member has indicated, there is the continuing problem of the location of the conservatory. Once the Botanic Gardens preferred location was seen as probably not a realistic political option in view of the opposition of the City of Adelaide and certain groups within the City of Adelaide to that suggestion. Since that time, we have been looking at the Hackney Depot as an alternative location. That arises from the fact that there has long been a general feeling amongst Governments, if not a very firm policy, that ultimately the activities of the STA should be phased out on that site and that the site should be returned to some form of parkland, probably associated with the Botanic Gardens and/or Botanic Park.

So, the problem has been, given that we are not in a financial position at this stage to relocate completely the activities of the STA from that area, whether we can get sufficient of the area to build the conservatory as originally conceived and, secondly, whether we would still be able to continue with the STA in that location. A good deal of work has been done. A site has been identified in the depot, and there is still some work to be done. The effect of that location would be that a small area of the depot would be transferred to the gardens for the purpose of the conservatory. The balance of the area where the conservatory would be built would be on land that is already part of the gardens.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I take it that the site originally looked at in the Botanic Park has been abandoned.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I wonder whether the Minister can indicate (and I know that this is not his direct responsibility, but in regard to the time factor, I am aware that a decision needs to be made very soon if we are to take advantage of the bicentennial funding) what we are looking at in relation to coming forward with a proposition that can be considered as part of that funding.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: My understanding is that the advice from the joint committee should be before Cabinet within a month, although that is the responsibility of the Premier. He will be the Minister who will place those recommendations before Cabinet. I do not know how much work he will want to do on it to put his own stamp on the recommendations before we as a Cabinet see them, but the general expectation is that within a month those recommendations will be before us. We are in the position with the STA to proceed on that site, should, first, the right recommendation be made from the committee in so far as this project is concerned and, secondly, should the Cabinet accept the priority that is placed on it by that committee. There may be some matters of detail that still have to be worked out with the STA, but sufficient area has been identified in my judgment to allow the project to proceed without drastically and adversely affecting the STA's capacity to continue to use that site.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Further to that, if it is not possible to obtain bicentennial funding, the Minister has already indicated to the Parliament that he supports the need for a new tropical conservatory. Are any alternative funding procedures being considered to enable the project to be commenced, or is the Minister of the opinion that,

should bicentennial funding not be available, that is the end of the project?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: It is certainly the end of the project in relation to the time frame at which we are looking for the present project. It is a proposition that could be revived in the later 1980s or the early 1990s—who knows? However, in terms of the current time frame, if bicentennial money is not available for it, there is no other public money of which I am aware that can be earmarked.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to the joint matter of the Botanic Gardens and the Zoological Gardens. Have satisfactory arrangements been made to provide adequate parking now for patrons visiting both the Zoological Gardens and the Botanic Gardens? I am certainly aware that a consultants report was completed in February 1983. I know that there is a concern on the part of both boards—certainly on the part of the Botanic Gardens Board—and I will be questioning the Minister when we get to the 'Miscellaneous' line to ascertain what is happening with the Zoological Board (or whatever it will be or is). However, can the Minister indicate what is the current situation, because it is of concern to a lot of people?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: To be frank, the current situation is unsatisfactory, and I imagine that it will continue to be unsatisfactory. There has been a long history of problems with parking in that part of the city, and I think that there will continue to be problems. We have, quite frankly, two public facilities that generate a need for more parking than I think can reasonably be provided in that part of the city. In addition, of course, STA employees park in the Hackney Depot, and any movement of land away from the STA in that area which reduced their capacity to park would, of course, bring further strain on the limited parking facilities available outside.

A report has been prepared and is currently the subject of negotiation between the Zoological Gardens and the Botanic Gardens. Without any criticism of the people who are involved, who are good people and who are trying to resolve the problem, I am not too optimistic that we will get what we might call the ultimate solution.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is the point I am making. That report has been available since February 1983.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not think that it is good enough for the Minister to say, 'We recognise that there is a problem.' After all, we are considering two of the major tourist attractions in the city at least. The situation will not improve: it will not go away, and it is becoming a wider concern now within the community than that relating to merely the two authorities—the Botanic Gardens Board and the Royal Zoological Society. I have some concerns about the recommendations that were made in that report and about the way in which the report itself was prepared. I have some particular concerns that I do not want to canvass at this stage, but surely to goodness the Minister responsible must be in a position very soon to come up with some firm alternatives as to the availability of parking in that area.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: There will obviously be some changes to the existing facilities, but I have to be perfectly frank with the Committee and say that I am not optimistic that in the long run we will be able to resolve those problems except by solutions which might not be acceptable on other grounds. For example, we could filch more parking from the Botanic Park and that would go over like a lead balloon, I would imagine, in the community. We could ultimately, I suppose if and when the STA depot becomes available for other uses, put a multi-storey car park or an underground car park in that area. That solution is possible but it would cost money, and it might be subject to other concerns because, as the Committee knows, over the years there has

been continuing debate about the appropriateness of providing additional car parking facilities within the City of Adelaide and the effect that that has on the clogging of roads by automobiles. The opposite policy, of course, is to try to encourage people to make at least the last section of their trip by public transport. There are solutions, but they have problems associated with them.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is something I might follow up later if we have time. I note in relation to 'Commentary on major resource variations' a decrease of \$85 000 due to the winding down of the NESA scheme and general decrease in manpower. What is meant by 'general decrease' and how does it relate to the training programme under the NESA scheme, which I take it has been discontinued. I thought that was an excellent programme and I would like to know the current situation.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: We are talking about two different things, although they are both subject to Commonwealth funding. Let me first of all address the matter of the Aboriginal trainees. During the honourable member's time as Minister, four men (I guess all from the Nepabunna community because they were from the Andjamatana tribe) were taken into a Commonwealth training scheme under an excellent officer from the Commonwealth, Peter Taylor. I had the opportunity to visit Mr Taylor and the four trainees about 12 months ago, when they were still undergoing training. Three of those men were able to complete the course successfully and have now been taken into the general ranger strength of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and that is part of the resource increase that has gone to that Division. In this financial year the additional three salaries are available for their employment. In addition, when we get to capital works, we will note that there are things like houses to be built for them, and so on, and I think that is proceeding. That is a scheme which has run its course as far as that class is concerned.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not want to interrupt; I am very much aware of the Aboriginal training programme, but is this the programme we are talking about under the programme for the Botanic Gardens? I thought that that was a separate training programme for those involved in the Botanic Gardens.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I have the details in front of me. I wanted to go on and say that the general NESA scheme was something of broader application; for example, it applied to fire damage at the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden, work done at the Adelaide Botanic Gardens, and so on. That second scheme is very much dependent upon the availability of Commonwealth funds which come and go for the scheme. At Mount Lofty Botanic Garden the work has finished for the trainee garden labourers. It had a total strength as at 30 June 1984 of 10, and that will reduce to three salaries for this financial year. It has been reduced at the Adelaide Botanic Gardens where there was one trainee garden labourer, and that one continues. There is also an apprentice gardener greenkeeper, and that will continue. From a total of 12 as at 30 June 1984 we are moving to a proposal for 30 June 1985 of five. Additional people are also employed under the national parks and wildlife scheme but we are not talking about them at this stage.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In relation to the general decrease in employment, I notice that it is going from 112 in 1983-84 to 108. I know that that is not significant in itself, but as Minister I was very much aware of a need for increased staffing to deal with the responsibilities that the botanic gardens now have, particularly as the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden starts to become more involved in its specialist activities. I am particularly concerned that rather than seeing an increase in staff we are actually seeing a decrease in the overall staff of the botanic gardens.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We intend to continue the scheme, and we are negotiating with the Commonwealth but the money comes and goes, so all we can do in relation to Commonwealth moneys is make some sort of guess as to the flow of the cash. If more cash becomes available as the financial year proceeds, we can make full use of it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The last question on that line relates to the extent of vandalism that is occurring. It has been noted on previous occasions that the Adelaide Botanic Gardens cop most of the vandalism. Could the Minister give me an update of what has happened over the past 12 months: whether it is increasing, whether it is of major concern, or whether any specific action has been taken to alleviate the problem?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Unfortunately, vandalism does continue. The Director of the Botanic Gardens has not been able to get here in time because of the timing of the consideration of this line. I will get the information for the honourable member. The problem continues to be serious and a proposition has been formulated by the Director of the Botanic Gardens that he swear in as special wardens people who have a particular responsibility in that area. I assume that they will be from the existing staff and that they will have *quasi* constabulary functions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am most impressed, as I am sure the Minister would be, with the Friends of the Botanic Gardens organisation. Can the Minister see any particular use being made of that organisation? I know that it is very much involved in taking people around the gardens and things like that but are they being used for specific purposes?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes, bequests are from time to time made and they almost invariably come from members or former members of the Friends. Fund raising occurs and, as the honourable member has indicated, they have specific programmes such as guided tours which are designed to capture the interest and imagination of the public. I think that this is particularly important in relation to some of the newer botanic gardens. The Adelaide Botanic Gardens are well known to the public but some of the newer gardens are not well known, and this is where the Friends can have a significant input.

I know that when I opened the glasshouse up in the hills, the Friends were there with a stall, selling plants and generally raising money for the cause. I want to underline what the honourable member says in relation to the worth of this body to the gardens generally.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that Beechwood is to be opened on a more general basis. Is the Minister talking about the glasshouse in the hills?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister indicate when it will be opened on a regular basis?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I do not have that information immediately in front of me, but I will obtain it. It will be more often than the *National Times* indicated would be the times of opening.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I believe it should be, too.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In relation to the earlier question about the Friends, I mention that the Gardens Trust received \$100 000 in bequests last year.

The CHAIRMAN: For the *Hansard* record, the Chair points out that the member for Murray has been allowed 3 742 questions.

Mr BAKER: My colleague seems to be dominating the proceedings at the moment. In regard to the tropical conservatory, I have looked through the information provided by the Minister. Whilst it is included under 'Issues and Trends', there is no specific target or action listed for 1984-85 for bringing onstream the tropical conservatory. Has the

Minister given away the tropical conservatory? There is no reference to it. There is nothing to indicate that there is any intention to build it.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Of course there is not as it will be entirely Commonwealth funded.

Mr BAKER: It will not be entirely Commonwealth funded as there will have to be some State input, whether through a transfer of land, or anything else. There will also be some local input including officers involved in the project, whether supervising or otherwise.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will be more specific. The honourable member rightly pulls me up. We would not anticipate that there would have to be an operating budget for the tropical conservatory in this financial year. If it is to succeed, as I indicated to the honourable member's colleague, the capital must entirely come from the bicentenary programme. We do not know at this stage whether those funds will be available. Should they be available, they will be Commonwealth funds. All the front-end stuff is bicentenary money. In those circumstances we would not anticipate that there would be any call on State funds. The honourable member also refers to the transfer of land. That will show up somewhere, even if it is only a book entry, as someone has to do a valuation. That will not have a drastic impact on the accounts of the State and can be done at any time. It can be done, since we are talking about public land anyway, after the darn thing is built. It does not have to be in advance of construction.

Mr BAKER: I simply make the point that no mention is made of it in the 1984-85 achievements. There will be some input from the Minister's Department of a nature related to that project for a number of reasons, even if only for the bringing in of the ultimate plants. There is nothing in the book that would indicate that the Minister has not already given away the project.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There has already been an input from my Department. Mr Madigan does not appear to have any grey hairs at this stage, although it is a wonder, in view of the time he has spent on my behalf in negotiations with other instrumentalities. To calculate a fraction of his time, and work out what it is in dollar terms, seems to be a highly artificial process. That is as much as could appear in the Estimates at this stage.

Mr BAKER: I simply say that there should have been some mention of it under 'Targets'. I now refer to the arid land for the botanic gardens established at Port Augusta. What is the status of that project?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It is a competitor with the tropical conservatory for bicentenary funds. Whether either, both or neither will be approved is yet to be determined.

Mr BAKER: Is there any difficulty with the Port Augusta project of which the Minister is aware in regard to siting of the conservatory? Is there any difficulty with that project getting under way as soon as a decision has been made on the conservatory, if that is appropriate?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There seem to be no siting difficulties. I have visited the projected site of the arid lands botanic garden. It is a good and imaginative site. Some interesting and exciting things could happen there. We do not have that sort of problem. The basic problem that Cabinet and, indeed, the Joint Committee of the Commonwealth and the State that is looking at this will have in relation to that initiative is its operating costs as we go down the track. With the tropical conservatory, and the high volume of tourist visitation to a city the size of Adelaide, there has to be some chance of being able to break even on the operating side. The best information I have at this stage is that it is unlikely that an arid lands botanic garden, located where it should be in the North of the State, can get anywhere near a break-even figure.

Mr BAKER: So, it is fairly important that the conservatory gets sorted out quickly.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Indeed.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the Wittunga Reserve, of which I have some knowledge as I used to live near it, and also to the Wittunga Botanic Garden. I presume moneys have been allocated, from what I read under 'Specific Targets'. From my viewing of the place, it could be subject to over-development and it is servicing the area well as it stands today without further improvement. Is it possible to transfer moneys from that line to upgrade the Windy Point Lookout?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I indicate first what is proposed for this expenditure. Did the honourable member mention a specific sum?

Mr BAKER: No, I did not have a sum available. It refers to a lake area, storage area, platform and surface paving for the nursery/administration area.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: We are looking at \$8 000 for garden beds; \$5 000 for the feeding platform; \$12 000 for paving of the nursery/administration area; and, \$15 000 for the storage area, giving a total of \$40 000. That is our present intention. It is for the honourable member to convince me that priorities are higher elsewhere. I do not think that that of itself would result in a significant over-development of the Wittunga garden. I am aware that we have to be sensitive to that possibility, but this expenditure itself does not seem to run that risk.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions on programme 1, I will go to programme 2.

Mr KLUNDER: I ask a general question, using programme 2 as an example. It seems that, if the Estimates of Payments are done on a line basis and the yellow book is on a programme basis, we cannot expect to have any correlation of funds until the final sum. However, the Department has now switched over to some form of programme performance budgeting and I would hope for a greater correlation between the yellow book and the Estimates of Payments. Using programme 2 as an example, I can see from page 87 that heritage conservation salaries and contingencies add up to \$1.577 million, and from the yellow book at page 17 I can see that for heritage conservation proposed recurrent expenditure is \$697 000 and capital expenditure is shown at \$1.643 million.

That totals \$2.34 million. Am I to understand that from page 173 in the Estimates of Payments the balance between \$1.577 million and \$2.34 million, namely \$762 000, would come from capital but that that has not been split according to programmes?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I think the honourable member is correct.

Mr Hill: There is a transfer from recurrent to capital for the purpose of the State Heritage Fund which would be the difference. On the bottom line of page 87, one will notice the amount of \$925 000. No, the capital otherwise is quite separate. The Loan Account provision of \$1.643 million on page 17 is separate. One has to net out the influence of the \$925 000 transfer to the State Heritage Fund to reconcile the numbers.

Mr KLUNDER: Therefore, the total of recurrent and capital in the yellow book of \$2.34 million should have \$925 000 subtracted from it?

Mr Hill: The real provision under recurrent would be the \$568 500, the \$77 000 and the \$7 400 which should reconcile, I would think, with the \$697 000. That is how it should come together.

Mr KLUNDER: Can information be provided on how the capital expenditure proposed at page 17 of the yellow book comes out of the capital expenditure on the Estimates of Payments at page 173?

Mr Hill: It is not clear why we accumulate the capital under those four headings; they do not relate directly to that programme in isolation, but are an accumulation. The Treasury dictates to us, and it includes a mixture of programmes.

Mr KLUNDER: Could I ask whether, in future, the department could split its proposed capital expenditure according to programmes so that it is in greater detail for honourable members to follow?

Mr Hill: In the line Estimates?

Mr KLUNDER: Yes.

Mr Hill: We in fact requested that of Treasury and for some reason that we do not understand it required these particular groupings. Our total capital expenditure is defined in the yellow book under the various programmes. Treasury, for reasons I am not aware of, required those four groupings which to me do not have any real significance.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: That is something that we should take up next year. As we indicated at the beginning of the Committee, we will be able to compare this financial year's programme budgeting with next year's where there is this line as opposed to the programme problem we have had to grapple with today.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the honourable member that again he was dealing with the yellow book, which deals with capital expenditure with which the line does not deal. The Chair has allowed the question to carry on but there are grave doubts in the Chair's mind as to whether we have not in fact strayed away from the actual line before us.

Mr KLUNDER: I appreciate your indulgence, Mr Chairman; it is a difficult matter.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Referring to page 17 of the yellow book I note that there has been a decrease in employment levels in the Department from 31 to 30 and from the 1983-84 figures of 33 to 30. Under 'Issues and trends' it is suggested that there is a greater awareness of and interest in the conservation of historic shipwrecks. On occasions in Parliament I have raised the need for more involvement on the part of the State and the Department with regard to historic shipwrecks. Can the Minister indicate what action has been taken since he has received representations on this matter and also whether, at this stage, the State has been able to receive any financial assistance from the Commonwealth regarding the administration of that legislation?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: First, there has been a reduction of three in employment levels as a result of the completion of our involvement in certain National Estate projects. This is more Commonwealth money that tends to come and go. The people are employed under contract and therefore as more money becomes available and we are able to take advantage of it, of course, those contract positions will be taken up. That seems to represent the major variation, in view of the increase in the Aboriginal heritage area, which will represent two salaries for half a year, because that is about when the appointees will be taken on.

In relation to marine archeology, that continues to be a source of some concern to me. I am not aware of any specific assistance that currently is available from the Commonwealth for the implementation of the joint legislation. We have for the time being to be very grateful for the fact that a large amount of voluntary surveillance occurs from groups of people who are interested in diving and who often are the source of information as to all particular shipwrecks and who obviously have a continuing interest in the preservation of them.

The honourable member will recall that last year's Budget provided for funds for the purchase of a boat to enable our officer to better get around his area of responsibility, and I would hope that in time we will be able to provide additional resources. We felt that the priority for this financial year in

the general heritage area was in Aboriginal heritage, and that is why the additional appointments will be secured in that area.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When I asked the Minister a question earlier this year on the matter of wardens, he indicated that the provision of wardens was being looked at. Under the Historic Shipwrecks Act there is no provision for wardens. However, there is the provision of the appointment of inspectors, but as I understand it at this stage there are no voluntary wardens or inspectors under that legislation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: My recollection is that I have signed cards for people to operate as voluntary wardens.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In the past 12 months?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes. I do not recall specifically tying them to a clause in legislation, but the idea was to give these people who operate in a voluntary capacity some authority to deal with people who are hanging around and who have the potential for vandalism to these relics that we are trying to preserve. I will have to take advice for the honourable member as to the specific powers that we have been able to give these people.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Also, under 'Issues and trends', I note the increasing concern by Aborigines for the preservation of sites and items of importance to them. Is the Minister able to indicate where we are with the Aboriginal heritage legislation?

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have with me information that was requested earlier by the member for Murray relating to the fees paid to members of authorities, boards and committees. The honourable member said that, for the financial year 1983-84, \$240 300 had been voted and \$229 777 had been spent. He asked how much would be spent this year. The total expenditure this year is expected to be \$226 000.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Why the difference?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reduction in the amount may relate to the occasional slowness in filling positions. We could have the figures dissected, but the dissection would not be available this afternoon.

The Aboriginal heritage legislation, about which the honourable member asked a question, has been long awaited and there has been an ambitious programme of consultation both with Aboriginal communities throughout the State (they have been visited twice, so that we could discuss the legislation with them and seek their views) and with industry, especially the mining industry but also including the pastoral industry, which may be affected by the legislation. We are close to being able to go to Cabinet to get drafting instructions for a Bill and we are then committed to further public consultation. It will probably be some time yet before this legislation is ready for introduction to Parliament, but certainly a draft Bill will be available for public consultation within a reasonably short time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand that the current balance in the State Heritage Fund is \$925 000.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The yellow book, at page 17, refers to European heritage item identification and protection, under which is listed 'Historic Towns 1986'. What is that all about? I was not aware that there was a specific programme on historic towns for 1986. I have been made aware, as a result of a letter from the Minister, that discussions are taking place between his Department, the Highways Department and the Department of Tourism, about the preparation of a policy concerning heritage sign posting in South Australia. I have received strong representations on behalf of the people of Hahndorf who are keen to have a

sign post erected indicating that Hahndorf is a significant heritage or historic town, and I strongly support that request. Such a sign post would be good for tourism and I see no problem concerning anyone getting upset or offended about the erection of such a sign post. Will the Minister say how genuine are the discussions that are referred to in my letter, and when it is likely that there will be a response?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I ask the Director-General to reply to that question.

Mr Phipps: 'Historic Towns 1986' is just one activity in the European heritage subprogramme and it has not yet reached the programme stage. We have had funding from the Jubilee 150 Board to investigate historic trails which are tourist routes, which people can follow, and which involve certain towns. So, a small amount of investigation is proceeding to see whether we could have specific historic trails established by 1986.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When is the sign posting policy to be put into effect?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have no information here on that matter. We are looking to a common design and a set of criteria as to location of the signs. The town referred to, Hahndorf, which is an important town in the honourable member's district, would automatically qualify for this sort of treatment once a policy is laid down. However, I have had no recent report on progress, so I will get the information.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If the Minister could treat that matter as urgent I should be grateful.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Right.

Mr HAMILTON: Regarding the Aboriginal heritage subprogramme for which increased recurrent and capital allocations have been made this financial year, will the Minister say what sums are involved and on what will the money be spent?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This has been part of the report referred to when I indicated earlier that two more people would be employed in the area of Aboriginal heritage. One full-time equivalent only is listed because it is expected that the recruitment of these people will take a little time and that they will not be on the staff until the middle of this financial year. The programme is designed to provide for site assessment and protection work in this area. An increased sum of \$178 000 will be provided for survey work. In terms of additional accession of staff, only two areas of my responsibility receive an increase in this Budget, and they are in this Department (national parks and Aboriginal heritage). We believe that the latter requires a boost.

Mr HAMILTON: The member for Peake has requested me to ask the Minister how many Aboriginal rangers are employed by the Department in national parks and in other jobs. Where are they employed? Is it planned to increase the number of Aborigines employed by the Department? The Northern Territory Government has a system of employing Aborigines at Kakadu National Park with the aim of eventually allowing the Aborigines to take over the complete running of the park. Has the Minister's Department a similar plan, as stated?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As was mentioned earlier, three men were trained under the Commonwealth scheme and a little while ago were taken on to the full-time staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. They are all employed at the Gammon Range National Park. As far as I am aware, they are the only people of Aboriginal descent who occupy ranger positions. Of course the NESA scheme is an important source of employment and effort for us, and from time to time people from that scheme have been employed both at the Botanic Gardens and with the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Also, three people of Aboriginal descent are employed as heritage rangers in the Heritage Conservation Branch. So,

in effect we have three national park rangers and three heritage rangers. Further, an unspecified number involved in the NESAs scheme have been employed from time to time. I cannot be certain about this, but there may also be some people who are employed in a blue collar capacity in the National Parks area as park keepers or whatever who are in fact of Aboriginal descent.

As to beefing up this whole approach, we hope that we will be able to have a further training scheme similar to the one that was carried out at Balcanoonna until recently. In those circumstances we would expect that any people involved in that scheme, provided that they had successfully negotiated the training period, would then be taken on strength. I am told that as a result of a reclassification a person of Aboriginal descent who was employed as a park keeper is now employed as a ranger at the Lincoln National Park. So an extra one can be added to the figures that I gave. I thank the honourable member for his question: it is something that we are very keen to do, but the fully classified ranger can only be taken on following a detailed period of training. It is something that the Commonwealth is keen on doing, and we are hoping to work along with them.

Mr HAMILTON: I notice that under 'Heritage Conservation' a table for 1984-85 is provided concerning restoration and interpretation work at Fort Glanville. Can the Minister outline how far the work has progressed and what is intended from now on, particularly bearing in mind the application for \$2.1 million under the CEP scheme? What progress has been made in that regard, and when is it likely that that will be finalised? Can the Minister give some details on that? In conjunction with a previous question asked by the member for Murray, can the Minister advise what heritage signposting is to be carried out in the north-western suburbs? As the Minister would appreciate there is a considerable number of heritage items in the north-western suburbs. I want some information about this because I think it is most important, because of the amount of heritage that is in that area and in the Port Adelaide area generally.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: A portion of the City of Port Adelaide is itself a heritage area. It was either the first or the second heritage area in South Australia to be proclaimed, the first I think being the Moonta mines area. I anticipate that the Port Adelaide area would automatically qualify for the type of signposting to which the honourable member referred. Other areas, of course, would have to await identification. However, in regard to that portion of Port Adelaide there is no doubt that the new policy as it evolves would apply to it.

In regard to Fort Glanville, a consultative committee has been established involving the Fort Glanville Historical Society, and it is directly involved in the management of the site. A draft management plan under the National Parks and Wildlife Act has been released only in the past week for public comment, and the details of what is to be achieved down there under CEP funding has been outlined in that document. We understand that to do the full job we would be looking at an all up cost of about \$2 million: about \$250 000 of that amount has already been provided from the Jubilee 150 fund. The exciting development which is set out in the management plan and which I know will have the support and interest of honourable members is something that we are fairly confident of being able to achieve over a span of years with the initial work identified being covered by the provision that we have received from Jubilee 150.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister advise what is the closing date for submissions in relation to that report? I want to provide to people in my electorate who are interested in this some idea of the time that is available to make submissions.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: This management plan is similar to many which the National Parks and Wildlife Service releases. It is a different sort of heritage that the National Parks and Wildlife Service is covering here. Normally, two months are allowed for public comment. We would expect to adhere to that without, of course, precluding people who might want to put in a submission, say, two days after the closing date—we would not be too strict about that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has a decision been made that Fort Glanville will remain with the National Parks and Wildlife Service?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I was not aware that that was altogether up for grabs. It is with the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and a conscious decision would be required before it went elsewhere. I know that there has been some speculation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am suggesting that there may be a conscious decision for it to become more involved with perhaps the History Trust.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: From time to time the suggestion has been made that perhaps the History Trust should become involved. Of course, the History Trust is under the purview of the Premier as Minister for the Arts. At present no serious negotiation, of which I am aware, is occurring in regard to a transfer.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I turn now to the controversy that has occurred over the Mount Barker police radio tower. I do not want to go into a lot of detail. The Minister would be aware of my concern for the need for that tower to be built as a matter of urgency. There has been much speculation in the local media, as well as on a wider base, as to the importance of the site with regard to Aboriginal heritage. Can the Minister indicate quite clearly what the status is and whether any proof at all has been adduced concerning the suggestions that the area is of significance, particularly as a burial site, for Aborigines? I appreciate that the Minister has given approval for the tower to proceed, but it is not proceeding and we know why. What is the exact situation? I understand that approval was given with some conditions set down. I would like to know what those conditions were.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The approval was given subject to the area which contains the claimed Aboriginal site being locked off from the rest of the mountain so that no vehicular access would be able to go into that area. Also, some redesign of the building was undertaken to provide for a generally lower profile than that of the original design.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am referring to the police tower—I thought you mentioned the building.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I am sure that there is a small building that is ancillary to the tower.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I was not aware that there was any concern about the building; concern expressed to me related to the tower.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: The honourable member is correct. I do not know that the argument was ever about the building ancillary to the tower, but we took the opportunity to get a redesign of that building. The honourable member simply asked me what conditions had been placed on it, and I want to give him the full information, as I understand it. I was going to address myself to the question of what hard evidence had been made available.

I have been given no hard evidence which would enable one to determine in a court of law (or something like that) that this area was the subject of specific ceremonies, burial rites, and so on, so far as Aborigines are concerned. The claims have been twofold: first, there have been two structures, sites or whatever one likes to call them, which have been said to be of some significance. One was some sticks in a tree, which could (and I stress could) relate to above-ground burial techniques. However, my people have not

been able to get sufficient access to that site to do an analysis on the wood to find out how old the structure is. Secondly, there were some claims in relation to a circle of stones and some charred material within the stones which could possibly be subjected to radio-carbon analysis if we really wanted to tie this down. Again, we have been denied access to that material.

The second claim is the more general: that there are people whose ancestry relates to that area and who claim to have been told by their parents that the whole of the mountain was of particular ceremonial significance to the Aborigines dating from tribal days. I guess that one would have to say from a scientific point of view that it is all pretty airy-fairy, but at the same time there are these Aborigines—a very small number, because there are very few Aborigines who can trace any sort of ancestry to those Aborigines who originally lived in the areas—who are making these claims.

In the light of those claims, of course, there has been a ban by the union movement on any work immediately in that area. The Government's tactic in these matters—as it was, for example, in the Aurora controversy in town—is not a crash-through or crash type of approach but rather to endeavour to conciliate in the matter to see what is possible in the general interest.

My colleague, the Minister of Public Works, was on the mountain yesterday and talked to some people, and negotiations are still continuing. The honourable member is probably aware that there has been an offer of the sale to the Government of some land adjacent to the Mount Barker site on which a tower could be built without significant opposition from Aborigines or, so far as I am aware, from the people who on what they call 'broad environmental grounds' have had objections, and certainly without any opposition from the trade union movement itself. I have that clearly from them. The problem with this alternative site is that the tower would have to be taller in order to span the same area and would, therefore, be more expensive to build.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: And not as effective.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It could be as effective, but only by making it higher and therefore larger at the base, and more expensive. So, that is the problem that we face in this alternative. The other point that perhaps would be of interest to the honourable member is that it would also be more obvious from the settled area of Mount Barker and surrounding districts, so that people who have had what we might call an aesthetic objection to building the tower on Mount Barker may even have a stronger aesthetic objection to the alternative site.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Exactly! Can the Minister indicate (if he is not able to now, on a future occasion) who the Aborigines were that put the claim before the Government?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have had a meeting with some Aborigines, some people of European descent and a solicitor. I assume that the people who were there intended that it should be a matter of public record because with my permission they took a tape recording of what was said. So, I really have no compunction in providing that information, which is being prepared for me now. The Aboriginal people who were present in the capacity of people representative of what one might call the Mount Barker area (as opposed to people who were simply there from Adelaide because they get involved in those things) were a Mr Paul Smith, Mr and Mrs Roberts—and I believe that Mr Roberts goes by the pseudonym of 'Bluey'—and Mr Jimmy James, who I believe is the same person who is well known as a tracker.

Mr HAMILTON: I would like to ask a question about European Heritage Week. I would like the Minister to spell

out the Government's capital works programme for European heritage conservation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Are we dealing with capital at this stage?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): That item might be in the capital line, which will have to be taken later. We should keep it in order; otherwise chaos will develop.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We certainly have the information for the honourable member when it is appropriate.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on programme 2?

Mr BAKER: The explanation that we have just heard from the Minister amazes me: it related to the Aboriginal heritage significance of the Mount Lofty Ranges and to the sticks and stones that exist there as sites. My limited reading suggests that there are no living relatives of the lineage of those people who inhabited the Adelaide Plains some 150 years ago. When does the Minister believe that the matter will be resolved? From everyone's point of view, obviously the deficiencies in communications during the last bushfire were significant in relation to the ultimate holocaust that eventuated. When does the Minister believe that there will be either an establishment or rejection of a claim or, alternatively, a rationalisation of alternative siting? Is the Minister working towards a time table?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I guess that the time table is not really mine; it is that of the Minister of Public Works. It is his Department that has arranged through a contractor for this to be built. Its client, in turn, is the Police Department. My formal role in this is as Minister responsible for the protection of Aboriginal heritage. I suppose that I have a further role: as Minister responsible for development control. However, in relation to that latter matter, of course, that has already been discharged because it was treated as a section 7 application. Due notice was given to the Parliament at the beginning of Question Time one day on the recommendation of the Commission, so that matter has been disposed of. It gets back to the other material. As I have indicated to the honourable member's colleague, to the extent that I have been able to discharge my function I have done so.

I have had difficulty in discharging this function because my advisers have not been able to get the full access to the claimed sites that they would have liked in order to advise me and the honourable member properly. Of course, we have done a thorough research of the reading, and the most that we can come up with is that what is claimed is not in conflict with what we know of Aboriginal cultural activities in the southern Mount Lofty Ranges. However, that is a long way away from establishing a claim, and I am not aware that any formal claim is being contemplated. All that has been said is that there are Aborigines who claim that the summit is of ceremonial significance, and the unions potentially involved in the construction of the tower have accepted this claim to the extent of *pro tem* placing a ban on the site.

As I have also indicated to the Committee, my colleague in furtherance of the project has been there and has had further discussions with the lone picket who was there when he arrived and, secondly, with a crowd of people who arrived soon after, having somehow been made aware of the fact that the Minister was there. I do not know what my colleague's time table is, but my formal function has really been discharged to the extent that we have been allowed to discharge it. The other point I make is that the reason for my slip of the tongue in relation to the list of names earlier was that the solicitor who was there from the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement is another Paul (Mr Paul White).

Mr BAKER: I raised the Mount Lofty issue as part of a general question in regard to guidelines. I understand that 11 bodies have been identified in connection with the Aboriginal heritage. Under what guidelines is this identification process taking place, and will the principle that has come to light in terms of the Mount Lofty site be an accepted form of recognition of listings in the future?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The procedure that has been gone through at Mount Barker falls far short of what anyone would regard as a satisfactory procedure for any sort of listing. What should happen ideally when there is a claim for significance which should have the protection of legislation (and, as the honourable member would know, at present we have only a very limited relics legislation in operation in relation to such matters) is as follows: first, following a claim there should be a search of the anthropological literature so that we can satisfy ourselves that what is being claimed is not in conflict with what is known; and, secondly, there should be some analysis of the material brought forward if in fact analysis is appropriate. I mentioned earlier that antiquity can be a component in these matters. If one can establish that a particular artifact or burial site that is claimed to represent practices that stopped 100 years ago in particular areas is in fact only five years old, then one is pushing against the wind a little to substantiate the claim.

Mr BAKER: That is the exact point. I wonder what the guidelines are.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Therefore, dating becomes, I would have thought, an important aspect of the analysis in certain circumstances.

Mr BAKER: I will not labour the point, but if one has been refused access to the site to enable samples to be taken, that principle means that whenever a claim is made there is the right of any individual to say, 'You cannot take samples to prove one way or the other, but it is proven anyway because we have made a claim.' Where does one satisfy that situation?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: No-one is making a claim at this stage except in the very general sense which, for their own reasons, has satisfied the constructing unions. There is no attempt to prevent me from going on to the mountain—or, indeed my colleague, because he went there yesterday—although, earlier, when some of my officers attempted to obtain material for analysis from those sites, I understand that they were constrained from doing so. I do not know who constrained them: I assume that they were the pickets who were operating on the mountain at the time. If the honourable member is saying that it is a totally unsatisfactory procedure so far as listing is concerned, I agree with him. However, listing is not a matter that is in issue at this stage. If the honourable member is saying that, if we are to have a satisfactory system of listing of artifacts, sites and areas of significance, and we should do something other than simply follow the procedure that has been followed in this case, again, I fully agree with him.

Mr GUNN: I understand that this is the appropriate line on which to raise the Minister's Department's involvement in an extensive proposal that the District Council of Hawker has put forward for Federal funding under the employment scheme. Can the Minister advise whether his Department is doing everything possible to assist the Hawker council and to convince his colleague's officers that this is not only a worthwhile project but also one which would have considerable benefit to tourism?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: My understanding is that indeed assistance is coming from the State to the district council in its approach to the Commonwealth, and more detailed information may be available from my officers. One of the components of the project would be a national parks display,

and that has been placed specifically before us for funding, although there has been no final decision. In addition, we are assisting in the approach to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is it possible (and this information can be provided at a later stage) for an up-to-date listing of the items that are registered on the list of heritage items in this State and on the interim register to be provided?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Indeed, all that information can be provided.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, we will now deal with programme 3.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Programme 3 refers to 'Conservation policy and programme development'. In the 1983-84 specific targets, mention is made of action initiated to protect South Australia's wet lands. In the 1984-85 specific targets appears the following:

Survey remaining wet lands and define programme of policies and actions for protection of remaining wet lands.

What action has been taken or is being taken in regard to the recent reports on the preservation of wet lands?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: First, there have been certain purchases of land and negotiations for the purchase I think of Butchers Lake, Poocher Swamp and Naen Naen Swamp in the South-East. These are all areas that will eventually come under the care and control of national parks. In the arid north of the State, the Dalhousie purchase (Mound Springs) is a very important and unique wet land area that is now potentially under protective covenant. It has not yet taken its place in the national parks system. I wonder whether I might invite Mr David Ellis, our Acting Director of Conservation Programmes, to add a little more detail to what I have said.

Mr Ellis: The Wet Lands Report recommended the formation of two main committees: one for fresh water wet lands and one for coastal wet lands. Both those committees are now in action, and that is why the provision of the report was an achievement last year, and it is ongoing this year. The Minister has explained some of the fresh water purchases. On the coastal side there is a large mapping task proceeding to find out exactly the areas of sand fire and mangrove predominantly that exist around the State, and that will be undertaken this year with the assistance of the Department of Lands mapping people.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does the South-Eastern Wet Lands Committee still exist?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: At one stage two committees were in operation: one was the South-Eastern Wet Lands Committee, which has long since reported; and the other was a broader committee jointly formed between me and the Minister of Water Resources to look at the total State picture. That committee is still in operation, but the earlier committee, having given its report, was wound up.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under the heading '1984-85 Specific Targets/Objectives,' we find 'Promote roadside vegetation guidelines with councils, seek legislative protection'. How is that promotion proceeding, and how is it being implemented? I am also interested in any legislation that will be brought down relating to this matter.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: First, the guidelines have been completed and are to be published for general consultation. There is an allocation in the lines for that printing and the follow-up work to occur. There is no decision at this stage for specific legislation. I have not put anything before my colleagues, and it is a little difficult at this stage to canvass whether we will even decide that legislation is appropriate or whether a general programme of consultation with local government and a general education programme will be sufficient to secure our objectives. The money is set aside for that promotion of the guidelines that have now been agreed upon.

Mr BAKER: I was unsure when I read the book about the reason for protecting roadside vegetation. Is it to protect people from bush fires or to protect the vegetation?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The basic thrust of it is to protect the vegetation that is there. If one looks, for example, at Yorke Peninsula, apart from the coastal vegetation and the Innes National Park in the south-western corner, practically all that is left is the roadside vegetation, because the rest has long since been cleared for one of the most productive agricultural areas of the State. We see the roadside vegetation as providing some sort of corridors of haven for what is left of the natural fauna there.

Of course, the proper management of this vegetation resource is important and has a bearing on the hazard that it could sometimes cause. What is perhaps not always recognised is that some substantial impact on the natural vegetation can bring weed growth which is likely to be more subject to the influence of wildfire than is the original natural vegetation.

Mr BAKER: I was thinking of the situation particularly in relation to roads in the Hills. It has been suggested to me that there is a need for a far greater clearance from Hills roads. During the Ash Wednesday bush fire the Upper Sturt Road was full of cars being driven by people trying to get back to their houses after they had heard one of the messages on the radio that they should go home. It is believed that if a fire had got through to that road up to 100 people could have been incinerated because the vegetation is so close to the road. The motor vehicles would have provided inadequate protection for their passengers, because it is such a narrow road. I am interested in how the two conflicting interests can be managed: on the one hand, there are areas with little vegetation left on the roadside; and on the other hand, there are areas where there are enormous amounts of vegetation that really needs to be cleared back.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I would imagine this is the sort of thing that will eventually come through from our fire hazard mapping which is being undertaken. It is a significant initiative, and obviously we would have to turn to the Adelaide Hills as the first area for this type of mapping. I did originally think that the honourable member was talking more about the rural situation, but I now see that his concern is more with the Hills. Of course, it is certainly true that roadside vegetation forms only a small proportion of the total fire mass. I would imagine that when the fire hazard maps are finally available we will be talking to local government about what has to be done for the management of that resource.

Mr BAKER: Can the Minister tell me under whose control are the mangrove swamps that extend from Outer Harbor to St Kilda and points farther north and what studies have been done on these particular mangroves? I understand that proposals have been made to infill some of that land.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Really, two Ministers are involved. First, the Minister of Fisheries is responsible for some of that area. In addition, what I think is sometimes in popular parlance called the Everglades (the area south of St Kilda coming through to Swan Alley Creek, Broad Creek and North Arm Creek) is one of those areas which was purchased under the old State Planning Authority with money from the Planning and Development Fund. With the demise of the State Planning Authority that land was formally transferred to the name of the Minister for Environment and Planning, and we are looking at that area very seriously as either a conservation reserve to be managed under normal national parks programmes or else as an area which has potential for our second generation parkland proposal which, of course, is now reasonably down the track, having been publicly announced some time ago.

Much work has gone into the studies on the ecological balance of this and, coincidentally, Mr Ellis, as well as the formal position he is holding with us today, also services the Coast Protection Board and is Manager of the Coast Management Branch. He might like to expand a little further on this specific work that is being done on mangroves.

Mr Ellis: Much of the mangroves are on unallotted Crown land. There is a joint committee between the Fisheries Department, which has an interest, the Lands Department, which administers the unallotted Crown lands, and the Department of Environment and Planning because of the interests in mangroves as an important area. This joint committee is looking at the tenure operations involved in some of the mangrove areas.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: A short time ago I inspected a boardwalk which is being constructed from St Kilda down through some of that Everglades area using CEP funds and which will be opened to the public some time in November. It is a first-class facility with bird hides being constructed along the way so that the 'ornies' (as they are called) can watch the birds to their heart's content. I urge all members to take the opportunity to go out there some sunny afternoon and have a good look.

Mr Hamilton: The programme includes plans for further greening of Adelaide this year. Can the Minister advise of any more details of this project, particularly in relation to the greening of Port Road, leading to the Port?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Yes, I certainly can. The Department is involved in a co-ordinating and promotional role in relation to improving the aesthetics of Port Road, the median strip and the roadside. An amount of \$26 000 is proposed for the employment of a technical officer to implement design activities and co-ordinate planting activities during the 1985 planting season. In addition, there is a programme for the greening of the stock paddock area, which is seen as being an important element of the second generation parkland concept. An amount of \$4 000 has been set aside for the employment of consultants to work with us. There is also the greening of the Glenelg tram line, which was officially opened by the Premier some time ago. About two-thirds of that planting programme was completed in June this year and \$44 300 has been budgeted for the continuing of this programme.

Mr BAKER: I put two Questions on Notice about the greening of Adelaide, both related to a study that I encountered many years ago when I was involved in the criminal statistical area and the Minister, when he read the Question on Notice, must have wondered what it was all about. Perhaps I could provide a fairly brief explanation.

An American study showed that as soon as cover in the form of trees, bushes, and so on, is provided around commercial premises—and it has the statistics to bear this out—they were subject to a greater number of break-ins, arson and other unacceptable activities, merely because this sort of activity could be well hidden from passing motor or foot traffic. I asked the question so that some of these well meaning programmes take into account what may be done in some cases to improve an area may ultimately be to its detriment. I ask the Minister again to review any evidence. I cannot name the study but it was made available about 1975, when I was involved with the central crime body in Canberra.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The honourable member has not yet received my answer to his Question on Notice, although I have answered it, because the House has not sat to receive the question. I hope that he will not find that I was unduly abrupt when I answered it. From memory the question was 'Are you considering a study?' and the answer of course is 'No'.

Mr BAKER: I have a follow up question.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That has not come to me at that stage. From the point of view of the individual who owns those premises, it is a trade off between what would be a marginal improvement, on the one hand, in the aesthetics of the property and, on the other hand, a marginal deterioration in the security. I have no doubt that the honourable member is correct and that the survey is correct. I can recall, as Minister of Education, on one occasion initiating a programme for security of a school which involved floodlighting—

Mr BAKER: That is the most effective means of stopping it.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: —on the grounds that that would tend to identify anyone who was wandering around the site when they should not have been. It is part of the same principle. It gets down to whether there are other security measures which can be put into place and which will redress the marginal deterioration in security which is brought about by the planting process.

Mr BAKER: Or the other way around. Let us think about the greening process so that we do not have the security deterioration.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: All right. Our concern as a Department and mine as a Minister is that we want a good greening programme to go on. People who come into the programme have to be aware of these qualifications to the whole business, but how exactly they redress them to their benefit is for them.

Mr BAKER: My concern was that they would not necessarily appreciate at first that their process of beautification could put their premises at risk.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): Order! Before the Minister answers that, I would like to make clear that the Chair would like to be involved in the interchange between the Minister and the Committee.

Mr BAKER: It is clarification only, Mr Chairman.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Prior to the last election the Minister indicated that it was the Government's policy to appoint a full-time Chairman to the Environmental Protection Council. Is it intended that that should occur? I did not note any financial provision for it. Also, what current resources are provided to that council and does the Government intend to increase those resources?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There is no intention of giving the EPC a full-time Chairman. It is one of those things that seemed a good idea at the time, but from a different perspective it is perhaps seen in a different light. The resources currently available to the EPC are no different from the resources available to the EPC when the honourable member was Minister. I would hope that the EPC may be able to take a more active role in policy formulation and, in some respects, implementation. With time I would have to admit to perhaps having moved a little more slowly in relation to this matter than I have in many matters in my portfolio.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note, under the 1983-84 'Specific targets', that a report was completed on South Australia's firewood resources, that a Government committee was established to co-ordinate action, and that we are looking in 1984-85 to defining policies and actions regarding firewood resources. Would it be possible to obtain a copy of that report?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We can certainly make the report available to the honourable member. It is not completed or printed but it is very close to being completed. When the honourable member receives it it will be in typewritten form—as long as he appreciates that that is the form that I am receiving it in, too.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister is not down the track to defining a policy?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: No.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am anxious to know the recommendations to come out of the report and what will be done about the resources.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: So am I.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mention is made under the 1983-84 'Specific targets/objectives' that a departmental strategic plan was prepared. Is that an ongoing plan? A plan was prepared during my term as Minister. Is this an updated plan or a new plan?

Mr Phipps: That item is referring to the corporate planning process in the Department and the co-ordination component for the various programmes that make up that plan. It comes from that area of the Department so it is really the ongoing of the planning process.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister provide some details about the State of South Australia Environment Report?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That matter is almost ready to come to me for consideration. It is something that has evolved over a couple of years now. There have been various ways in which the other States have approached this matter. Victoria has a regular annual reporting process of this nature.

Mr Ellis: I have little more to add. An officer was liberated from other duties last year specifically to update the earlier report. I understand that his report has been typed but as yet has not been bound.

Mr Phipps: One of the priority actions in the national conservation strategy of Australia, which most States have now endorsed, was that there should be regular reporting by the States on the conditions of the environment. At present, a national project is working on a process and guidelines by means of which the States may easily prepare regular reports on the state of the environment. That is the specific context for this activity.

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

Mr Phipps: I would expect so. We have not yet reached the point of defining all the parameters to be covered in the report. The major purpose of such reports is that, as public documents, they inform and make the community aware of the state of the environment.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I understand that most of the States have at this stage not underwritten the national conservation strategy, although most have given some sort of assent to an approach such as this. A thoroughgoing acceptance of the national conservation strategy that this Government has accepted has not been replicated in the other States. Major projects are now required to be placed before Cabinet and justified in terms of the national conservation strategy. It is expected that in the long run all States will endorse this strategy in the same form as we have, but that is yet to happen.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I read somewhere that a working party had been set up to consider a strategy plan for South Australia. I take it that that is the plan?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What specific incentives are being provided by the Government at present to promote tree planting in rural areas?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: As a Department, we are not involved in that at this stage. I understand that the Woods and Forests Department has a programme whereby trees can be provided at cost but, as a Department, we have not those sorts of resources. Our Department is doing things such as broad acre seeding trials to see how much such seeding can contribute to the revegetation of parts of our agricultural areas. However, up to the present there have been no specific incentives, certainly not under my care and control.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has the Minister details of the proposed national seminar on techniques used for revegetation trials?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is not something in which I am involved: it is obviously a seminar at officer level. Mr Ellis may have details.

Mr Ellis: True, there is a seminar and papers have been prepared for it by people within the Department working on the seeding referred to by the Minister. I am certain that those papers could be made available to honourable members.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would appreciate that. My last question relates to the funds allocated in 1983-84 for the purchase of the Wakefield Street property for the Conservation Council. I understand that that property cost \$178 000?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I take it that that property has been purchased by the Government and leased to the council?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

Mr Hill: The Government has 75 per cent ownership and the council 25 per cent. The council contributed \$60 000, the Government \$180 000.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Have approaches been made to the Government by other organisations that would like similar treatment?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes, the United Farmers and Stockowners wrote to me.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What was the response of the Minister?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I pointed out that, in fact, the Conservation Council was seen as an umbrella organisation and that, as a result of this initiative both on its part and on the part of the Government, about 48 tributary or satellite organisations had been helped, and that, if people wanted to take advantage of this Government initiative, perhaps they should look to affiliating to the Conservation Council.

Mr HAMILTON: The yellow book, at page 20, states that specific studies have been completed on a review on an alternative protection strategy for metropolitan beaches. Will the Minister say what action has been taken as a result of recommendations made as a result of those studies?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The broad thrust of the recommendations is along these lines: a major replenishment of the metropolitan coastline can only follow on the identification of a sand resource that would enable this to be undertaken. As the honourable member would know, although Governments for the past 10 years have been searching onshore and offshore for such a resource, it has yet to be identified in a form that is visible. For instance, some sand resources comprise too fine a grain, therefore the material would be moved northward along the beaches by the long shore drift much too quickly to have a stabilising effect on the coastline. So, until this resource is identified, what we have been doing for the past 10 years appears to be the best strategy: that is, a limited replenishment strategy, involving sand from the area of accretion on the northern beaches, and also from areas such as Torrens Island, which contains remnant dunes with sand that would be suitable for some replenishment. That is the general thrust that dictates that we continue with the annual sand replenishment programme. We are doing that and funds are being set aside here for that purpose. In view of Mr Ellis's pivotal position in this matter, he may care to expand.

Mr Ellis: I have little to add. We are continuing to look for sand. A preliminary report on work done after the review was completed will be with the Coast Protection Board by next Monday when it meets. The situation in

respect of offshore sands does not appear to be promising at this stage, although we will investigate that aspect.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Minister satisfied at this stage with the composition and structure of the Coast Protection Board?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What consultation has taken place between developers and the Coast Protection Board about the development that was recently announced for the Patawalonga?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: A meeting has been arranged. At this stage this is only a concept with no formal development proposition before me, as Minister responsible for development control, and I would imagine that it would be some time before we would be in that position. Speaking only from newspaper reports, I believe that the developers have talked about sand pumping procedures and have suggested that such a procedure as a cost against the total cost of the project would provide some permanent resolution of the Patawalonga inlet-outlet problem.

Of course we are very interested in looking very closely at that as an initiative. I assume that the meeting was set up at the initiative of the developers. A joint meeting is to take place shortly, and it will, I guess, be tentative and will explore at this stage just the questions that have to be answered.

Mr HAMILTON: The Minister would be aware that I have forwarded a submission to his office about the question of access along beaches in South Australia. The Government was good enough to provide access to the beach in the West Lakes and Tennyson area for a constituent of mine who is in a wheel chair. I know that that was much appreciated. How far has the Government addressed this problem concerning access by disabled people? The Minister would be aware of what has taken place in Western Australia, for example, in regard to access that has been provided for disabled people along beaches. I believe that this is a matter that must be addressed, particularly with the increasing number of aged people in this country. I believe that those people should not be denied access and that every attempt should be made to provide access for them so that they can enjoy what most of us take for granted.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: This in part brings me back to my walkway at St Kilda. In fact, a portion of that was constructed specifically to allow disabled people to take advantage of it. We are anxious to expand those sorts of initiatives. Of course it is not easy. Sometimes structures built to try to accommodate these problems over time are subject to a good deal of erosion and therefore damage. For example, at Port Noarlunga South a boardwalk was put in some years ago, but that has now been undermined. Eventually it will be renewed, and that may even be seen as a component of the rebuilding of the Southport Surf Life Saving Club that is occurring at the moment, although I am not sure about that. When one considers what must be done to secure access for the disabled there (after all, it is probably the favourite spot for the South Australian Surf Life Saving Championships), one is looking at going down a bit of a hill from the access road to a bridge (which in itself creates no problems for those in a wheelchair), and then going along a beach adjacent to the Onkaparinga River and then up over the dune before one gets to the beach. So, it is quite a sizeable project to be undertaken. Even when that has been done, because of the dynamic nature of the dune structure, one can get shifting sand and therefore some undermining of it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Which electorate is that in?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: A very famous electorate—Baudin. Of course, the boardwalk was put there many years ago. I suppose it could be regarded as a bit of a strike

against the local member that there has not been some renewal of what is a dangerous structure. I simply refer to that as an example of some of the problems that one has in this regard. Of course, one could find beaches where access for the disabled is much easier and where one does not have a river or a dune system to cross.

Mr HAMILTON: Has there been consultation with disabled aged groups in the community?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: There has, for example, been a good deal of very positive response to the redesign of the Tantanoola cave which now makes that fully accessible to people in wheel chairs.

Mr HAMILTON: I think I know what the response from the Minister will be, but I will ask this question anyhow: I have received complaints from constituents who live in the Tennyson, West Lakes and Semaphore Park areas about dogs, horses, etc., on the beach. I understand that this matter is also under the jurisdiction of the local government authority. It is a matter about which people have been complaining for a considerable time. There is the problem of horse owners and trainers using the beach front, and, of course, the matter of the droppings from those animals. Many people are not greatly concerned about that, but those people who are not animal lovers express strong objection to it. Can the Minister give me some advice about the manner in which this should be handled. I find that this is rather a difficult problem because some people are animal lovers while others believe that no animals should be on the beach at all. Perhaps the Minister could give me some advice as to the best way of handling this.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I think a similar question was directed to Noah when he was Minister in another part of the world some time ago—it is a perennial problem! The responsibility in part is with the Minister of Local Government. Any regulations would be brought down under the Local Government Act. Our approach to the matter has been to try to get some co-ordination between local government authorities in the area through the consultative committee that advises us in these matters. The consultative committee is representative of local government. That seemed to be the appropriate vehicle for getting a co-ordinated approach to the problem. But I cannot in any way pretend that that has solved the problem or that it is one that is easily resolved.

Mr BAKER: In regard to the 1983-84 Budget allocation for coastal protection, an over-expenditure of \$120 000 occurred and there was an under-expenditure of \$55 000 for coastal management research. First, why was there an over-expenditure during 1983-84?

Secondly, I refer to the philosophical question of whether or not the money should be spent on research and whether we are going to continue with this very expensive system of grabbing sand from somewhere and dumping it somewhere else. I am sure that there must be a solution somewhere within our tidal systems which will allow us to perhaps get a satisfactory long term answer. I am concerned about the decrease in expenditure for research, and that dumping has been increased.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: First, the over-expenditure relates to a speedier commencement than was anticipated for the Witton Bluff protection work that is being undertaken. That work has been staged over several years, and in regard to those sorts of projects which are of a capital nature one is never sure exactly when the payments will fall due. That can cause distortions in the accounts for any given year, but that does not necessarily imply any significant over-expenditure over the total life of the project.

As to the particular matter that the honourable member raised, that very question about the picking up of sand from one spot and dumping it elsewhere was of course the total

matter that was addressed by the study about which his colleague has already asked me a question. We do not see that as being an expensive programme in terms of benefits that will eventually accrue to us. Certainly, without the replenishment programme, it would take only two energetic winters for Brighton to no longer have a beach, and, in terms of the impact on tourism incomes, and so on, that is quite substantial. Of course, with the beach going there would then be the impact of energetic seas on roads and property, because the beach provides some shield or abatement for tidal and wave energy.

It then gets back to what are the alternatives to what we are doing, which is, in effect, returning the sand whence it came courtesy of the long shore drift. That precisely is the matter that is addressed in the report.

For example, the report looks at a series of groynes which could be built across the beach and which would impede the long shore drift, at least to an extent, and build up reservoirs of sand. We can see the sort of thing that would happen: the breakwater at the Patawalonga outlet acts as a groyne; the energy of the emergent water from the Torrens River acts as a groyne; and even something as small as the little boat ramp at Christies Beach acts in a very minor way as a groyne.

The effect of this would be: first, to be extremely expensive; and, secondly, to alter permanently the appearance and nature of the beaches in a way that we think would probably be unacceptable to South Australians. A second alternative would be to build a series of breakwaters parallel to the beach. Obviously, water acts differently from gases. The Bernoulli theorem suggests that when gas goes through a smaller diameter it accelerates because the total volume going through has to be the same. But, liquids being incompressible, I suppose do not work that way so that, in fact, they slow down. I see the Acting Chairman nodding, having been a former physics teacher.

The effect of this, of course, is to dump the accumulated sediment with the reduction in the velocity of the water flow. One way of getting some beach growth in those areas would be to build offshore breakwaters. I take it that they could be submarine; they do not have to get above the surface, as long as there was some impedence in the long shore drift. However, again one has a very expensive programme and one which will permanently alter the general shape of the coastline.

So, the study says that we should look at a major replenishment option which may secure the health of the coastline for perhaps five to 10 years (something like that) and which would enable some break in the programme to occur; or, alternatively, we continue with the modest programme that we have. There are problems with the programme, which we are addressing. There was a problem in getting sand on to the beach at Brighton; that has largely been addressed.

One has to choose one's season properly, because in addition to the long shore drift there is an inward-outward motion that is associated with the seasons and a sand bank is being created offshore during the energetic period—the winter months. However, we have that pretty well licked. A good deal of work has been done. Mr Ellis could talk to us for hours about much of the work that has been done in charting sand movements. However, on present indications, the most cost effective means of ensuring that Adelaide continues to have the beaches that we have enjoyed for a long time is what we are doing at present.

Mr HAMILTON: I see at page 20 of the yellow book a comment about undertaking an inland waters recreation and boating programme. Can the Minister elaborate on that? I do not know whether it has any application to the West Lakes area; if it has, I would like to know. Also, would he give us a rundown on what is planned in that area.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: This traditionally has been applied almost exclusively to the Murray River and it relates to mooring facilities and things like that. The programme has run down in the last couple of years as the initial demands on it have largely been satisfied. The amount of money involved is very modest indeed, and the honourable member probably should look either to other areas of my portfolio or to my colleague, the Minister of Marine, for assistance in what he has in mind.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister indicate the cost of the study?

Mr Ellis: I believe that the original approval for the study was \$65 000, which is a very small amount for a study of such a size. However, other subsidiary studies have been done (both during and after the main study) that were put together in that main study. For example, we looked at sea grass recession separately. We had two separate consultant investigations and studies of that type, so to put a total figure on the cost would be difficult. However, I estimate that it would be well under \$100 000, which is rather cheap for that size of problem.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I think a report of the Coastal Management Branch or a media statement associated with it stated that the report by the Coastal Management Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning values Adelaide's beaches (including the southern beaches to Sellicks Beach) at \$6.4 million. How does one value beaches at \$6.4 million?

Mr Ellis: That is also claimed in the report and it is in more detail in one of the associated consultant's reports.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will go home and read the report. I have no further questions.

Mr HAMILTON: In relation to the disposal of sewage treatment water, can the Minister advise me what effects this has and what study has been carried out on the effects of its disposal into the sea? The Minister might tell me that that would come under the portfolio of the Minister of Water Resources, but I imagine that there would be some likely effect on the sea grasses and marine life along the Adelaide coastal regions. If there are areas of concern, what are they and what are the particular problems?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: As the member indicated, the prime responsibility is with the Minister of Water Resources; in fact, the E & WS Department has done some studies. We have assisted, through the Coastal Management Branch, with those studies. However, there remains an area of controversy as to the impact. Certainly, there has been some sea grass recession over time. It still seems to be somewhat of a moot point regarding the extent to which outfall at places like Glenelg and Christies Beach has affected the health of sea grasses and to the extent that it is the influence on sedimentation. Again, perhaps Mr Ellis might like to hazard some approaches for us here.

Mr Ellis: An investigation is now being funded by the Australian Marine Science Committee and undertaken by the Fisheries Department with some assistance from the Coastal Protection Board on this matter. Basically it is an E & WS responsibility to look at the effects of sewage on the natural marine environment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Klunder): We will now deal with programme 5.

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Dr Brian Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In connection with 1984-85 specific targets, stating 'Investigate the computerisation of herbarium data . . .' I would like a little more information, because I recognise the need for it.

Dr Morley: Discussions are taking place largely through the heads of herbaria organisations. A number of sister organisations in various States have computerised systems; the State Herbarium in South Australia does not, and the administration of the Board of the Botanic Gardens is concerned lest we lag too far behind other organisations. One can report that discussions only are taking place both with colleagues in the Department and colleagues interstate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have always had the feeling that it would be good for more people to be made aware of and to have more involvement with the Herbarium. There may be problems in regard to controlling people, staffing and that sort of thing, but I wonder how the Minister or Dr Morley feels about the possibility of more people becoming involved and whether that is a good thing. As far as the State is concerned, I recognise that we should be extremely proud of the work that is done in the Herbarium, and I would like some reaction.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I guess that knowledge is power. It is a fund of a considerable amount of information that should be available to South Australians to the maximum extent possible. Perhaps Dr Morley could give us an indication of the extent to which the general public uses the facility there or the extent to which agencies are able to and do take advantage of the facilities.

Dr Morley: There are facilities in the Herbarium for members of the public to use a reference collection so that they may identify their own plants under the loose supervision of the staff. Furthermore, it is possible for members of the public (usually groups) to have a guided tour of the State Herbarium. However, as the Minister has intimated, it is a research organisation, so it cannot be perpetually open for members of the public. The other aspect that may interest the Committee is that the Friends of the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide who now number some 700 have been very helpful in assisting the staff of the State Herbarium with a number of projects, and the administration of the Board of the Botanic Gardens is very grateful to the Friends for this purpose. Those are the main areas in which the public is involved in the State Herbarium.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions on programme 5, we will now deal with programme 6.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am concerned about the matter of reclassification, because I understand that there is a distinct likelihood that that matter will blow again. I am led to believe that the matter was supposed to have been clarified. In fact, it was indicated in a press release in April that it was understood that the keepers were told following a meeting with the Minister and other members that those who could justify that they were doing the work of park rangers would be classified as rangers grade 1 and were aware of the threats that were made to close the parks over Easter.

I would hate to see the parks closed over the October long weekend, which I understand is an important and busy time for park visitation. What is the current status? Has that situation been clarified? Is it a matter that needs to come before Parliament?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: So far as I am aware, the matter to which the honourable member has referred has now been completely resolved. I am interested in his comment that the thing could blow again. If that is the case, he knows more than I do. However, in case that is the position I call on Mr Nichols, Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, to give the Committee a rundown on the situation.

Mr Nichols: The Public Service Board and now Cabinet have agreed that most of those men will be reclassified to become rangers. I am not sure whether they have all been notified as to which of them fit into that category, and that

may be why there is some unrest among the men at present. They will be notified if they have not been already within the next week or so. Further, not all of them have been reclassified. Some do not particularly want to be reclassified; they realise that they are doing completely different kinds of work from the work of rangers, and they will have no objection to that. A handful will have to be reviewed at a later date because they were taken on during the course of this industrial consideration.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If that is the case, and if there is some uncertainty, I suggest that it would be good for all those involved to be notified because, as I understand it (and I have received that information very late), some concern is being expressed.

My next question relates to the preparation of management plans for parks, which is a subject about which I have questioned the Minister previously, particularly in relation to the commitment that was made before the last election when the now Minister indicated that plans prepared would contain specific recommendations as to the staffing level appropriate to the proper management of those parks and reserves. The answer provided by the Minister indicated that all the plans contain recommendations as to appropriate staffing levels. I would like to know whether the parks are carrying the recommended staffing levels.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The honourable member's understanding of this is perfectly correct. From a certain point when the policies are implemented all management plans that have been brought down from that time have had recommendations as to what is regarded as a reasonable staff to carry out what is recommended in the plan for the identity and continuing use of the park. In other words, the management plan sets out why a park is in a particular part of the State, what its natural resources are and how best they should be managed. It is only reasonable then that it should spell out what the staffing resources should be arising out of those considerations. When one comes to implement that, one runs into another set of considerations which have to do with dollars and cents. What I have set out to do is serve notice on Governments (present and future) as to what the proper staffing component would be, taking into account the ecological circumstances. That does not mean that the next day we are able to make that staff effective, but we are building up I believe some sort of clear picture as to what the staffing of the National Parks and Wildlife Service properly should be in terms of the resources it has to manage.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under the heading 'Agency Overview', the following reference appears:

Resources for future management of additional areas to be added to the national parks system are limited. Accordingly, the focus in this programme has to be confined to setting aside conservation areas in perpetuity, rather than upgrading management of these areas.

That is obviously a policy decision and one that we could fire backwards and forwards for the rest of the afternoon, but it is not my intention to do that other than to express concern to the Minister, as I have done previously, that while I recognise that it is important that areas of special significance should be set aside there is also growing concern (and I do not think I am over-emphasising this) in the community about under-management of some of the parks and reserves. I am aware of the additional areas that have been put under parks and reserves by the present Minister, and if that is to continue (I would prefer to address a different question on that at a later stage), if it is the policy of the Government not to increase staffing to improve management and to just continue to go on and add to the areas of land under parks and reserves, I think there will

be growing concern on the part of the community. I would like the Minister to comment on that.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Given that this Government has run for the past couple of financial years with pretty well static Budgets in terms of the total amount of dollars in real terms available, we have to appreciate that there has been an attempt to do what we possibly could in relation to the staffing of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. An additional three ranger positions have been secured for this financial year. That is, of course, a very modest growth in terms of the needs we face and the demands that are upon us, but nonetheless it is some sort of growth. We have attempted to recruit (from areas identified as surplus to needs in the blue-collar areas of the PBD and E & WS Departments) people who could work in our parks system, and we have had some modest success in that area. The problem is that where the people are identified as being surplus is not always where they are needed in a system as decentralised as national parks inevitably must be. However, having said all that, I do not believe that that is an excuse for not proceeding to the acquisition of additional areas of significance where that is seen as being justified. I guess the Dalhousie purchase could be regarded as a case in point. There we are talking about a capital item, and that is not specifically taking money away from funds used to staff these areas, although it competes with funds in the development of management plans, on the one hand, and also the implementation of resources of parks, on the other.

Dalhousie also illustrates another point: there are perhaps alternative management options available to us other than simply through the traditional methods of the service itself. For example, we are looking at a lease-back arrangement of the Dalhousie area with conditions. There is the possibility in some cases of private arrangements being entered into for the management of some of these areas which have been purchased for future community use and in order to protect the environment of those areas. It is not a simple matter. I would simply conclude by saying that I do not believe, provided reasonable resources are available in the capital area, that we should pass up the opportunity to acquire additional areas of sensitivity for the future community and for the good of the environment just because we continue to face a management problem in terms of manning the resources we have available to us.

Mr HAMILTON: I notice that the recurrent fund proposed for 1984-85 is \$1 million above that proposed for last financial year. Can the Minister explain the extent and significance of the increase in expenditure on national parks?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: First, on the staffing side, I have already indicated that three additional ranger positions have been appointed to the Gammon Range arising out of the Aboriginal training programme. In addition, \$317 000 has been set aside for the operations budget. Operations is a problem that has bedevilled us for some time. For instance, a person in one of the more remote regions of the State two-thirds through the financial year simply runs out of his allocation for petrol and yet mobility is the name of the game for that person. We have really tried to make an effort here to beef up that side of the programme. We would expect that there would be additional areas such as fire protection, weed and vermin control, communications, improving the radio network system, and a reserve fund for fighting bush fires. Much of that is not for additional staff resources: it is additional operations money to assist the operation of such staff as we already have on strength.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister say whether further funds will be spent on Morialta Conservation Park this year, acknowledging that as a major tourist attraction and the need for rehabilitation work following the flood which

devastated the Gorge some time ago. Further, will he say what will be done about the kiosk?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: About \$130 000 will be spent as part of an overall \$300 000 upgrading programme on the Morialta Conservation Park, which is one of our parks with very high visitation. There will be development of tracks, toilet facility upgrading, walking track signs, visitor information, bridges, and so on. In relation to a matter that the honourable member asked earlier in regard to facilities for handicapped people, we are designing the track to the first and major waterfall in such a way as to ensure that people with mobility difficulties will at least be able to get to the first fall. People with the mobility of the honourable member can get to the third fall and beyond and are invited to do so.

In regard to the other question the honourable member asked via his colleague on the other side of the House, we propose to carry out additions to an upgrading of the existing building to ensure that the additional facilities which we sought for the management of the park can be secured while the kiosk continues to operate. We are hoping to have our cake and eat it, too.

Mr HAMILTON: I notice that the Government intends to maintain law enforcement activity in regard to illegal dealing in native fauna. How many prosecutions were there for people dealing illegally in native fauna previously? What is the extent of that activity?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: As to specifics, I will have to take that question on notice. We have had some success recently. Our rangers did a raid in the Innamincka area not so long ago and got quite a sizable haul. While on one hand that is a matter of congratulation that the Service was so nimble footed as to be able to catch the offenders red handed, and it is also good that local people are prepared to indicate to us where these problems arise, on the other hand it is a source of some concern that we have individuals in the community who would so flout the wildlife regulations in that way. As to the specifics of the overall programme and the number of prosecutions involved, I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: When is the Minister going to do something to correct the disgraceful state of Windy Point?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I believe some work is programmed for this year. Would the honourable member like to be more specific about the conditions to which he objects?

Mr BAKER: I did not want to waste the time of the Committee with what I thought was a simple question. I wrote to the Minister many moons ago and virtually got no response at the time. That was back in January, after one of my constituents was injured up there. As a result, I wrote to the Minister. I received no reply. I tried to get some sense out of some of his officers in the process. It was only when I sent off a press release to his office, as well as to the local *Courier*, that in fact the Department sent along a bitumen truck to fill in a few holes. Specifically, it is one of our major attractions. It is not going to be a costly exercise to upgrade that area to a standard that will allow proper access by cars and allow safety for people to walk to the edge and overlook Adelaide. If the Minister wants me to be specific, I would like to know why I have never received a reply to my letter and also when he is going to do something to make the area safe and make it the attraction it should be.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I will look up the files. I am sure the honourable member received an acknowledgment from my staff upon receipt of the letter. I cannot believe that he did not at least get that, but I will check to ascertain why it went off the rails on that occasion. Does the honourable member want pot holes fixed, or is he looking at

something more fundamental, such as a redesign? I am having trouble with the specifics of the problem.

Mr BAKER: Obviously the departmental officers have not acquainted the Minister with the problem. The problem is that the area is an absolute disgrace. The lower area of Windy Point is a disgrace as it is full of pot holes and now has black bitumen in those pot holes which is fairly uneven. It is totally unsatisfactory as a major site from which to view Adelaide. It is one of the best sites in Adelaide, as the Minister well knows, and it deserves to be of a high standard for the people visiting that site. If tourist buses are going to visit the site it should be attractive. At the moment it has had no major work done on it, as far as I am aware, for at least 10 to 15 years. Whether it be the area next to the balustrade over which people look or the area where the buses can move in, it is an absolute disgrace. What more can I say? Does the Minister want me to tell him how many pebbles are out of place?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I want to know what work the member wants me to do.

Mr BAKER: The whole area needs to be redone. It must be paved. If bituminising is the answer, so be it. The whole surface of the area needs to be redone. There have to be thoughts about the background and its relationship to the restaurant. The restaurant is kept in immaculate order and the area below is a shambles.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: Is the member concerned about the condition of the area on which people park?

Mr BAKER: Yes, and where people walk. I thought I made that clear.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I will take up the matter.

Mr BAKER: The fire protection plan for Cleland Reserve has been raised on a number of occasions, formally as well as informally. My understanding is that the residents and property owners near Cleland Reserve are still not satisfied with the arrangements for access and, more importantly, the clearing of an area to form a buffer between themselves and the reserve should it again be swept by fire. What further investigations has the Minister made as a result of these submissions that would have been made to him over a period of time about the Cleland Reserve?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: The major investigation has been the coronial inquiry. In fact, I think the Service and the way in which it manages the area came out of the inquiry extremely well. The problem we will always have in a national park which is adjacent to areas that are reasonably heavily settled is that there will always be a conflict between, on the one hand, the people who want to maximise the security aspect and, on the other hand, the responsibility we have to maintain that area in something close to a pristine condition. There is a sense in which that conflict will never be completely resolved.

As the honourable member has indicated, we have established a fire management plan for that area. We believe it is sufficient to meet reasonable contingencies. The honourable member will recall that, in relation to that tragedy, we had a raging fire that was spotting in some cases a quarter to half a mile ahead of the fire front. No sort of break will ever be able to adequately address that problem. A first-class fire break exists through the Adelaide Hills called the South-Eastern Freeway, and the fire jumped that road. If it can jump the South-Eastern Freeway in those conditions, it can jump anything. I accept that there is a responsibility in relation to the normal fire hazard and we have to do all that we can to minimise the impact of a fuel rich area on surrounding residential areas. We do have to balance that alongside our responsibility to try to maintain that area in something like a pristine condition.

Mr HAMILTON: I notice that the Government intends upgrading the electrical and mechanical services at the Wil-

pena Pound Motel and camping ground. When is that likely to occur and what expenditure is involved? I also notice the Government's concern in relation to the high visitation of the recreation park and the increased demand for public facilities and maintenance needs in parks. Can the Minister provide some information on the programme involved in those two matters?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: This financial year it is expected that \$150 000 will be spent at Wilpena; that has already started. Work is being undertaken in the kitchen area and will continue throughout the financial year. In relation to recreation parks, is the honourable member talking about Belair National Park?

Mr HAMILTON: Recreational parks generally. Page 24 of the yellow book states:

High visitation in recreation parks continues the demand for public facilities and maintenance needs in parks.

What parks are involved?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: We are talking specifically about Belair and Para Wirra. There is a four-stage classification of parks under the National Parks and Wildlife Act: national parks; conservation reserves; game reserves; and recreation reserves. Recreation reserves are regarded as the lowest category in terms of preservation of the natural heritage, but of great importance for recreation.

Belair and Para Wirra also have some status as conservation reserves because they cannot be taken out of the protection of the Act without a motion going through both Houses of Parliament. So, there is that dual function. Because of the proximity of these areas to the metropolitan area and the traditional associations that people have with these parks, there is a very high rate of visitation, and careful management is needed to ensure that this does not impact on the future viability of the park as a nature conservation resource.

So, from time to time it is necessary to close certain tracks and roads and to renew the facilities that are provided much more quickly than may have to be done at a more remote park, for example, on Kangaroo Island or somewhere like that. The setting up of lunch and barbecue areas is a cost that we have to face. The renewing of these facilities, and so on, is part of the on-going programme.

It is a difficult programme and one with which we have conversations with people involved in tourism, because they see our resources as being of great importance to the aims that they have in mind. So, these two parks are basically the ones that we are talking about. There are other recreation reserves, but either they have a lower level of visitation or, alternatively, they have a higher level of visitation but they are really not critical in terms of nature conservation; in other words, there is less to be wrecked by the trampling of human feet.

Mr GUNN: My comments are made with the best interests of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in mind, from experience I have had as a practical person, and from what I have gained on a recent overseas trip. The first matter of concern is the extension of national parks. I was interested in the Minister's comments about the power facilities at Wilpena. If I heard correctly, \$150 000 will be spent in upgrading the power generator.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: No, generally the facilities there: the kitchen, toilets, and so on.

Mr GUNN: I was going to say that that money ought to be spent towards putting power lines through to Wilpena. What is the state of play as far as the Department is concerned in doing everything possible to have the power extended from Hawker, through to Wilpena and then on to Blinman? Recently at a meeting at Quorn, people interested in the tourism industry were advised that the capital cost of extending electricity to Wilpena would be recouped in

less than five years. This would be a far more efficient and better operation and would allow for electricity to be connected to the caravan site—something which is long overdue. It is a beautiful caravan park which attracts many people. Having had experience in generating my own power, I would not wish that great diesel engine on any group in the community.

Will the Minister's Department do everything possible to support the local people who want the power extended? The argument that it will spoil the environment does not hold water. I have seen power lines through the mountains of Austria and Switzerland. It would not be visible from the road. There is no logic in that argument. It would not be possible to put it underground, as has been suggested by people who have not given it a great deal of thought.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I am not aware that there has been any suggestion from my Department—certainly not from me—about any unwillingness on our part to consider SWER lines on—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:—aesthetic grounds. Reticulation of electricity throughout the State is a matter for the Minister of Mines and Energy. We would be his customer and we would have to look at what costs he may place on us for that facility to become available. If ETSA decided that the extension of the facility should be undertaken, then obviously we would take advantage of it. However, it is not altogether a decision that is in my hands.

Mr GUNN: You would not object?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: No, there is no environmental objection to that.

Mr GUNN: That is excellent; I am pleased with that answer. I will now pursue that matter in other areas with some vigour. I turn now to controlled burning off in national parks. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Goldsworthy) has expressed concern in relation to the problems in the hills face zone and the need to control material either by burning off—and people may throw their hands in the air when I say this—or by some controlled grazing to reduce the amount of material in water catchment areas. We know of the problems of the bush fire in the Mount Remarkable national park. I want to raise two matters. First, does the Department have a programme? In Colorado and California extensive plans and programmes have been brought into effect with controlled burning off. If the Minister is not going overseas I suggest that he reconsider and go to Colorado and California to look at the programmes that have been developed there. I would recommend it to the Minister.

In America, it is a Federal Government programme where fire fighting apparatus, using helicopters, has been developed. It was a most efficient organisation, and monitored lightning strikes because of the concern about uncontrolled fire damage to lives and property. If the parks were properly burnt off it would be environmentally advantageous, particularly in California.

In relation to the Mount Remarkable park, can the Minister give an assurance that there will not be a repetition of the sort of unfortunate occurrences that took place, where local fire officers were not allowed to make the decisions which could have meant that that fire was put out on the first night, and the sort of ill feeling that was generated because of the action of certain officers who obviously were inexperienced and did not understand the attitude of the local people?

Will the Minister give an assurance that such events will not occur again, or will he support the amending of the Country Fire Services Act to allow those fire control officers to move in and take the necessary action? I have been reliably informed by the Mayor of one council and the Chairman of a district council that they doubt that, if

another fire occurred in that area in the next few months, the authorities would get the co-operation of local landholders because of the unrealistic attitude of certain officers at the time to which I have referred. Many people have come to me expressing concern. Some of them were there for three nights when it was not really necessary. It took three days to get permission to bring in a bulldozer and make the breaks.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Both as a department and as a division of a department, we are involved in a series of programmes to address this problem. In the late spring months, there is always a series of programmes of cold burns in parts to reduce the fire hazard that is often brought about by weed infestation that usually results from some modification of the original environment by the activities of man. That has been a feature over the last few years and is an increasing feature of our activities, and money is being set aside for that. A fire hazard mapping programme in the district, to which I have referred earlier today, is considering such variants as the availability of fuel, the wind, and the slope of the land. Once those fire hazard maps have been prepared, they will give us a far better idea of the extent of the hazard and the location of the potential hazard, which will enable us to implement whatever amelioration methods are required.

We have also copied from New South Wales a pre-plan programme. I talked at length about this matter last year, so perhaps I should not go into it in great detail today. That programme is expensive to set up and we are only into it in a modest way. Even New South Wales with its vast resources has applied it only in the Kosciusko National Park. The programme involves collecting data at the intersections of a kilometre square grid as to meteorological conditions, soil moisture, availability of fuel, and so on. Those details are fed into a computer so that, when a fire breaks out, it is possible, first, to locate the fire on the grid and, secondly, to ring up the computer and indicate the location of the fire and the prevailing meteorological conditions, humidity, wind direction, and so on. The computer can then give a fair idea of the direction in which the fire will burn and the duration of the burning, because there will be some limiting conditions. For example, because of the lack of fuel the fire may well burn itself out in 15 minutes, and the fire fighters would do less damage by letting it burn than by getting in there and fighting it. Both in the field in respect of burning off operations and in head office in respect of those programmes that take advantage of data processing, we believe that we are moving to reduce the hazard as much as possible.

Concerning the specifics of the Mount Remarkable fire, the member for Eyre will have an argument with me. However, all we need say at this stage is that some of the matters that came to the fore on that occasion and some that have come to the fore as a result of the bitter experience of Ash Wednesday are at present being investigated by a Select Committee set up by another place, and we will no doubt obtain further advice as a result of that Select Committee's deliberations. The firefighting people associated with the National Parks and Wildlife Service are the best equipped and among the most experienced of the people involved in fighting wildfires in this State. I would back their judgment against the judgment of other people. I say that, however, without making a specific judgment on the matters that arose at Mount Remarkable.

There will always be problems of judgment as to the best way to face these situations. I invite the honourable member, since I assume he is not without influence in the rural community, to reverse the advice that he has given me. If I have a responsibility to ensure that my officers address the fires on parks in the best way possible, the agriculturists

who hold land adjacent to the park have a responsibility to minimise the fire hazard on their property. As the Select Committee will undoubtedly report, the vast majority of fires in a park start out of the park and burn on to it. It is a complete myth that being next to a national park is a great hazard to an agriculturist because of fires that burn out of the park, because for the most part the traffic is in the other direction.

It gives me no great pleasure to return the advice that the honourable member has given me, but agriculturists have a responsibility. The committee considers that it is important that it should place these matters before me again, and I believe that it is important that I should respond in the same way.

Mr GUNN: The rural community is conscious of the need to take adequate fire precautions, and they are happy to lend a willing hand at any time. They are practical experienced people, and I would disagree with those people responsible for national parks in what they are doing. If the Minister wants it, I can give chapter and verse. The Select Committee has received evidence from some of those people who were up for two nights, unlike the national parks officers who could stay at a hotel. If the local firefighters had enjoyed the power to make a decision, they would not have been there for the third day and the third night. No-one can dispute that these practical people who have lived in the area for generations should have been given the power to decide. If they had had that power they would have solved the problem.

I do not want to make provocative comments: I merely want the Minister to give an undertaking that this sort of problem will not recur, because the national parks firefighting officers need the co-operation of the local firefighting service and the local landholders to volunteer to control the fire. If the Minister wishes to obtain the co-operation of the landholders, the attitude to which I have referred must change. No doubt, the people concerned were well meaning, but they did not understand the circumstances of the situation. The bulldozer should have been brought in earlier. Many volunteers with their own equipment were taken from their businesses to give their time freely in fighting the fire, but they had had it up to the neck by the time they were finished.

I attended two meetings. I was inundated with telephone calls and with people coming to see me. I actually interviewed many of those people, and I was quite surprised. The matter cannot simply be brushed off. However, if that is the attitude of the Minister and the Department, it disturbs me, and I believe that in the future there will be a lot less co-operation unless common sense prevails.

I wish to refer to a number of matters, although time is running out. Perhaps it would be fair to allow the Minister to respond to what I have had to say before I ask further questions. I am really disappointed with the attitude of the Minister and the Department in this matter. It concerns me because, if another fire occurs in the park up there, people certainly will not want to be involved in the sort of problems that occurred previously. I understand that tempers frayed considerably up there and that the person who had responsibility for three nights and who was in charge of that fire fighting operation (and who did an excellent job) was completely frustrated, to put it mildly.

The Director of the Country Fire Services did not give the support that he should have given. He flew up there with great gusto in a helicopter, but he did not even go to the front to talk to the people who had the overall responsibility for controlling the fire. He did not help. He should have gone up there and delegated his complete authority to the local person, and the problem would have been solved. But he did not do that. I will now allow the Minister to

respond because I have a number of other questions about other matters, including the Calca Conservation Park, that I want to ask.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The basic facts surrounding this matter are in dispute between the honourable member and me, and I do not know how we can resolve them as a result of that. I ask the honourable member whether he would be satisfied to allow the Select Committee to adjudicate on this matter, because he will not believe anything that I or my officers say. There is a difference in philosophy and approach to these things. The honourable member is well aware that a Select Committee is looking at this matter together with other matters to do with fires. The Government (although it was on the initiative of an individual within his own department) has fully co-operated with the setting up of this Select Committee, and it will be quite happy to take into full consideration the recommendations of the committee. I would hope that the honourable member, if he finds that the report of the Select Committee is other than what he regards as being satisfactory in terms of his present attitude towards these things, might be prepared also to undertake to modify his attitude.

Mr GUNN: I have been badly misrepresented by the Minister's saying that I would not believe what he or his officers said. That is not correct. I may have been critical of the Department, but I have always been prepared to listen to what the Minister's officers have had to say. I do listen to them; I see them in the field. Some are not very happy with me, but others I know quite well and I am happy to discuss matters with them. I am happy to discuss this matter with the Minister or any of his officers in a most reasonable fashion. My concern is that there is not a repetition of this problem.

I think that the Select Committee is a good idea, although I do not know how long it will be before that Committee winds up its operation. One must consider that there is another summer approaching and that there has been a good season in that part of the State. I hope that there is not another bushfire in the meantime. If the Minister thinks that there is any value in my talking to his officers or to certain people in my electorate, I am happy to co-operate.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I thank the honourable member for those assurances. All I can say is that it is not clear to me what radical changes we should make in our approaches to the fighting of bush fires in advance of the recommendations of the Select Committee.

Mr GUNN: I am happy to have the opportunity of discussions with senior officers.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the point has been made by the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What stage has the review of the National Parks and Wildlife Act which was commenced in 1972 reached?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We are practically ready to come into this place with legislation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Now that I presume a decision has been made to not proceed with the development on the Mount Lofty summit, what is the Government's intention with regard to that important site?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: First, it is important that the site be tidied up as soon as possible, and we are seeking CEP funds for that to occur. That will have to happen, anyway, irrespective of the identification of the funds. I expect that we would want to put up there, at least *pro tem*, some sort of small information facility which would assist those people who go to the summit. The New Zealanders refer to it, I think, as a plane table—I think perhaps there ought to be a plane table there. Perhaps there ought to be some sort of notice board or map giving details about other aspects of the summit and the vistas that people can inspect

from the summit, and one or two other sorts of low impact things such as that.

As to the replication of the tourist facility that was burnt out during the fire, as we will now not be proceeding to build something there, we are of course looking around for other suitable sites further down the range, although there is no definite resolution of that problem at this stage.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to take that matter further, and I will do so on another occasion. In the commentary on major resource variations, I was interested to note that there has been a decrease in capital of \$318 000 due to the reduction in funds required for the fauna facility construction which was due to be completed in November 1984. Recognising the absolute need for that facility and that it may be a policy decision of the Minister not to proceed with that facility on the site that was proposed earlier, can the Minister say what is happening in regard to that facility and why is it not being built as a matter of priority?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Mr Nichols can provide some information on that.

Mr Nichols: The Monarto fauna facility has been built: it is largely completed and largely paid for. The reduction in the programme, as I understand it from the accounting point of view, is because the money is not needed in the next financial year—it was spent last financial year from the P&D fund.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The \$318 000?

Mr Nichols: For the total expenditure on that area, which includes quite an extensive development around the area. The facility itself is also fairly extensive because it will be used by the zoo as well as by us.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that a new officer/visitor centre has been completed at Salt Creek, which I have seen. What was the cost of that facility?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In general terms it was about \$120 000. I will try to obtain the exact figure before the conclusion of the Committee.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the matter of second generation parks and to the future of the Craighburn farm which, I understand, has some relationship with the Minister's announcement about second generation parks. I understand that an application has been made for a subdivision of that land. For well over a year an attempt has been made to tie that land into a special use category which would thus make it unavailable for subdivision. Can the Minister outline the present position?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The background of this matter goes back to the time when Mr Hugh Hudson was the Minister of Urban and Regional Affairs. At that time the Craighburn people, or Minda Incorporated, came forward with a plan for subdivision of the area of what one could call the Happy Valley side of the Sturt River. The agreement at that time was that that should be allowed in exchange for a transfer to the Government of an area under substantial bushland further down the gorge to the west and, secondly, open space proclamation of the area on the Mitcham side.

That agreement was not carried through in its fullest sense. The land subject to the transfer occurred: the applications for subdivision went in, and maximum use was made of the 12.5 per cent open space. However, Minda decided not to proceed with its application for an open space proclamation and no open space proclamation occurred. Minda's explanation was that, although it had no plans to develop that area, it wanted to be able to use it as collateral for loan raising and that an open space proclamation would have adversely affected its capacity to raise funds in that way.

That was largely the position when I came into the picture, except that there was a first-class donnybrook going on in

the Mitcham council about the whole matter and whether there should be a rezoning—a supplementary development plan which would rezone the residual area—of the area originally subject to the open space proclamation to general use. It did not seem to me that at that stage it was necessary that I intervene, because the matter was properly before the Mitcham council. Suddenly, there was this application for subdivision. I immediately called the Minda people in and requested them not to proceed with that application for subdivision, in exchange for a joint committee that would be set up to look at the whole future use of the residual Craighburn land for its open space potential. That committee is still in session.

When the decision was made for the second generation parkland concept it was necessary, of course, in furtherance of the commitments I had made to Minda, that I call them in. I indicated to them that, while clearly the Craighburn land was seen as being potential land for the concept we were about to announce, nonetheless this did not mean I was welching on the agreement: the committee would continue to operate and would report to me in due course. That committee has sat and obtained an extension of time for its deliberations. It is difficult for me to speculate as to the outcome of that until a report has been placed before me.

Mr BAKER: I thank the Minister. I am amazed that an agreement was reached so many years ago, yet it has not been tied up. In relation to the question of native vegetation and the vegetation retention scheme, I note that a substantial sum was spent during 1983-84; in fact, there is an increase in moneys proposed for 1984-85, but I am not sure whether that is under the heritage vegetation retention or development management, so I may be a little astray in asking the question. Since the introduction of regulations relating to vegetation clearance, has the Department costed the impact of land values and, obviously, those landholders' ability to sell their property as a result of vegetation clearance? What is their capital loss as a result of the vegetation clearance regulations?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Before we leave the matter of Craighburn, may I say, in relation to the sort of throw-away comment that the honourable member made before he went on to this matter, that the Government cannot force a private landholder to apply for an open space declaration: it is for private landholders to make an application and for us to grant it or not, as may be.

Mr BAKER: The Government already has another application and has just set it aside.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I have not had an application from council: council cannot make that sort of application; it is not the owner.

Mr BAKER: It is an application for rezoning.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is an entirely different matter, which had not been resolved when the application for subdivision came in. Let us be perfectly clear about this: we are talking about two different matters. There has been open space proclamation which can be initiated only by the landowner. If Minda does not want to apply for an open space proclamation there is nothing I can do about it. Secondly, there is a supplementary development plan which can be initiated by either local government or me under conditions laid down in the Planning Act. The conditions laid down in the Planning Act had not been specified at the time of the application for subdivision, nor had there been a resolution of the matter of the supplementary development plan at the council level. Had there been, I would have been only too happy to process it. However, that is the plain fact of the matter.

It relates, of course, to the more decentralised nature of the piece of legislation with which we are dealing, compared

with the old Planning and Development Act, but I do not want to go into that at this stage. Returning to the substantive question raised by the honourable member, I do not have the specific figures before me, but I refer him to *Hansard* of the last week of sitting in the Legislative Council and to the remarks of the Hon. Brian Chatterton in response to one or other of the Bills currently on the Notice Paper in another place.

In fact, I think it was Mr Gilfillan's Bill, because the honourable member will probably be aware that Mr Gilfillan's Bill envisaged looking at the difference between the valuation of the property unaffected by any decision of the Planning Commission in relation to vegetation clearance and the valuation of the property as affected by a refusal for clearance. Mr Chatterton placed before the Upper House a series of valuations which had been made by the State Valuer-General of properties that have been the subject of applications for clearance.

These were looked at in the light of the application, if you like, and the effect of the application. There is no doubt that there is a very substantial writing down of value in the view of the Valuer-General where there is a refusal for an application. Of course, the point that the honourable member in another place was making was that, if the Government is to accept the principle of compensation, it may as well simply accept that it has to acquire the land in the light of such a decision, because the difference between an amount of money involved, an outright acquisition and a compensation (where there is a change in value as a result of the decision) is marginal. The only case in which it is not marginal is where the land was already under some protective covenant in relation to protection to water catchment areas.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move now to programme 7: what stage has been reached in the final investigation into the extent of hazardous chemicals in South Australia? I understood that a committee was formed to look into the use and disposal of chemicals and that it was suggested in February that it would take six months before it could report. What is the present status of that report?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There has been a good deal of discussion and investigation in relation to this matter, particularly with the Commonwealth and the other States, because of course we are looking at a national programme in which it would be necessary for the States and the Commonwealth to play a certain role. The Commonwealth will be involved in the identification of hazard where the States, of course, will be involved in control of that hazard once identified. Mr Inglis, the Director of Pollution Management, is also the Chairperson of that committee, so who better than he to report?

Mr Inglis: The committee is at the point of drafting its recommendations, and it would expect to report to the Government by December.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will that report be a public report? I would not mind having a copy of it.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes. I would anticipate that most aspects of the report will be made public. Mr Inglis may be able to say whether, in obtaining information from industry, it has been necessary for us to give certain assurances as to the confidentiality of some of the information coming forward. As the honourable member would know, sometimes these assurances have to be given, but with that caveat I would think that it is in the Government's and everyone's interest that the information should be given as broad a dissemination as possible.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am aware of the incredible cost of the lead monitoring programme at Port Pirie and the increase in manpower for that purpose. In the 1984-85 specific targets the lead monitoring programme is to continue. Can the Minister indicate (having just been to Port Pirie

and understanding some of the concerns being expressed by the local council and some residents about the continuation of some of the work being carried out in regard to this programme) how long it is likely to proceed?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I do not have the term of the work. Again, I might ask for advice on that in a moment. There is approximately an extra \$245 000 for which we will be responsible and which involves the monitoring that is going on there.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is on top of the \$343 000 quoted?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: The figure that I just indicated is the actual monitoring cost, and there is approximately \$80 000 in capital equipment as well. However, Mr Inglis may be able to assist the Committee as to the term of the study or any particular aspects of it that may be of interest to the Committee.

Mr Inglis: The odd \$20 000 that balances the \$240 000 and the \$80 000 also involves a certain amount of research work to try to find out what happens to a house after it has been cleaned (the so-called recontamination programme). The total expenditure by the Department this year in that area will be of the order of \$340 000. That is for the next 12 months. The length of the programme is entirely determined by the number of children found to have elevated blood lead levels, and this screening programme is an ongoing programme. It is not necessarily so that one finds all the children the first time that one takes the blood lead readings. Some children have a rising elevation of lead in their blood and are detected only later in the screening programme, so it is not easy at present to determine for how long this would go on.

It is expected that there would be enough data to know what sort of corrective action could be taken after 12 months of monitoring. It is envisaged that there would have to be at least another 12 months monitoring perhaps of the recontamination of the houses after they have been cleaned in the next financial year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In regard to the beverage container legislation, the Minister in reply to a question asked by one of his Government colleagues indicated that he needed to make a statement as a result of a strong rumour floating around the place. I would suggest to the Minister that it was more than a strong rumour. I have received considerable comment from business organisations and the community generally who see it as much more than a rumour. I asked a question of the Minister some time ago about the Government's policy on placing a mandatory deposit on beer bottles and, if that was the policy, when it was intended to do so.

I was informed that at that stage it was not the policy of the Government to put a mandatory deposit on beer bottles. The Minister would be aware of the concern being expressed by scouting groups and others. If the Minister is receiving the same communications as I am from his local scouting groups and groups that have some interest in the present collection method of the pickaxe bottle, he would appreciate the concern in the community. I would like some indication (and I know that we will have to wait to find out what happens with the introduction of the legislation) as to where we are on this matter.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I think that there are people in the community who have a great deal of difficulty in understanding the way in which the legislation operates and knowing what containers are included in the legislation and what containers are not. So, I make the point that I made in the House a week or so ago: I think that my indication by way of a letter to the industry that it would be necessary to apply the law strictly in relation to the one trip container for premium beers was misinterpreted in some areas, but

more so because it came on top of calls from medical practitioners for levels of deposit to beer containers which would be comparable if adopted to what the soft drink industry runs in relation to the deposits on their containers.

Let me make it absolutely clear: there are those containers that are subject to what one might call a deposit, but that is something that is run by the industry itself, and that relates to soft drink containers and the pickaxe system—both the 750 ml bottles and the echoes. There are other containers, on the other hand, which are subject to a deposit because it is required by the legislation that they carry that deposit and, of course, they are typically the one trip containers: the cans and the premium beer containers that are subject to only one trip. I think that because of this confusion—what is being said by the doctors publicly and what I indicated would have to happen, my attention having been drawn to pretty large-scale infringements of the law—people have assumed that all beer containers should be subject to a 5 cent deposit, and since that would be something the Government would require it would be necessary that these containers be brought under the legislation.

I have to say to the honourable member, as I say to this Committee, that the Government believes that the amount of money redeemed on an ordinary beer bottle at the marine store dealer should be increased. At present it is effectively 2½ cents, and it probably ought to go to 3 cents in order to take account of the erosion of money values since the time when the honourable member who asked the question was Minister and when the industry agreed or volunteered that 15 cents per dozen ought to be increased to 30 cents per dozen. However, I believe that that is something that can be negotiated with the industry, and it is not necessary to bring these containers under the legislation in order for that to happen.

As to greater increases and their efficacy or otherwise, it really gets back to what quantum of increase is likely to bring what quantum of return. It is true that the level of return on beer containers is very high in this State in Australian terms. However, it is also true that one can differentiate between the level of return of the 750 ml container and the level of return of the echo, and the echo has a significantly lower level of return than the old fashioned pickaxe full-size bottle has. However, the question we have to ask ourselves is: if we were to go to 5 cents per container (and that could happen only by bringing these containers under the legislation because it is not something to which the industry would agree) let us go to extremes and say 20 cents per container (which could happen only by compulsion)—what increase in return would actually occur, given that most people return their bottles through the normal MSC system, and most of the remaining bottles are returned by the boy scouts picking them up from the individual at home, along the roadside, or wherever?

What remains is a small proportion of the total stream of these containers which, by the nature of the material we are dealing with, are broken and act as some sort of a hazard. I think that relates largely to the condition of the people in charge of these containers at the time they are broken. The material in these containers (though personally I have never indulged) I understand has interesting effects on the central nervous system of human beings—in short, there are drunken yobbos in our community who go to the beach and deliberately make a nuisance of themselves. The best advice I could obtain is that no level of deposit is going to alter that unfortunate situation. That has to be addressed by the general litter laws of this State and the extent to which they can be properly policed and implemented.

The Government's general position (and I am laying it out here in some detail so that the honourable member, the

Committee and the general public can understand it) is that we do not believe at this stage that it is necessary to bring the normal pickaxe system under the legislation, but we do believe the time is ripe for the industry to co-operate with us in going from a 30 cents to 36 cents per dozen deposit (if you can use that), using the normal traditional marine store system.

Mr GUNN: Would that include echoes?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes. It might also include a smaller bottle. Perhaps I should get some advice for the Committee on this. We were given to understand quite some time ago that a 250 ml bottle (which is in extensive use in the Eastern States) might be introduced in this State. It is the sort of thing one sees Americans swilling at gridiron matches, and so on. I do not think that, as a container, it is a very attractive proposition because it is a heck of a lot of container for a small amount of content. These would be reusable containers—they are not one trippers which would be automatically treated as a can. Our belief as a Government and a Department, was that, were they introduced, they would have to be treated just as the ordinary pickaxe system and they would be subject to the 30 cents per dozen redemption at the marine store dealer. I do not know whether Mr Inglis is in a position to say whether these bottles are a feature of the marketing arrangements in this State.

Mr Inglis: As I understand it, there are no definite plans to introduce a 250 ml bottle in South Australia.

Mr HAMILTON: In relation to the increased allocation for noise abatement works, can the Minister advise how the work of the Noise Abatement Branch can contribute to resolving the very real local noise and resulting health problems (and this may come as some surprise to the Minister), such as those which arose in the case of Allied Engineering metal fabrication plant in my district at Albert Park?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Perhaps we might first of all turn our attention to the Allied Engineering problem, where I guess the advantage of having such a unit within the Department has been displayed by what happened down there. The Allied Engineering problem has been with us for some considerable time. The member for Murray, when he was Minister, had to specifically give exemption for Allied Engineering to be able to continue operating, and I had to continue with that exemption. There was no alternative, even though the company was clearly in breach of the Act and, although it was important that the Government kept pressure on it, nonetheless to apply the law in its full might and majesty would have meant the immediate termination of employment for 20 to 25 people.

An alternative site has been identified. Allied Engineering is rebuilding on that site and it is taking the opportunity of substantially upgrading the premises compared with what they have had at Albert Park. The State Opera Company, for a period of eight years, will use the old site for warehousing activities, which, of course, will be subject to significantly lower levels of noise than occurred under the steel fabrication work that was going on at Allied Engineering.

At the end of that period the State Opera Company will vacate that site and it will revert to residential use. I would like to have seen the reversion to residential use occurring at an earlier time, and I know that the honourable member, if anything, was even more enthusiastic about that possibility than was I. It is difficult for an instrumentality to pick up a lease on a property in that area unless it is going to have a reasonable life. So, that is all happening to the benefit of the honourable member's constituents who faced real problems there and, although it has been a sad story, it does have a reasonably happy outcome.

As to the more general aspects of this matter, the honourable member would know that the Noise Abatement

Branch provides an advisory service to assist people wishing to install such things as air-conditioners and swimming pool pumps. We would hope that they would make maximum use of that advisory service so that the problem will not arise and we will not have to go out to investigate complaints. Other items under the heading of portable equipment create problems from time to time, namely, the garden shredder which, from the viewpoint of treatment of domestic waste is a marvellous facility, but, nonetheless, is a problem in that it creates a hell of a din. That is something with which we are having problems from time to time as we do with the old-fashioned lawn mower and other such items. The unit is there for people to take advantage of it, and people do indeed take advantage of the service.

Mr HAMILTON: My constituents are seeking a firm guarantee from the Government that that land at Allied Engineering at Royal Park definitely will revert to the Housing Trust after a period of eight years. I seek the assurance from the Minister that that will occur at the expiration of the eight-year period. My constituents are naturally somewhat disappointed that the initial period of five years, as indicated, did not come to fruition, and there is some degree of hesitancy as to whether the period of eight years will be agreed to.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I am only one of the Ministers involved because the Premier, as Minister for the Arts, is responsible for the State Opera Company. The Housing Trust is under the general care and good guidance of the Hon. Mr Hemmings. The matter has been discussed at Government level and, on behalf of my colleagues, I give the assurance that at the term of the lease currently being negotiated the land will certainly revert to the Housing Trust for residential redevelopment.

Mr HAMILTON: When is the introduction into South Australia of unleaded petrol to take place? What will be the phasing in period, and over what length of time? The matter may come under the Minister of Transport, but will there be increased costs to motorists? I imagine that there would be a need for dual pumps or individual service stations dealing with leaded and unleaded petrol. I could ask a multiplicity of questions on this matter. Is the Minister aware of what is taking place in Toronto, Canada, where the authorities rigidly enforce inspection of motor vehicles for exhaust emissions, thus ensuring that cars that operate unsatisfactorily and burn oil are regularly inspected? Has the Government considered this aspect in conjunction with its interstate and Federal counterparts? It is one of the very important areas that should be looked at in this country, particularly with some of the old bombs that are chugging around the streets. One would think that they were running on kerosene, from the amount of smoke that pours out of their exhausts. Has the Minister looked at that aspect? I have asked a number of questions, but I believe they are all very important.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on any member's car.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The dreadful thought occurred to me that someone might be running on kerosene—I hope not! Unleaded petrol will be introduced on 1 July 1985. There will be a six-month phase in and from 1 January 1986, it will be compulsory for all new cars to run on unleaded petrol. Mr Inglis has been closely involved in negotiations with the Commonwealth on this matter, and I invite him to speak on it. The pricing policy to which the honourable member referred is a sensitive issue and our aim would be to ensure that pricing arrangements are such that unleaded petrol would be no dearer than leaded petrol. In relation to any more specific details and to the Toronto situation, about which Mr Inglis may know (I certainly do

not), I invite him to share that knowledge with the Committee.

Mr Inglis: The system of introduction will be to phase out standard grade petrol and replace it with unleaded petrol. The rate of penetration of the market of unleaded petrol would be very rapid—20 to 25 per cent of the market in the first year, rising to 50 per cent in the second and third years. Very quickly unleaded petrol will become the major petrol sold. There will be no new pumps at service stations in that there will still be only two grades of petrol available—unleaded petrol and super grade petrol. The pumps will be redecorated and remarked to show that it is a new type of petrol. The vehicles will be different and the petrol pumps will be different from the present ones, in that it will not be possible to insert the super grade petrol nozzle into unleaded petrol cars, to try to avoid misfuelling. Also, to try to avoid misfuelling is part of the question behind the pricing policy. Most States in Australia and the Commonwealth are examining ways in which either parity pricing (that is, the same price for unleaded petrol as for super grade petrol) can be achieved or whether there should be a slight differential in favour of unleaded petrol.

With respect to inspection maintenances carried out in Toronto, that really is the responsibility of the Minister of Transport. It has been examined in South Australia. Two schemes are available: first, a complete inspection every one, two or three years of every vehicle; and, secondly, a statistical examination of the number of vehicles. It turns out that—and the Toronto experience is relevant—if you examine 14 per cent to 15 per cent of vehicles you get about the same effectiveness as examining all vehicles, because only a few vehicles are defective. In certain areas of inspection through the defect system in South Australia the inspection rate is close to that now. No final decision has been made about proceeding with a total inspection maintenance system.

Mr HAMILTON: On the question of swimming pools, to which the Minister briefly alluded, I have had a number of representations made to me about swimming pool pump motors. Will the Minister elaborate a little on what action members of Parliament can advise constituents to take, particularly during the day and after the specified hours. It is becoming an increasing problem within the community, particularly where small pumps about other properties, are up against corrugated iron fences or housed in corrugated iron constructions, through which the sound is amplified. It has generated a considerable amount of anxiety amongst a number of my residents in the West Lakes Shore and Tennyson areas. It is an important matter, and the problems concerning these pumps will increase in the future.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The Noise Control Act applies here, and the levels set down in that Act are there to be enforced. The levels are lower at night than they are during the day and people, where they believe they have cause for complaint, should bring forward a complaint in the normal way to my officers. We want, if at all possible, to act in a preventive rather than a punitive way. We can give advice to people as to silencers which can be placed on pumps, and as to the location. The honourable member has referred to the echo effect of the pump being next to a corrugated iron fence or something of that nature. All these things can be tried but if, finally, all have been tried and the noise is still such as to be in excess and people want to exercise their rights under the Act, it is necessary for my officers to be brought in, and we would take measurements, as the Act decrees, at the boundary of the property, and then take such action as seems appropriate with the person from whose property the noise is originating.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I now turn to programme 9. The Minister would be expecting a question as to the likely

introduction date of the review of the amendments to the Planning Act, considering that some time ago he said that it was his view to introduce amending legislation during the March 1984 session. Can the Minister indicate when we are likely to see amendments to the legislation?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, they are with the draftsman now, and I would be very anxious to go on with them as soon as the House reconvenes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does that mean we are not likely to see it happen during this session?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, I am very keen to proceed with them as soon as the House reconvenes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, if they are still with the draftsman—

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, a good deal of drafting effort has already gone into them.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Representatives of the development industry have had a couple of meetings with the Minister in recent times; I am aware of that. Can the Minister indicate what list of claims has been put forward by that industry group? What are they looking for most in the way of assisting the industry? What has been the Minister's response, and what action has been taken as a result of those meetings?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Although they are all related to the same thing, that is, the problem of getting raw land on to the market as developed allotments (that has been the general thrust of the concern), we might divide the concern into probably four components, all relating to aspects of that process. The first concern was about the regulations under the Planning Act and the somewhat more decentralised nature of the decision making process which is as a result of the Planning Act. I gave some indication to that in answer to a question in the House a week or so ago.

There have been discussions with the industry and there have been certain modifications to practice—we can give details if necessary—and further matters are still being discussed, about which further details can be given. That is one of the areas—the Planning Act and its regulations, and the fact that developers felt that what was designed to be a streamlining procedure had meant an elongation of the development control process.

The second concern was in relation to the Registrar-General's Office and the time taken for the conveyancing of titles in that office. That has been related not so much to procedures as simply to the staff available to meet the demand, because as the honourable member knows, there has been an enormous increase in activity in relation to title registration in that office over the past 12 months. Frankly, we have run out of people to recruit, people of experience, to be able to do the work. So, there is some lag in the Registrar-General's Office. There has been an attempt to address this lag with limited success, although with some success, and further discussions are proceeding.

The third area of concern is with the E & WS Department and how long it takes for it, as a utility, to do its servicing once the plan of subdivision has been approved and registered under those two preceding areas that I have just indicated. Again, we could go into some detail about that, but the industry says that it is very happy with the E & WS and the amendment of procedures that has taken place.

The fourth area of concern is the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the time that that takes to do its aspect of the servicing, particularly because the norm these days is undergrounding of electricity reticulation rather than the traditional stobie pole approach. At this stage the industry is still not satisfied that ETSA has been able to move in the direction that they would see as desirable as E & WS. Discussions are continuing. Mr Sykes indicated in a meeting some time ago that he had seconded one of his officers full

time to the job of looking at some detail of procedures so as to reduce the time taken, and some additional staff has been recruited for the mechanical task of simply getting the wires on the stobie poles or into the ground. In general terms, they are the matters that have been on our plate at the two meetings, and there has been significant progress, although not all the matters have been completely resolved.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister said that there were matters outside those that will be dealt with under amendments to the Planning Act that were being discussed with officers of his Department and that we could go into that further if we so desired. I would like to know what some of those matters are.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I meant by that matters to do with the utilities, which are not matters that are addressed by my Department. However, I have acted for the Government in a co-ordinating fashion.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Are the matters that these representatives of industry have come to talk to you about (forgetting about other Ministerial responsibilities, as they relate to the Minister's responsibilities within the Department of Environment and Planning) to be dealt with under the amendments that will be introduced to the Planning Act?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, because not all of them are a matter of statutory amendment. Some are amendments to regulations, some of which have already occurred. I can ask Mr Hodgson to give a detailed report on the matters that have been discussed and in some cases resolved if that is the wish of the Committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes.

Mr Hodgson: The proposed amendments can be summarised fairly briefly. The first of those is that we are seeking to make changes to the land division regulations which will require the central lodging with the Department of Environment and Planning of all applications for land division. At present, applications for land division, as for all other development applications, are made to local councils and then forwarded to the Department of Environment and Planning for comment and advice to councils. The object of the central lodging is that it expedites the processing of land division applications in two ways; first, it cuts down the time taken for the Department to pick up applications because the vast majority of survey forms are from firms in Adelaide, and it is therefore far easier for them to be lodged in Adelaide; secondly, because the Department can screen applications so that it can immediately send councils those applications requiring no comment by Government agencies and deal in the normal way with those that do. That means that minor applications, instead of taking the same time as the major ones, can be dealt with far more quickly.

The second change is that an application under the Planning Act will, under the proposed regulation amendments, also suffice as an application for certificates under the Real Property Act. The land division regulations will also enable a proposal plan to suffice for applications for certificates under the Real Property Act.

Thirdly, the land division regulations will provide that, where a council is the planning authority, a statement of requirements for a land division application will be issued concurrently with planning approval and the Commission's requirements within three weeks. Where the Commission is the planning authority, its requirements will issue concurrently with planning approval and council's within six weeks. Where certificates are applied for separately from planning approval, a time limit of two months will apply for the issue of a statement of requirements. Those are the key changes to the regulations.

Mr HAMILTON: The yellow book, at page 34, refers to the continued consultation programme with local govern-

ment on the review of residential development standards. I am concerned, as no doubt is the Government, about the increasing age of the population in the community. In this respect, certain problems are associated with the erection of granny flats. Will the Minister say what consultations have taken place with the Minister of Local Government concerning granny flats? Some councils in the north-western suburbs of Adelaide have indicated that they would consider this matter sympathetically, whereas others have reservations. As the number of aged people in the north-western suburbs, as in other parts of the State, is increasing, this problem must be addressed not only in the short term but also in the long term. I understand that councils have problems with granny flats because, once the aged occupant dies, the flat may be used for other purposes. However, in Victoria this position is covered by legislation. What is the current situation concerning the control of the building of granny flats in this State?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This is really a subset of a bigger problem of how, through land use planning, significantly higher densities may be obtained in some parts of the city where such planning is seen as appropriate. As the honourable member has indicated, over the years there has been much local resistance to such initiatives. The most interesting aspect concerns New South Wales, where a broad approach was taken and where the Government took the initiative to require that the planning documents should be altered to allow this to happen. This action produced a backlash that did not help the cause.

Our approach would be to encourage local government to amend its planning documents and zoning regulations so as to produce flexibility, and we would help by giving advice to local councils that wanted to take the initiative that would automatically take up the building of granny flats. However, for the Government to initiate a plan on a metropolitan-wide basis to enable the ultimate authority, either the planning commission or the local council, to give approval in those circumstances would be counter-productive and simply produce the backlash experienced by the Hon. Murray Hill when these matters were discussed while he was Minister of Housing in the Tonkin Government.

We would certainly encourage those councils that were willing to give it a try to take the initiative themselves in relation to their own planning documents. The Housing Advisory Council has discussed this matter and further discussions will take place.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Various suggestions have been made regarding the area of land currently available for low density development: that is, the fringe residential and potential residential land. I understand that the Minister recently indicated that it would be about six years and that others have indicated that it would be a decade. Can the Minister comment on this matter?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Does the honourable member mean land that is currently available for subdivision and the problem of getting it into subdividable form?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In terms of the staging sequence (which the honourable member will understand as the strategy for ensuring that, instead of getting scattered development, the development of the northern and southern areas of the metropolitan area should proceed in sequence), north of the city we have an immediate commitment to the development of the Tea Tree Gully-Golden Grove area, which is to be followed by the development of the Munno Para area and then farther north beyond Smithfield Plains to Evanston. In the south, we have been working through the development of the Happy Valley-Aberfoyle Park area to Morphett Vale East, after which it would be expected that the Seaford area would be further developed. Once

those developments have been worked through, the subdividable land in the greater metropolitan area will be largely exhausted, at least at present levels of density.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: At that level, how long will that take?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I think that we would probably have up to 25 years. However, that is not really the problem that we face at this stage. Some time ago I initiated a debate on this subject because within the next five years we must look seriously at the potential for land banking beyond the existing metropolitan area, adopt significantly higher densities, or extend into an area such as the Willunga basin, although most people would say that extension in that direction was undesirable because the land should be kept for horticultural or viticultural use. There is no lack of land for subdivision in the foreseeable future. It is rather a matter of getting the industry up and running after the fairly low levels of activity of the past four or five years.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The programme for Golden Grove caused yet another headline when it was reported to be a \$1 360 million plan. I have great difficulty in determining how that type of money is going to be spent. If the Minister is unable to provide that information now, can he provide details later about how much money is to go into facilities, how much into housing, how many people are involved, and so on?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There was a good deal of cynicism on behalf of one of the daily newspapers in relation to that announcement. I do not know whether that related in part to jealousy between the two newspapers because of one having run the story before the other.

Mr BAKER: Come on!

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Is the honourable member suggesting that that does not happen, for heaven's sake? The other aspect concerned a misunderstanding on the part of the press as to the origin of the announcement: it was not the Government recycling an old announcement but our private venture enterprise partner making an announcement contemporaneous with the launching of its exhibit at the Royal Show. I understand that both members inspected that, and I think they would agree with me that it was a first-class contribution to the Royal Show. It was on the initiative of the private venture that that announcement was made at that time, and the figures given were theirs. The very large figure that the honourable member has referred to is, of course, an all-up figure, the total amount of money which Governments, private enterprise and individuals will spend on the total fabric of that development.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would like to know how that was determined.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That, of course, was not the Government's figure but that given by our private enterprise partner. I will endeavour to obtain a dissection of the figure for the honourable member. Our responsibility is twofold: first, as a partner in the joint venture through the Urban Land Trust, it is necessary that we bring two sorts of resources into the task. The first of those is the raw land which of course is currently owned by the Urban Land Trust and which will be sold to the joint venture for it to develop, and then certain up-front cash has to be provided, just as any developer must do. The balance of the up-front cash will come from the private enterprise part of that joint development. That initially is our responsibility.

In addition, of course, the instrumentalities of Government and, for example, the Highways Department have a responsibility for putting up the cash for those aspects of the urban fabric which traditionally are their responsibility. The Highways Department does not pay for side roads or the connector roads, but for arterial roads. In that respect the procedures are no different for Golden Grove from those applying to

normal and traditional private enterprise land development. All the figures associated with the work are available to us. I am not aware that anyone in Government has calculated the all-up cost, because exactly what arrangements Jack and Jill make for their home on the block of land that they purchase from the joint venture is their responsibility, and that is not really our concern. However, I will certainly undertake to ascertain dissection of the total cost for the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Earlier this afternoon the paddocks at Gepps Cross and the second generation park concept were mentioned. From what has been said I presume that none of that area will be used for housing development. In relation to that part of the metropolitan area, what is likely to happen to the land at Northfield now used by the Department of Agriculture? Is it likely that that will be resold for housing?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It is important that it be understood what is being referred to in regard to the stock paddocks. The remark I made earlier today was specifically about that area which is bounded on the west by the Main North Road north of Gepps Cross, on the north by the Northfield railway line, on the east by Briens Road, and on the south largely by Grand Junction Road, although there is a subdivision which cuts across Grand Junction Road, making the southern boundary of that large paddock a boundary that does not run east-west but runs a little north of west and south of east.

When the present Government came to office the Government was committed to retaining that open space. An additional open space exists north of the railway line: the Government indicated that it would develop that area but it would not develop south of that area. We see that as being land which is important for open space purposes. As the honourable member would know, there are other stock paddocks to the west of Main North Road which during the honourable member's time as Minister were subject to a rezoning.

A very generous proposition was put forward by the Tonkin Government whereby not only did it buy at full tote odds from private enterprise the area for Technology Park but also for good measure the former Government considerably increased the value for owners of the residual area by agreeing to a rezoning from special uses. The honourable member would appreciate that I am perhaps being a little critical at this point. The potential of that area for open space is clearly limited because of that rezoning undertaken by the previous Government.

As to the Northfield research station, it is no secret that the Department of Agriculture as part of its overall rationalisation programme would very much like to quit the site, or most of it. At this stage it is not known when that might happen. The Government has maintained that although there is no final decision as to the ultimate use to which the site might be put it has potential in regard to the second generation parkland concept. One can well imagine a belt of vegetation extending from the stock paddocks to which I have just referred, going past Yatala gaol, and generally following the line of Dry Creek up to the Department of Agriculture land. It is for the committee involved to determine how much of that potential open space should be committed to that purpose. However, I can tell the honourable member that we are considering quite seriously its potential as open space land. No final decision has been made. From a concept that has arisen we will define a more specific policy-type concept, a cadastral concept.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Prior to the last election the Opposition indicated that if elected to office a Labor Government would review the environmental impact procedures. I have asked the Minister previously about when that review

will take place. That was some time ago, and I would like an up-to-date answer to that question. If that information is not available today, I would appreciate it if it could be made available later. I want to know how many environmental impact statements were called for by the Minister during the time between July 1983 to June 1984, and I would like to know the average time for assessing the statements called for during that period of time.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: A review of environmental assessment procedures is taking place. It is being undertaken as an in-house review, rather than by means of what might have been envisaged by the honourable member or even by me when I originally made the commitment to get some heavies in from the outside to run the slide rule over it (the wise men from the east technique, as one of my colleagues sometimes refers to it). I shall keep the honourable member informed in relation to that matter. As to the specific matters raised, we can certainly make that information available. Perhaps Mr Hodgson might like to give some effective indications and, where there are matters and details we do not immediately have, we will undertake to get them.

Mr Hodgson: I could not tell you how many EISs have been called for in the past 12 months, but we can get that information for the Committee. An average time to deal with an EIS following receipt depends on the scale. In respect to major EISs we have always attempted (and generally succeeded) to produce an assessment in eight weeks; for minor EISs it is six weeks.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What is the current arrangement between the State and Federal Governments in regard to environmental impact statements and the preparation of the assessment being carried out?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Of course, there is Federal legislation that runs parallel with our own. There are those projects that are not subject to Federal legislation. Is the honourable member referring to institutional arrangements between the Federal Minister's officers and my own?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, to avoid duplication.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I know that arrangements have been made to avoid duplication in the past; has the arrangement been simplified or what is the current arrangement?

Mr Hodgson: The same informal arrangement that used to apply will still apply in the case of the Departments of Home Affairs and Environment in the sense that informal liaison is maintained between officers of the assessment branches in both departments. Where a Federal EIS and a State EIS are being contemplated, normally speaking the Federal Government would allow the State to prepare the EIS, which would suffice for Federal assessment purposes. We seek to avoid duplication by preparation of two separate EISs over the one development proposal.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister give me some detail of the work load of the Planning Commission and indicate whether the Commission itself is able to keep up with the applications that are coming before it or whether there is a backlog at present?

Mr Hodgson: Without citing actual figures, there has been a substantial upsurge in the number of applications received over the past six months, particularly in July and August. Applications were, I think, running at something like 110 to 120 a month on average up to that time; they went up to over 200 at one stage. That includes applications for all classes of development dealt with by the Commission.

Processing of applications is prescribed (in terms of time) by the regulations under the Planning Act. At the moment about 60 to 70 per cent of applications are dealt with within the prescribed time; of the remainder a number are not dealt with within that time because of a requirement for further information before the Commission can deal with the application.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The ASER development has come in for some criticism, although I do not want to get too involved in that at this stage. However, I was surprised by a statement that the Minister was reported to have made in a recent media article that he was surprised by the City of Adelaide's criticism and that plans for the general outline for the development have been known for quite some time. He was also reported to have said that he found it strange that the council should come out only now with criticisms.

As far as I am aware, the situation is that only recently detailed plans have been made available. Is the Minister suggesting in that statement that the opportunity was given prior to the time suggested through the media for the City Council to become involved, or did he expect the council to find out more detail in some other way?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I suppose that there are two matters here: first, the formal process (and it is certainly true that as a formal proposition the matter was placed before the City of Adelaide only fairly recently); but as an informal proposition it has been well known for a long time that a development such as this would take place. One can perhaps speculate as to the scale of the project and whether one is talking about a 15 or 24 storey building, but the general concept is one that has been around for a long time.

This Government has been under questioning from the Opposition about when the project would be up and running. The Bill passed into law (as all Bills must do) after its passage through this House and in another place when there was a good deal of debate about the development.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It certainly was not known that there was to be a 23 storey building.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: It was certainly known at that stage that there was to be an office component in the building which, as I understand it, is one of the major areas of concern that the City of Adelaide has. I think Mr Phipps—not only as Director-General but as a member of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission—might have a little more information on the scale and nature of the project and how long it has been generally known, without having to direct him into the policies or politics of the argument.

Mr Phipps: The indenture provides for the area of office space included in the development; it specifies 22 000 square metres. That gives some indication that it is a very sizable office development. It was in the schedule attached to the Bill.

Membership:

Mr Plunkett substituted for Mr Hamilton.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under the provisions of the Planning Act the opportunity is provided, of course, for councils to be responsible for bringing down development plans, preparation of development plans and supplementary development plans. The Act also provides that if the council does not do so—if it refuses for some reason or does not have the resources to proceed—the Government can proceed. Has that opportunity been taken, or has it been necessary for the Government to become involved in either the preparation of the development plan or a supplementary development plan, particularly if the council has refused to do so?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Two questions are raised: first, the situation where the Government thinks it is desirable that a supplementary development plan be undertaken and the council refuses; then of course after a period of, I think, two months the Government can proceed with its own supplementary development plan; or, alternatively, if it likes to define the area subject to the development plan to incorporate more than simply one local government area, it can proceed immediately.

Of course, there is the other situation in which the Government (simply at the invitation of the local government area) initiates the plan on behalf of the local government area. As far as I am aware, that second circumstance happens all the time. We undertake plans on behalf of small country councils that are unable to do their own aspect of planning. As to the first circumstance where, from the Government point of view there is an intransigent local government authority, I am not aware of that situation occurring recently.

Mr Hodgson: I do not recall any instance of that happening under the Planning Act.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: But the other circumstance is something that is quite natural and should occur where Government can assist small country councils with their planning.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Possibly an answer to my question can be provided later. However, it is suggested that a draft supplementary development plan is to be prepared for the control of fire hazards in the Adelaide Hills. How far advanced is that?

Mr Hodgson: Preliminary work requires fire hazard planning which is taking place. We have taken a computer run to plot various inputs for the resolution of fire hazard through various areas of the Hills. Once we have the results of that work we will draft an SDP that reflects the relative risk of fire in various areas; that will come out in the normal process with consultation.

Mr BAKER: I note in the development and management part of the report as it relates to lines of expenditure, particularly in the yellow book, that mention is made of a land monitoring report. What has happened to the other arms of the development programming area? Basically, what is happening to the forecasting role, the future demands on land stocks, where pressures are arising and how that area is providing information to industry on the critical situation that seems to have arisen in relation to availability of land in Adelaide?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: As to the disposition of the unit, nothing has happened to it. It is where it was and it is still continuing its traditional function. As to what in fact happens as a result of the function, I think that we can say that the unit has provided a very valuable source of information to the Government and private industry over the past couple of years. Indeed, it co-operated very closely in a joint review that was done with private industry. I do not have immediately in my mind the details of that. I do not mean the figures: I mean actually how the thing was set up and how it was developed. Perhaps Mr Hodgson can prompt my memory.

Mr Hodgson: The work that was done with the Urban Development Institute had to do with existing stocks of privately held land and examination of the extent to which that land was potentially available for urban subdivision and development, because large tracts of it were not available for a variety of purposes.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: To be quite specific, the argument has never been so much about the development of new blocks in new areas, but if there was a weedy paddock in Gladstone Road, Prospect, can one really say that that is part of the land stock that is immediately available for housing purposes or, to look at the global picture, what percentage of those blocks of land is immediately available and how many are being sat on by Auntie Flo, because they are to go to her nephew at the appropriate time? I think that that study was very valuable in trying to sort out that kind of question and getting some idea of the percentage of odd blocks, usually in older suburbs, which can be counted as part of the land stock and what really cannot be.

Mr BAKER: I will restate the question. I appreciate that the Minister has given me a small part of the answer. The

unit to which I used to belong was responsible for a number of things. One was a projection role. It had to project the South Australian population and it was responsible for small area projections. No mention is made of this in the yellow book. It was responsible for feeding the projections of the future population increase into the housing model, if one likes, and into the land consumption. We set up a land consumption model that indicated the general demands that would be placed on the blocks of available land in Adelaide.

Is that work still continuing? The reports normally come out as a matter of course. Are they still coming out? Supplementary to that, what liaison took place with industry when the first signs of what we can now call the housing uplift took place and obviously signalled the imminent pressure on the available land stock? So, it is a two part question, because that was the whole role that the unit was there to perform.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: First, all of those functions are still carried out by the unit. If the yellow book is less than candid about some of those things that is perhaps to be regretted, but I can assure the honourable member that all those functions are still carried out. I think that the comprehensive report is issued quarterly, and negotiations or discussions with the industry occurred very early in the piece as a result of industry comments on the report. I think that initially it probably resulted from the industry having some philosophical differences with the unit as to what ought to be counted as part of land stocks and what could not be. However, the joint programme with the UDIA which has been explained by Mr Hodgson was very useful in bringing the methodology together. For the help of the Committee I draw its attention to page 35 of the yellow book, which gets fairly close to listing most of the matters the honourable member has raised with me.

Mr BAKER: I was looking at the written description. I can leave instructions on there and not do anything about them, but they may be set down as target information. In relation to the fire study on fire hazards in the Adelaide Hills, as the Minister is aware, I have expressed some considerable concern about the new regulations in regard to burning as they relate to the Hills area and specifically to largish household blocks that do not exceed the one hectare laid down in the Act. Publicity has been given to some of my statements on this and I have received a number of calls about the potential fire hazard situation that will arise because of the restricted ability of these people to burn off excess material.

I should also explain to the Minister that the Waste Management Report has come out with a proposition that the Eden Hills dump that services, for example, Mitcham be infilled so that its future life is one year. Therefore, that means that not only will the burning proposals restrict people's ability to get rid of rubbish through that means but also their ability to dump rubbish will be curtailed, and that will cause some enormous difficulties. People have pointed out to me that it will cause them great problems. I have made this point to the Minister previously. Has he, in the process of looking at fire hazards in the Adelaide Hills, consulted with people and councils on these matters or has that not happened?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There has been considerable consultation. I think that, if I may be so bold, there is perhaps a slight element of contradiction in some of the matters the honourable member has mentioned, because we would be concerned about a lot of backyard burning occurring in an area of high fire hazard.

Mr BAKER: Before the bushfire season gets started in these early spring months is the normal time that they dump or dispose.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: All I can say is that the regulations under the Clean Air Act are subject to the Country Fires Act, and there is a mechanism in the Country Fires Act to provide that these people can obtain permission for burning or reducing fire hazard on these properties, despite the clean air regulations. I think that the honourable member's constituents ought to take that up with their local government authority so that the normal provisions of the Country Fires Act can operate.

As to the overall ultimate disposal of refuse, obviously we would prefer to see that local government took the stuff away rather than it being burnt on the property. In some cases that may be impractical and in other cases it may not be, but it has to be taken up as part of the overall strategy for refuse removal and ultimate disposal which is partly addressed in the 10-year plan recently released by my colleague the Minister of Local Government.

If in fact the Hills area does not get sufficient of a guernsey in that document, it is for the honourable member and his local government authorities and others to say so, so that their legitimate concerns can be taken on board in the ultimate form that that strategy will take. It is out for public comment in order to pick up these matters. I am well aware that there are districts in the metropolitan area and beyond where the ultimate disposal of household and other refuse is very much more difficult than in an area like my own, where there has been a long term plan for a tip, which works extremely well, and the local government authority picks up everything.

Mr GUNN: I raise with the Minister a matter that I raised extensively last year in reference to the Calpatanna Waterhole Conservation Park. The District Council of Streaky Bay, to put it mildly, expressed great annoyance to me a few weeks ago when it received a letter from the Premier which it believed to be somewhat different to a reply I got to a Question on Notice on 8 May 1984. The bottom part of that reply states:

The draft plan will suggest the extension of the area leased by the Calca Tennis Club to include one extra tennis court as requested by that club. However, I understand that the draft plan will recommend that extra land should not be made available . . .

That does not please me and certainly did not please the council. The council wrote to the Premier. I did explain that, if the council wrote to the Premier, the Minister's Department would supply the answer. The Premier wrote back in similar terms on 7 August. I draw to the Minister's attention that in 1982 the then Minister for the Environment gave me an undertaking. I refer to a letter, reference 212-81, dated 22 February, which stated:

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.

We are now at the end of September 1984. These people do not receive very much from the Government. Will the Minister now say whether, first, these people are going to get their tennis court land rapidly and whether they can proceed forthwith to peg it out? Secondly, will the people be given the opportunity in the next few weeks to arrange to peg out the land for an oval?

In the Premier's reply he talked about the limestone area. There is no shortage of that sort of limestone country on Eyre Peninsula. I could show him tens of thousands of hectares of that sort of land. I have a limited knowledge of certain areas, but perhaps Upper Eyre Peninsula is one area of which I have a considerable knowledge. Will the Minister

please take some action to rectify this problem which I believe should not be a matter that I should have to continually raise in a Committee of this nature? My people are frustrated and they cannot understand this sort of nonsense, because that land should never have been put into the park. I thought that in this society, if a mistake is made, it ought to be rectified rapidly and common sense and good judgment put into effect. At this stage that has not occurred. I hope that the Minister can clear up the matter once and for all.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The honourable member refers to a matter that originated before I became Minister and to an agreement which he says was entered into by a previous Minister. Without in any way wanting to drag Mr Nichols into what may (or may not) be a conflict between the honourable member and me on this matter, I invite him to rehearse with the Committee the background to this matter which has led to our present thinking.

Mr Nichols: Two areas of land are involved abutting each other within a conservation park. On one area are some tennis courts and it is contended that more land needs to be added to that immediate vicinity to build extra tennis courts. It has always been our intention, when we recommend to Government that sufficient land be available, to provide for all the tennis courts reasonably required there. The latest advice I have is that the area currently fenced from the rest of the reserve around the tennis courts will provide sufficient land for the construction of an additional court without the necessity to start breaking into mature vegetation. In summary, we would see that there must be some way by which we could arrive at a compromise with the Calca Tennis Club to meet their needs.

The second area is an area of mallee vegetation—some of it very old—on which the local people would like to build an oval. That is the area that the management plan is going to recommend should not be so alienated for that purpose. The management plan will be produced for public display and comment within the next few months. The comments will be commented on by the independent Reserves Advisory Committee, which reports to the Minister. When I say 'independent', it is not part of the Public Service. The Minister will make a final decision on the future of that area. That will be the recommendation of the management plan, that it should not be turned into an oval.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Further to that, the honourable member did not raise the question of an oval in his query but rather the matter of the tennis courts. If he wants to continue with this line of questioning, I would be interested to know whether Mr Nichol's advice that there is an area in the immediate vicinity of the courts suitable for an additional court to be built without going beyond the fence is also his understanding of the situation.

Mr GUNN: The first matter is the question of the tennis court, to which I do not think any person could object—it should have been there now. I am absolutely flabbergasted at the response to the oval. I have a letter signed by the previous Minister. If this Government is not prepared to do it, if it is the last thing I achieve as a member of Parliament, it will happen with the next change of Government. It upsets me to think that those people, who are so entitled to have that facility, will be denied it. If there was only 100 hectares there, I could understand it, but there are tens of thousands of acres of land on Upper Eyre Peninsula of a similar nature. It is just so unfair for people, who have every sporting facility in the world in the metropolitan area, to sit in judgment and say that those people cannot have it. We have now got a situation where this matter will become embroiled in a political decision. I am now wasting my time, but I must wait for the appropriate time—and I can say that it will happen.

It took a lot of work for me to eventually get legal advice to find a way around the National Parks and Wildlife Act so that land could be hived off by leasing. It took some work, but I got around it. I am sorry that I had to do it. I am very disappointed; I think the decision is unfair. It is another example of where the Department is going to be held in disregard in the local community. I could go on and say a lot of things about the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It has done some foolish things in Eyre Peninsula and has upset the Streaky Bay council greatly. I do not want to mention these things. If the Service wants co-operation in that community it ought to give it that bit of land. It will not have any effect on the blasted park with the regional people. There are ovals at Belair and in other places—in fact, there is more than one. I ask the Minister to reconsider this matter so that it will not become embroiled in a political argument; I see that we are heading right into it. Eventually, it will be hived off anyway.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I have to congratulate the honourable member for his vigorous espousal of the interests of his constituents, particularly the tennis club and the local community. The position is that, first, we believe that the third tennis court can be built. It can be built without the fence being shifted. My understanding was that that was not the honourable member's original position: that he and his constituents were looking for a shifting of the fence and that it would be necessary to eat into the vegetated area in order to get that extra tennis court. We are trying to say that that is not necessary: a third tennis court can still be built. Perhaps the honourable member would like to take it up with his constituents to see whether they agree with our judgment.

As to the broader issue of the oval, the honourable member has overreacted a little to the information that he was just given. The honourable member was given an indication that the advice to Government—and that is what draft management plans are—would be along certain lines. That is a little less than a decision. The honourable member then proceeded to take umbrage at what he called 'the decision' of a particular matter. The decision will eventually be taken by the Government in the light of the public comments on the management plan. Perhaps the honourable member can assist in relation to what is described as 'the oval' on the other side of the road.

Mr GUNN: That is privately owned land. Surely the Minister is prepared to sit down and discuss the matter with me.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We are trying to explore a resolution. What are the possibilities on the other side of the road?

Mr GUNN: That is not really acceptable because there is a tennis court on one side of the road and most of the cars park on the other side. Obviously with a tennis court there is a clubhouse. If the oval were put on the other side of the road there would be a risk to children going backwards and forwards from the motor cars. I have spent a number of Saturday afternoons on a hot day at that oval and it is not a satisfactory arrangement. Any reasonable person who looked at it would come to the conclusion that if an oval was to be built it should be next door to the tennis courts.

One of the tragedies in country towns being small communities is that the sporting facilities are split up. Bowling clubs and tennis courts are scattered and there is not one decent facility to service both sporting clubs. Here is a proposal that would allow them to do that. I am sure that if the Minister was to look at it he would agree with me. It is only a small oval: they are not asking for 100 acres, and it would not matter if they were. There is plenty of limestone mallee scrub and gypsum lakes—the Upper Eyre Peninsula is full of it. I hope that the Minister will agree to be

reasonable in this matter. I am happy to sit and talk to him and his officers about it, but I would like the matter resolved as quickly as possible.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It would not be proper to resolve the matter of the oval until the period for public comment on the management plan had expired. After all, this is why there is a period for public comment so that all points of view can be taken into account. I am not unsympathetic to the cause that the honourable member espouses. We all know that the Eyre Peninsula produces some pretty good tennis players from time to time, even though they spend a lot of time in the telephone box, it would appear from the television. I am prepared to look at it.

In relation to the limestone country on the Peninsula, there are large amounts of it: not all of that is represented in the parks system. I have to be concerned for the amount that is represented in the parks system and the impact on it of any particular development, small scale though this may be.

Mr GUNN: I hope that the Minister's officers will be prepared to discuss the matter so that it can be resolved. I will recommend to my constituents to make appropriate representation to the draft plan when it comes out. I expect to be around this place for a while and I can assure the Committee that at the appropriate time that oval will be established. I hope that it can be done by negotiation or before that. I hope that I have achieved something for my constituents. The next matter, I understand, the Minister touched on earlier. I understand, too, that he indicated that no compulsory levy or deposit would be put on beer bottles.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Yes.

Mr GUNN: I would like to quote briefly from a letter that I received from a scout group, which states:

Our scout group has been advised that the State Government—I do not know who advised them—

through the Department of Environment and Planning intends to introduce legislation which will impose a deposit on all beer bottles. We believe that this deposit will be a minimum 5 cents and perhaps as high as 20 cents.

Could the Minister briefly clear up this matter so that I can inform those people that it is not accurate?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: This matter was raised earlier today, and the honourable member must have been absent. I answered a question on it from the member for Henley Beach in the House a week or so ago. There is no intention by the Government to bring the pickaxe system under the Act. Concerning the 20 cent deposit, I can only assume that the confusion arose for the most part out of statements made by medical practitioners in their public comments about damage to people from broken glass on beaches. I am not responsible, nor is the Government, for statements that might come from the medical fraternity.

Mr BAKER: What is the status of our 'sniffers'?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The honourable member has taken considerable interest in this matter. It relates to the amendments approved by the House some time ago to the Clean Air Act. The new Act provided that odour could be the subject of a prosecution. On one occasion the honourable member asked what technical training or expertise was required of such a person, and I simply make the point that it is a bit like jurors in the criminal system. By the very nature of the control that we seek to impose, it would be quite wrong for people to be recruited purely from those who had some particular training or expertise.

The people with whom we are dealing do have training and expertise in other areas, but the legislation provides that a prosecution can only be launched (a) following the laying of a complaint, and (b) where it can be established that the odour emanating from a particular plant is significantly greater than the normal level of odour that emanates

from that area. One does not need a machine to establish that, nor does one need special training: all one needs is olfactory organs in reasonable condition.

Mr BAKER: I presume from the Minister's answer that he will get 12 people without any particular skills to do the job because he has related it to the jury system. In fact, we can get a consensus on the subject, because it would be wrong if we chose one person whose nasal passages were not all that clear or who might have some sinus problem that could affect his judgment.

Does the transportation review SDP, under development and management in the booklet, relate to the north-south corridor and the lands that are being disposed of by the Minister of Transport in the near western suburbs and, if so, what is the impact of that SDP?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: In response to the throwaway line of the honourable member for Mitcham, may I say that, if there is a prosecution, the Crown must be able to prove its case in court. That will be the safeguard for the individual in the rare case where a prosecution is brought. Transportation SDP is a fairly straightforward matter. The development plan, as amalgamated under the new Planning Act, had as one of its features the north-south transport corridor. When the Government decided that the corridor, in the form in which it was envisaged, should no longer be part of the plan, a supplementary development plan had to be prepared so as to remove it, and that matter is proceeding.

Mr BAKER: I take it then that the Government is taking back the land that was under the formal control of the Minister of Transport and that it will revert to some other use through the supplementary development plan. I assume that residential and industrial use will be involved in that SDP or that there will just be a general statement of intent.

Regarding the Department's capital programme, can the Minister provide a statement of payments in June 1984 in respect of all capital works undertaken by his Department? I am looking at this matter from the point of view of debt scheduling. How much was spent during June 1984 on capital items and to whom were payments made?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: We have not got those figures here, but they can be obtained.

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister say why the National Parks and Wildlife Service has a strong objection to the importing of kangaroo meat from Queensland by people who wish to pack it in a fairly standard container and sell it through butcher shops for human consumption? Recently, a Mrs Brown sent the following letter, dated 14 September, to the Department:

We wish to import kangaroo meat, boned and dressed from Queensland, pack it into 500 gramme containers (enclosed) and market it into butcher shops and supermarkets. The South Australian Health Commission informs us that meat originating from Queensland does not contravene regulation 4 of the Food and Drugs Act. It is not lawful to slaughter, dress, or process kangaroo meat for human consumption, when the regulations in Queensland are of a very high standard on hygiene and plant operation, meat preparation, and the handling of all kangaroo meat is to human consumption standard. In Queensland, under the Department of Primary Industry, kangaroo meat must have blue strip dye which is only an identification mark. The dye is the same used for the colours of food and confectionery, so how can they say that in this State it is condemned for sale in butcher shops and supermarkets? Our packaging has been approved by the Metropolitan County Board, so there is no fear whatsoever of cross-contamination.

Then follows a lengthy explanation. Why does the Department not wish people to enter into this process? Such people want to set up in business and employ other people. I understand that they have spent much money and that considerable negotiation has been involved. These people hold a shooter's permit from the Department to take protected animals as well as carcasses and skins. I have discussed this matter at length with these people. Has this case been

reconsidered or can it be reconsidered, because it seems that, so long as the meat is processed so as to be fit for human consumption, these people should be encouraged in their aim?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Perhaps Mr Nichols can answer that question.

Mr Nichols: Has the lady received a point-blank refusal to do this?

Mr GUNN: I do not think so.

Mr Nichols: Then I would say that the Department has no objection in principle. If the lady complied with the necessary health regulations and the regulations regarding the movement of meat between the States, we would have no intrinsic objection to her plan.

Mr GUNN: These people came to me and told me that they intended to spend much money and employ other people. There seems to be a conflict in the interpretation of the regulations. Can the Minister's officer say what can be done to resolve the doubts and concerns of the Department, which seeks to protect the interests and welfare of the public?

Mr Nichols: I cannot outline those steps in the detail that the honourable member wants, but I believe that the consultation with our law enforcement officers has been such that we have covered all the points referred to by the honourable member. Indeed, I believe that the lady is to get her permit and that she was in our office only a week or so ago.

Mr GUNN: Does the Department plan to acquire, either by negotiation or by compulsion, land near Wilpena Pound? Has pressure been placed on a landholder to make his land available for the extension of a national park?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: No pressure has been placed on anyone. When I visited Wilpena Pound with some of my officers about a year ago, I had discussions with a local landholder and indicated that we would be interested in purchase if he was interested in sale. He indicated that he was not interested in sale, and I dropped the matter at that point. We are, however, continuing to be interested because we believe that the general health of the park would be better served by dispersal of human activity there which at this stage is heavily concentrated in the caravan park area and that an extension of the park would allow for some dispersal of that tourist impact and would help us. However, the gentleman is not interested in sale at this stage. We are not at all interested in compulsory acquisition or anything like that. So, that is where the matter rests.

Mr GUNN: Will the Department try to prevent the said gentleman transferring that land to members of his immediate family if he wishes to do so?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: No.

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister briefly outline his Department's attitude to the issuing of permits for the destruction of kangaroos? Does the Minister expect that in the next allocation there will be a significant increase in the number of permits issued?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: That will depend on the survey. As the honourable member would be aware, my consistent approach since becoming Minister has been to reduce the number of permits available, although it is interesting to note that the quota has never been taken up. That reduction has reflected two things: first, my concern that perhaps the balance was too far in the direction of the culling programme; and, secondly (and possibly more importantly), the impact of the drought on macroquad numbers such as occurred in the early 1980s.

That position has turned right around, and I would expect that there would be a very substantial recovery of numbers indicated in our next survey. Until I have the results of that survey I am not in the position to say whether I approve

an increase in the quota, whether I will maintain the *status quo* or even provide for a reduction. The other point is that this is a matter that is now very closely tied in with the Commonwealth. We obtained considerable assistance from the Commonwealth in kind in relation to the resources necessary for surveys to be undertaken. We are locked into a national system in regard to the survey. The Federal Minister, Mr Cohen, has attempted to fight the good fight in the international realms to ensure that we are not placed in the position that in effect the private industry which does the culling for us is forced right out of business.

I am fairly happy with the way that the programme is going at this stage. I do not accept the arguments of some of the more extreme groups who cannot be too critical of it. In any event, they have been fairly quiet in South Australia in the past year or so. Maybe that is tempting fate to even make that statement, but I understand from Mr Cohen that he is continuing to be inundated by correspondence from extreme groups. However, it has been very quiet in South Australia, which suggests to me that for the most part people are reasonably happy. As the honourable member would be aware from our infamous kangaroo summit, the mainstream environmental groups that were represented there, such as the Nature Conservation Society, came out with very responsible attitudes in regard to the culling of the species.

Mr GUNN: I refer to the problem at Oraparinna and at the other national parks in relation to controlling rabbit numbers. During a weekend recently I received considerable representation from people expressing real concern about the number of rabbits particularly in Oraparinna Park and about the ineffective programme to eradicate them. I drive through that area and have also flown over it, and I have flown over the North-West and have been most perturbed about the rabbit numbers there and about how they can be controlled.

In regard to Oraparinna, can the Minister advise whether there are any plans to let rabbit trappers in for a limited period, using their own vehicles? I understand that they are not allowed to use vehicles, but that is just hopeless. Could I suggest that they have an organised programme involving ripping or bulldozing burrows with follow up poisoning. In that way I believe that some impact can be made. I know that the Minister's office is concerned about protecting the parks and the environment but, no matter what course of action is taken, if the place continues to be inundated with rabbits such an action would be useless. From my own experience the only way to get rid of rabbits in the long term is to have effective ripping of warrens. I realise that that would be a very large undertaking in a place such as Oraparinna, but I believe that something like that will have to be done. Some people on neighbouring properties have told me that they are considering their own programmes. The programmes would involve fencing off certain areas and getting rid of the rabbits. I understand that some of the strains of myxomatosis have not been as effective as they used to be. I am really concerned about some action being taken to get rid of this problem.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I invite Mr Nichols to provide us with details of the programmes that we have in train. In general terms we share the honourable member's concern that the exclosures that have been set up in the Gammon Range National Park, for example, suggest that the rabbits are probably responsible for imposing the greatest grazing pressure on the environment of any of the either native or feral species in that area. It is a real concern. It is a pattern that varies in the North. For example, I am told that numbers of rabbits are fairly low on the Willochra Plain. I do not know whether the honourable member has better information than I have. However, most people would certainly agree with him in relation to the rabbits in the North-West. We

have a ripping programme that I have seen in operation at Katarapko, in the Riverland. It is a more difficult problem where there are extensive park areas such as those in the Gammon or Flinders Ranges National Parks to which the honourable member referred. Perhaps Mr Nichols could indicate or identify the programmes that we have.

Mr Nichols: I do not have exact details of the amounts of money that have been spent in the Flinders Ranges over the past several years. However, the programme has been extensive, as all of our immediate neighbours to that park know and are frequently willing to tell us. The work has been largely directed towards the use of myxomatosis strains, which, as the honourable member pointed out, are now reaching the stage of being ineffective. The use of 1080 with a follow up of phosphoxin, as well as some ripping (but not extensive) has occurred. We place most hope on the development of a rabbit flea which is an effective biological control at the moment in better areas but not yet in arid areas. However, we have been informed by the authorities involved that there should be further development of this and that there is a possibility that a flea that is effective in arid areas could be developed in the next couple of years. It is a massive problem.

Our exclosures prove that rabbits are a major problem, much more so than the kangaroo or euros, for example. We have set up exclosures where rabbits and kangaroos are operating, and exclosures where only kangaroos are operating. This indicates that there is a marked difference in regard to the areas affected by rabbits. We are devoting a lot of money and energy towards alleviating this problem. If specific figures are required by the honourable member I can provide them for him later.

Mr GUNN: Have the Minister's officers been doing any field work recently in the North-West area in relation to the effects that rabbits are having on the Pitjantjatjara lands or the area that is about to be proclaimed as the Maralinga lands?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Not in any specific way. We have certain responsibilities in regard to the Unnamed Conservation Park and in regard to matters involved in the transfer of those other areas.

Mr GUNN: Are any plans afoot for officers to go into those areas to survey the wildlife and other aspects of those areas?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: In the short term I do not know whether we would have the resources to do that. As the honourable member knows, we are flat out looking after the areas under our care and control in the North and in our endeavour to exercise our responsibility in relation to off-park conservation. The famous war at Innamincka recently in relation to illegal hunting was an indication that the rangers do their best. The vast areas of land, such as those to be transferred to the Aborigines as a result of the legislation that we passed really are completely beyond us.

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

Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous,
\$508 000—Examination declared completed.

Works and Services—Department of Environment and
Planning, \$6 440 000—Examination declared completed.

Lands, \$27 479 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr G.M. Gunn
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Mr E.J. Meier

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. Scriven, Director of Lands, Department of Lands.
Mr R.F. Elleway, Assistant Director, Department of Lands.
Mr J. Maher, Registrar-General, Department of Lands.
Mr W. Mellen, Director, Administration and Finance, Department of Lands.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I begin by referring to page 53 of the yellow book and to an increase of 37 in full-time equivalents. I notice that most of that increase relates to land survey, mapping, and administration of the land titles system, with which I have no argument inasmuch as possibly one of the major concerns in the community at the moment is in the real estate area and the problems of getting transfers and subdivisions through. What is the Government or the Department endeavouring to do to cope with the backlog resulting in the past year or two from new titles, subdivisions, and so forth? I notice that there has been a significant increase of some 16.5 full-time equivalents in land survey and mapping; in the land titles area there are some 10.4 full-time equivalents. To what extent will this overcome the problem that concerns the people involved? Land agents have certainly expressed a great deal of concern about delays and the problem of getting planning approval then titles through.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Perhaps I should ask the Registrar-General to answer that question in some detail. However, this matter came up in the previous Committee when the honourable member's colleague asked about it in much the same context. I indicated that the Government, through me, has had extensive consultations with the private land development industry. We have endeavoured to tackle it by looking at four areas of problems in this complex process of converting broad acres to developed urban allotments. First, there are the problems inherent in what, after all, is a more decentralised decision-making procedure in the Planning Act itself; information was placed before the previous Committee on that aspect.

Secondly, there are problems in getting the work done in the Registrar-General's office because of the increase in activity and, therefore, pressure on that office over the past 12 months. Thirdly and fourthly, in relation to the two major utilities—E & WS and ETSA—discussions have been held with them to improve their procedures and ensure that that part of the whole process is expedited. Now we are focusing more specifically on the second of those four areas. In all these areas I think private industry has expressed its gratitude that the Government has seriously attempted to address the problems identified. I will ask Mr Maher to reply to the specific matters as they affect the Registrar-General's office.

Mr Maher: I begin by referring to the document examination section and, in particular, to two aspects of that: one is what is described as grade 2 work, which would be the more difficult type of documentary work. We have in that area four examining officers of a level required to process division documents, documents creating easements and other more technical types of documents. In that area we have increased the staffing from five to seven which, in percentage terms, represents something like a 40 per cent increase in staffing in that area.

It is difficult to describe grade 1 work as the simpler type of documentary work, but it is at least work not requiring the greater expertise of the division type of work. There we have augmented that staff complement by three trained officers, together with a contract officer who had retired previously from that section. In terms of that group's complement, it has been increased from eight to 12 which, again in percentage terms, obviously represents a 50 per cent increase. In the plan examination section, over a period we have been able to add three technical officers who would be at roughly the top of the base grade level referred to as TO1 officers. With the assistance of these people we have been able to improve productivity in terms of survey examination by reducing our average time of survey examination from 2.3 to two man days in terms of each respective survey which is examined.

Three technical officers have been seconded from other Government departments. Two have returned to their own departments but we still have one of those working in the survey area of the Lands Titles Office. He has actually been allocated a specific job, in terms of some of those positions the Minister mentioned a short while ago in relation to the Government providing extra staff. These staff will now be working at least in these areas for up to 12 months in some effort to contain and eventually, in the longer term, reduce the backlogs.

We have had a domestic rearrangement of staff within the drafting branch of the titles office itself; we have added four additional personnel to survey examination. Of course, this has had some effect on backlogs in other areas of the office. However, it seemed to us in the titles office that it would be better to spread the backlog load to one or two of the other areas where the pressure was less from the point of view of people waiting at the end of the pipeline to see their surveys finally examined and proved. We had an advertisement in the Public Service Board notice on 15 August, when applications from technical officers, particularly from the point of view of survey examination, were called. As a result of that, we have been able to employ further staff there.

Effectively, overall the examining staff of the section has been increased by something like 21 per cent, which represents an increase of 14 to 17 officers. We have already employed in the drafting section of the Lands Titles Office three base grade technical people for drafting work, and only today people were being interviewed with a view to employing another six at base grade level in the Lands Titles Office. Of course, one of the difficulties is securing people who are trained or capable of being trained fairly rapidly at a level where they can be productive in terms of survey examination.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That is fine, but to what extent is it overcoming the problem that is confronting the public?

Mr Maher: At present, the problem is not being overcome. I think that one can only hope in the short term to contain the problem and I think that it is important to bear in mind that if we compare the number of surveys that were being lodged, say, in September 1983 with those lodged in September 1984, there was quite a significant increase in survey lodgements per month. In September 1983, 148 survey plans

were lodged and the comment was made in a report at that time that those plans lodged for examination in September 1983 eclipsed the previous all-time record lodgement of 145 in July of that year. In September 1984 we are facing an even greater number of survey lodgements: 171 surveys had been lodged until the close of business yesterday.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I add briefly that we have attempted to achieve some sort of priority in the examination of these things. Where a person wants to resubdivide a hectare block of land into two half-hectares, it is vitally important to that person that he should receive service as quickly as possible. However, I guess that in social terms that might be seen as having a lower priority than where a developer has plans for a subdivision that might provide 200 blocks of land, and supply and demand is a critical question at this stage as to serviced blocks of land which should be very quickly addressed, otherwise the pressure on prices which is already evident will accelerate. Obviously we try to give some priority to those types of applications.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Is there no way that the procedures that have been traditionally gone through to make certain that the title is correct and the guarantee provided by the Government that the title will be 100 per cent accurate can be streamlined or helped by the addition of some computerised equipment, or is it a straightout manual job that cannot in any way be electronically assisted?

Mr Maher: I pick up your last remark and the answer is that it is in real terms a straightout manual job that cannot be assisted by automated processes in that particular area. It is a matter of getting a survey plan, looking at the survey plan in relation to other survey plans that have been lodged previously, relating those to the boundaries of land described in certificates of title, and also ensuring that people lodging those plans of survey have observed all the necessary requisites in relation to obtaining the appropriate consents, not merely the consent of the South Australian Planning Commission and council consent but also a variety of other legal matters like the necessity for easements for access and things of that description to be created.

However, overall in the Lands Titles Office over a number of years we have had a very careful look at our methods and the way in which we have gone about processing these plans of survey, and it really comes down to saying simply that one has, as it were, pared to the bone all things that might be regarded as unnecessary. However, one must also bear in mind that the extent to which one goes in this direction is limited by the fact that what we are issuing, as the Committee may well and truly appreciate, are guaranteed certificates of title and they, in turn, depend on the validity of the survey data that is presented for plan examination and subsequent deposit of those plans to allow the land to be adequately and satisfactorily identified so that the purchaser is assured that what he has, as described in the title, is that to which he is entitled.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I have a letter that was forwarded to a colleague of mine from the State Bank which I think highlights the sort of problem whereby this person had made an application to the State Bank for a concessional housing loan and, while the bank indicated that approval could be given for the loan possibly within seven days, the State Bank stated in its letter:

In this particular instance we have followed up your inquiry with the Planning Commission who confirm that the application for issue is currently awaiting Planning Commission certification before being lodged with the Registrar-General for approval of the plan and issue of the title, a process which, according to the surveying consultants, is likely to take at least three months.

The letter further states that for the people to proceed in any way with building until that title is absolute could only be considered foolhardy. I suppose we are really looking at

the fact that every month there is a dramatic increase in the cost of building. We have certainly seen some massive increases in South Australia in the past 12 months in the value of buildings and, once again, this adds an unknown quantity in regard to the loan a purchaser may have to negotiate. The loan that was initiated might after a six-month delay suddenly be nowhere near sufficient to complete the house that they initially started.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: We recognise that problem. I do not know that I can add too much more to what has already been imparted to the Committee. I simply hope that the Government has indicated its priorities that, in what is largely a standstill Budget, we have been able to provide a significant addition of resources to the Registrar-General in order to try to cut into this backlog. In addition to the normal sort of budgetary restraints we have, there is simply the problem that we have come close to sucking dry the lemon so far as the supply of people who are able to carry on this work is concerned.

We have indeed made some inquiries as to the availability of such trained people from New Zealand. That, in itself, is a little bit of a tragedy in a country where there is unemployment at the level we have and we cannot immediately recruit from amongst the levels of the unemployed. We are dealing with specialised tasks for which specialised training is required. We will continue the search, and I certainly give the honourable member my assurance that the problem here is not lack of will by the Government or, indeed, predominantly lack of resources to meet the tasks in terms of dollars and cents, but rather the lack of suitably trained people left to undertake those tasks.

Mr MEIER: Page 53 of the yellow book states:

The total departmental expenditure for the 1984-85 financial year amounts to \$37.293 million.

In the details of Estimates of Payments on page 94 we have the proposed figure for the 1984-85 year of \$27.479 million. What is missing in the white book?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: I would imagine that one of the things missing is the capital component of our total expenditure. I assume the \$37.293 million represents the all-up capital and recurrent expenditure. I simply indicate to the Committee that this is a problem that bedevilled us in the previous Committee because, in both the Department of Environment and Planning and the Department of Lands, those departments have been chosen for programme performance budgeting. Honourable members have before them details of the Estimates and actual expenditure for last year in line budgeting terms and the Estimates for this year in programme budgeting terms. That is a recipe for confusion amongst everybody, not least of all the Minister. That has been put on us by Treasury, and next year we will be able to compare like with like because, indeed, the previous year's figures (that is this year's figures) will be on the programme basis as will the Estimates. There are in fact four components which get a guernsey in the global figure. They are the capital component, the recurrent component, the interdepartmental charges (because we are a service department to other agencies), and deposit and trust accounts that are operated.

Mr MEIER: It would appear from the Estimates that there was an overrun of roughly \$1.5 million in the voted sum *versus* actual payments. Will the Minister explain why it was overspent and whether there were any measures taken to try to prevent such overrunning?

The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood: There were two areas. First, we have been talking about the considerable increase in staffing resources made available to the Registrar-General as a result of this Budget in order to endeavour to eat away the backlog of which the honourable member's colleague complains and in which I share his concern. That is not something which

simply began at the beginning of this financial year and, in fact, some of these additional staffing resources had already been made available to the Registrar-General in the last financial year and show up in these figures. That was a deliberate Government decision to overspend in that area in order to meet that obvious need.

The other area was an increase in technical officers in the Surveyor-General's area. Again, we have been concerned about the continuing backlog in the mapping programme. Also, it was necessary to provide resources to get the DCDB (digital cadastral data base) programme under way, which everyone sees as being a very important underpinning of the whole of the mapping programme. That effort shows up again in the Budget with the additional 16.5 full-time equivalents that have been made available to the land survey and mapping section. Some of that effort in this Budget was anticipated towards the end of the last financial year.

Mr MEIER: I noted yesterday in the Health Budget that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had been fined \$600 000 for going over its budget. At least the Minister has explained the reasons and the Department will not be rapped over the knuckles in any way.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: No, it was deliberate Government policy.

Mr MEIER: At page 95 of the Estimates of Payments, the voted and actual payments appear with nothing in the proposed payments whereas on the next two pages there are no voted and actual payments for 1983-84 but there are figures for 1984-85. That is a little confusing when many other departments have endeavoured to provide all figures.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: This is a matter about which I apologised for, in a sense, five minutes ago. It is difficult to tie up because the votes and actual payments 1983-84 have been worked out on a line basis, whereas the 1984-85 proposed expenditure is on a programme basis. That is not of our doing; that is Treasury's doing. It relates to the gradual, phased implementation of programme performance budgeting through all departments.

As a private member of Parliament I have some concerns about that. I am not sure that in the long run we will see the magical benefit of this approach that has been represented. The honourable member would be aware that the previous Government set this programme in motion and that the present Government has decided that it should continue with the initiative. In the long run I may be proven wrong, in which case I will be the first to admit it. It is a recipe for confusion on this Committee. I apologise for that, although it is really none of my doing, nor that of my Department. The Treasury in its wisdom has decided that this is how it should be set up. Next year when 1984-85 and 1985-86 can be shown in programme form we will be able to compare apples with apples and not apples with pears.

Mr MEIER: At page 52 of the yellow book, under 'Implications for Resources', it states:

The twin Burroughs B6800 computers situated at the Department's Marden Computer Centre will require replacement in late 1986.

It then goes on to state that it has to be budgeted for. When were those computers installed and what is wrong with them? Was a mistake possibly made initially, or has subsequent technology completely outpaced them?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I understand that one device was installed in 1979 and another a little more recently. As a Department we indicate our preference for equipment, and this matter would certainly have to be referred to the Data Processing Board, because any purchases in excess of \$50 000 have to be referred to it. Then the normal processes of State Supply comes into operation in relation to purchase. So, whatever we say further down the track, there are suf-

ficient safeguards to ensure that the purchases made in the future are 'state of the art' purchases which will give us value for money. Technological innovations in this area are such that equipment like this becomes dated, and it is important that replacement occurs when it seems necessary.

Mr MEIER: It is worrying that computers have to be replaced in less than five years. Does the Minister think that perhaps the wrong computer or computers were purchased in the first place?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I make two points: the sheer volume of work involved means that replacement is usually necessary perhaps earlier than the layman would believe. Secondly, I understand that that is not a poor performance in the industry; that it is unusual to have a computer in operation for, say, 10 years. Replacement usually occurs well before that time. In fact, probably in terms of cost effectiveness the earlier replacement is to be preferred to allowing an older machine to limp along at a lower level of service than the state of the art replacement would give.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: With the change in the legislation concerning the issue of valuations, ratepayers may object at any time and, instead of an individual notice being sent out, the indication of the new rate is enclosed with the water rates or council rates notice. For example, council rates notices have been going out with the new valuation as early as July, and objections have been lodged with the Valuer-General's office against the new valuation. We have been informed that objections lodged as early as July this year still have received no response from the Valuer-General's office. Is that delay the result of a work load problem in the office, because council rates are due to be paid soon and, if no response is received from the Valuer-General, no adjustment can be made to the council rates?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I shall soon be introducing legislation to provide for a conciliation mechanism in respect of valuation objections, and I think that that legislation will be well supported and will help address this problem. The honourable member can examine the legislation at the appropriate time. There is a drain of valuers to the private sector at this time, and that has created problems for Government agencies. I am not aware that the problem is acute in the sense that there is a great backlog.

Another point concerns whether this problem has occurred at the regional level or in the Adelaide office of the Department. Regionalisation has proceeded quickly and smoothly in the Lands Department and many of these things can be handled at the regional level.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am informed that the Gawler council rate notices for 1984-85 went out some time ago and that some ratepayers have exercised their right to object to the Valuer-General concerning their new assessments. Although these objections were lodged in mid-July, the ratepayers have received no response. Obviously, the rate notices went out early in the Gawler area for the objections to have been lodged as early as July. The concern is that to this time, to the best of our knowledge, the objections have not been processed by the Valuer-General.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I will take that question on notice. I am not aware of a general problem. If there is a specific problem in relation to objections resulting from the issue of the rate notices in Gawler, I shall inquire and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The yellow book, at page 63, refers to the provision of residential land in country towns as a developer of last resort. I well remember trying to get private developers to deal with small land subdivisions in comparatively small country areas. It was almost impossible to get them to do so. At times there is a significant delay in availability of housing allotments in some of the small country towns. A shortage of housing allotments in small

country towns has the effect of substantially increasing the price that will be paid for the available residential blocks. In other words, an artificial shortage could be created, thus forcing up the value of allotments that are available. That would not be in the best interests of the State or the people living in small country centres.

On page 64 of the yellow book reference is made to proposed capital expenditure for last year being some \$655 000, although in fact only \$292 000 was spent. This year it is proposed to spend \$550 000. Is there a shortage? I have been given an indication that currently a shortage of readily available housing blocks exists in some country areas. Such an artificial shortage would significantly push up the price of allotments to the disadvantage of people trying to build and establish a home.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There is certainly a demand. Before me I have a list of projects under investigation in the various regions of South Australia—the Far North, Eyre Peninsula, Northern Yorke Peninsula, etc., divided into residential and commercial. These are all projects that would have the effect of some form of land division taking place to provide land for specific demands. In fact, 65 projects are listed. I also have before me a list of projects currently in operation, and they come largely under the same general headings: 30 of those projects are currently under way. The position varies from place to place. I see reference here to some areas where I doubt very much that there is a problem in terms of supply of blocks. In fact, some of the areas probably relate more to projects for shack provision rather than for the normal home situation. Of course, in other areas there are particular problems. I would be happy to have any problems of which the honourable member is aware drawn to my attention so that I can determine whether additional resources are needed.

As to the fluctuation of capital expenditure, of course that often relates to whether a certain expenditure is shown in a financial year. For example, the most recent financial year could be missed by a week, and the expenditure would be a charge shown for the next financial year. I doubt whether over a period of four or five years there would be drastic trends one way or another. As the honourable member would know, capital expenditure tends to be lumpy anyway.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Do you have an up-to-date list showing areas where the Department has accepted responsibility for subdividing and providing residential and industrial lands and the number of blocks available at any one time? This would provide us with a clear picture of the problem areas that may be developing.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We could obtain that information for the honourable member. The list that I have in front of me shows, first, by area the projects currently being undertaken and, secondly, by area the places around the State where demands have been put forward and where projects are under consideration. In some cases, of course, those projects may be abandoned because the Department sees them as being unfeasible, whereas in other cases they will proceed. As to the specific number of blocks being requested or produced, we would have to take that on notice, which we are happy to do.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The demand seems to vary greatly: one moment one could have in a town the size of Barmera 20 blocks on hand (and they might be on hand for quite a while) and then two or three months later they are virtually all gone. I am concerned that if they are auctioned and there is a shortage of blocks (and I refer to it as an artificial shortage), the going price at auction can be dramatically higher than what it would be if a significant number of blocks was readily available. This just adds to the problems of young people trying to get off the ground and build a home.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: There is no doubt about that. All I can say, without going into great detail from the documents I have in front of me, is that the Riverland is very well and heavily represented in the projects that are either being considered or are under way. Just from headings I have in front of me, I see Berri stage 3, Berri stage 2 and Berri stage 2B.

The P.B. Arnold: That does not indicate how many blocks are currently on hand.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: No, but it does indicate, for example, some areas of expenditure—finance for land purchased and so on. However, we need to get the information regarding the number of blocks.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I would appreciate an up-to-date list of areas for which the Government has accepted responsibility and the blocks available in the areas concerned.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will get that information.

Mr GUNN: I ask a question about the different criteria that apply when the Lands Department subdivides land and private developers do so. This matter was drawn to my attention recently by a council which was concerned that, when the Lands Department made land available, it really had then to set to work and put in what would normally be expected of a private developer. Has the Minister considered this matter and is he prepared to look at it? I do not want to mention the council concerned, but I will give the name to the Minister in private. Has the Minister or the Department given any consideration to the two sets of guidelines that appear to operate?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: First we have to remember that, in many cases, we are providing serviced land in circumstances where private enterprise is not interested to do so because they cannot even make a quid out of it. Therefore, the State in those circumstances has to step in and ensure that this land is made available. When we set about the task, we would be concerned that the level of service we provide in those subdivisions should be at least at the standard that we require of private enterprise through the normal planning process.

The difference is that since the Crown is involved it is treated as a section 7 application. That does not mean that the Planning Commission is by-passed: it means that it is necessary that the Planning Commission report to me in an advisory role rather than in a statutory decision making role, and that I in turn report to the Parliament. The honourable member will be aware that a very frequent feature of sittings of Parliament is my having to read out 24 Crown development reports. Most of those are not about the Lands Department's initiatives, but some are.

Regency Park was developed before the present Planning Act, so it would not have been subject to this procedure. The land further to the north—Grand Junction Estate—has been subject to that procedure. So, there is public notification (in fact through the Parliament) and it does come under the purview of the Planning Commission, although in a slightly different way from a normal private subdivision. So, I am not unduly alarmed; nor has it ever been drawn to my attention that there is any presumption in favour of the Department of Lands as a developer *vis-a-vis* private enterprise. In any event, I make the point that we are not, for the most part, in competition, anyway.

Mr GUNN: I seek information on the matter of different types of leases. Has the Government given any consideration to allowing people who currently have marginal perpetual leases the opportunity to freehold them? In many cases there is only a fence line, and it would appear to me and other people that it would be a sensible course of action to allow those people to freehold their properties. I understand the whole history of how the Marginal Lands Act was

brought into being. I grew up in the area, so I think that I have a fair knowledge.

However, it would appear now that the Marginal Lands Act has outlived its usefulness and other statutory requirements that prevent the abuse or the problems which cause the Act to be brought into operation. It would appear that it would be in the interests of the Government and the Department if people were encouraged to exercise the right to freehold this land.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: When the Government decided to continue with the policy that had been initiated by its predecessors for the freeholding of perpetual leases in agricultural areas, we decided that for the time being that policy would not extend to the marginal leases or perpetually leased (marginal) land. It had been put to us from certain areas that we should proceed very cautiously in relation to this matter because of the marginal nature in productivity terms, and therefore the more arid condition, of the lands that are subject to this sort of lease. So, what we have said as a Government is not that we have set our face completely against the ultimate freeholding of these areas, but that until such time as additional controls on the condition of the land have been identified and put into place, we will not immediately proceed to the freeholding.

The honourable member will be aware that about a year ago I determined that the time conditions that related to this land should no longer be enforced and at about the same time I set up a committee that is considering the sorts of controls that we believe should be put into place which would then free the Government's mind as to the propriety of allowing the marginal leases to be treated for freeholding in the same way that we have handled the normal perpetual leases. That committee is continuing with its task and it will be the job of the Government, once that process has been completed, to determine whether the recommendations put forward are sufficient to allow us to proceed to the freeholding that the honourable member sees as desirable.

Mr GUNN: Can the Minister give a definite response to whether the Government is planning to increase the perpetual leases? It was reported I think in last week's *Stock Journal* that this matter was either under active consideration or that the Government was planning to alter the long established belief that it was not possible once a perpetual lease fee had been set for the Government to alter it. I would be interested to know, because it was suggested that there would be a minimum fee of \$25 (I think). However, recently (and I happen to be a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee) on a weekly basis every fee possible has been increased. If this was to apply to the fees charged for perpetual leases it would not be long before we would get back to the same situation we had with land tax, where it could become a complete burden that people just could not meet. I would be interested to know what the Government has in mind and why.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: As the honourable member knows, the Government has made no final decision on this. The honourable member is perfectly correct: there has been some discussion about a minimum \$25 fee and that is the subject of discussion with the UF&S at this stage. An alternative has been looked at in terms of some sort of service charge that might be applied. Of course, the State, once one costs the effort that is put into the administration of the perpetual leases, loses a great deal of money on the administration of this tenure. I guess that that is one of the reasons why the former Government determined that the freeholding policy should take place.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Yes. Two things could have happened there. The Government could simply have given away the land, and that might have saved us some money,

or it could have decided, as it did, that some sort of figure should be set for the freehold. That, of course, was the decision taken, and it has been carried on by this Government after an initial period of examination. So, I cannot predict at this stage what the outcome of that matter will be for the honourable member, but discussions are proceeding with the UF&S, and all viewpoints will be taken into account before any final decision is taken.

Mr GUNN: Will legislation be necessary to implement any change?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: It would be necessary to amend the Crown Lands Act.

Mr MEIER: Concern regarding a possible increase in lease payments has come to my attention in two cases. In one instance on southern Yorke Peninsula a property owner has had a lease for many years on a coastal section of land and has been given the right to renew that lease at a new rate. The property owner feels that, as it has been used only as grazing land, it would be too expensive to take up. It was not the property owner who approached me, but a near neighbour who fears that, if the property owner does not lease the land for sheep grazing, trail bikes and the like will come into the area, that the grass will probably grow and create a fire hazard, and that the weeds may not be controlled as they were whilst the landowner was looking after it, as he was under virtual compulsion to do so. If the present lessee says that he will not continue at the higher rate, what options are there?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: This must be a miscellaneous lease, because it could not be a perpetual lease. I will ask Mr Elleway, our Assistant Director, to comment.

Mr Elleway: With miscellaneous leases, in the recent past we have been setting rents according to a formula which says that 5 per cent of the unimproved value of the lease shall be the rental per annum. If the person who wants the land cannot see his way clear to pay that figure, depending on the circumstances we may negotiate with him. If the land is required for future purposes such as town extensions or something of that kind, and we are aware that its productivity would not support that rental, we would be prepared to negotiate with the person. If the land is not required for future purposes and the person is not prepared to pay the rental, we may sell it. In the case that the honourable member quotes, it seems that it is desirable for us to either sell or lease the land at a lower rate, but we do ensure that all our land is leased so that the lessee can take a caretaker role. The neighbour does not need to worry too much about the rabbits and weeds because the land will be leased.

Mr MEIER: The other case involved a landholder who was approaching the age of 60 years and who did not want to buy any more land. The area that he has been leasing was offered at a certain amount, but he said that it would not be economic to buy because he crops it every second year only. That person was very worried that he would lose access to the land. The property is just out of my electorate and the matter may be taken up by another member. However, I am pleased to hear that negotiations are considered. At page 52 of the yellow book, under the heading 'Strategies' it states '... and by further expansion of the Department's operations in decentralised locations'. Where are those locations, and to what extent is decentralisation occurring?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: First, there are offices in the regions (Riverland, Clare and places like that), and then there are offices which are more specifically related to the land information system, particularly in the metropolitan area, and which have proven very valuable. Mr Elleway might be the appropriate person to give the detailed information.

Mr Elleway: Regional offices are located at Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Kadina, Berri, Mount Gambier and in Ade-

laide. District offices are located at Ceduna, Clare, Murray Bridge and Naracoorte. Those offices fulfil the functions of the Department of Lands, of land resource management, valuation, sale of copies of title and other real estate information. Maps and plans are also for sale at those places. Offices performing a valuation function are located at Port Adelaide, Manningham, Glenside, Noarlunga and in the Oaklands Park area. There is also a valuation office at Nuriootpa.

Mr MEIER: Then decentralisation will be expanded during the coming year, according to the statement that I read?

Mr Elleway: We have arrived at a situation where we have established all the regional offices that we will establish. The things that we will do relate largely to the Kadina and Port Augusta offices, which have only just been established, and we will build up staff numbers in those areas to cope with the work transferred out of the city.

Mr MEIER: Turning to computers, what was the cost of the twin Burroughs computers when first purchased and, secondly, can an estimate be given of the likely replacement cost, realising at this stage that it is now 1984 and that we are looking at replacement in 1986? If the Minister does not have the figures, they can be provided.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We will take that on notice and make sure that the honourable member gets the answers.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I return to the matter raised by the member for Eyre concerning marginal perpetual leases. It is recognised by the Department that about 80 per cent of the marginal lands in South Australia is already under Crown perpetual leases and can be freeholded. We are talking only about 10 or 20 per cent of the marginal lands in relation to the freeholding issue, because the remaining 80 or 90 per cent can already be freeholded under the present arrangement. It seems strange that we are arguing about the remaining 10 per cent or 15 per cent, when it would be far simpler (and we will not alter anything at this stage) for the remaining marginal perpetual leases to be converted to Crown perpetual leases, which would enable the freeholding process to go ahead.

Since most marginal perpetual leases are held in conjunction with a farm that is made up of possibly two or three Crown perpetual leases and a marginal lease, we are really splitting hairs in not converting the remaining marginal perpetual leases to Crown perpetual leases and allowing freeholding to take place.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Regarding the policy aspect, we see the committee that has been set up as being a useful exercise, as people from time to time have called on the Government to introduce stricter land management policies. We believe that the expertise that is represented on the committee has a good chance of identifying such policies. As the committee has operated for some time and we are therefore not looking at a great delay before recommendations are brought down, it is only reasonable that I should allow that process to continue.

I am not sure how great is the pressure for freeholding of some of those properties. The initial enthusiasm for the freeholding of perpetual leases generally has abated somewhat as the people who were clamouring have got what they wanted and some of the others wonder whether the expenditure in the purchase of the freehold title is worth it because in any event they hold an asset in the present perpetual lease. It is therefore not unreasonable for me to ask the few that are looking for freeholding to wait until the Government has completed the present review.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The enthusiasm will increase dramatically if there is a move afoot for the Government to break with the rents that have been fixed in perpetuity. Once those have been broken the landholder will have no guarantee as to where the Government is likely to stop, and

one could see not rents of a minimum of \$25 a year but higher rentals because there are many other rentals in this State on agricultural land that run into large sums that the lessees must find every year. So, that could create great enthusiasm.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is correct, but it is a separate issue that would take great courage on the part of any Government. This Government or any other Government may not want to go down that road, especially because there could be a human dimension in the problem of people being squeezed into having to find, on the one hand, money for higher rentals and, on the other hand, money for the purchase of land which otherwise they would not have had to take up. I do not rule out that there could be some flavour in what the honourable member says as to land that is eventually taken up, but no Government decision has been made at this time.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The average rural producer can work out for himself that the present Government, because of the voting patterns across the State, would find it easy to muster the courage to proceed down that track.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: That is a political consideration, and the Government must have regard for the overall perception of the South Australian community. If there was a perception abroad that any Government was taking a hard line with a group of people who were limited in the sanctions that they could apply to that Government, the general sense of fair play on the part of the electors might well come into being.

It should be remembered also (and perhaps this is not the time to be talking about electoral geography) that there is another Chamber that is part of this Parliament where a vote from one area is every bit as good as from another, and in regard to which there is no such thing as safe seats and marginal seats. Perhaps Mr Elleway can respond to one or two points of detail raised in the honourable member's explanation of his question dealing with marginal lands.

Mr Elleway: When the Liberal Party's policy of freeholding was in force all perpetual leases were able to be freehold. However, when the Labor Administration came to power an examination of the freeholding question was made and it was decided that marginal lands did not include only those lands under the Marginal Lands Act described as marginal perpetual leases but also, primarily, a large part of the northern Murray Mallee and the northern part of Eyre Peninsula. Therefore, in regard to marginal lands, the definition used by the present Administration covers a considerably larger area and it is a block, and not small areas to which I referred such as that on the northern edge of the Mallee areas of South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Is there anything to indicate that blocks of land held under a Crown perpetual lease or a marginal lands perpetual lease or a freehold title are managed any differently?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I think that in State-wide terms one would probably have to say, 'No there isn't.' But one must look at the condition of the lands in the various areas and ask why it is that historically we have determined that there is a somewhat consistent pattern with the conditions being applied to lessees being more stringent as one goes towards the more arid areas of the State. So, the marginal leases are seen as being appropriate to that land which is intermediate in condition, between the freehold and perpetual conditions which apply to the agricultural areas of the State and, of course, the limited tenure of lands in the North, the arid lands.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That argument certainly stood up many years ago, but with the development of modern dry land farming practices, for which Australia is probably well renowned, the practices that are currently being used

are far different from the ones we used 30 or 40 years ago. The problems to which the Minister is referred concerning why the Marginal Lands Act was necessary in years gone by have largely disappeared. In looking at this overall problem I only hope that the Committee will recognise that farming practices have dramatically changed, even in the past 10 or 15 years, with the equipment that is now available and the techniques of dry land farming.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The honourable member may well be right: that may well be part of it. What we are discussing here is that whether in fact tenure has any impact at all on land management practice. Historically it was seen as having some impact. With respect, even the honourable member, as Minister of Lands was not prepared to countenance, say, the freeholding of pastoral leases. Yet, if one were to accept the argument that the nature of the tenure is irrelevant to the management practices undertaken, I guess the argument for freeholding of pastoral areas could be substantiated.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I think there is a different argument there inasmuch as the pastoral areas to which the Minister referred cover vast areas of the State and are held by one person as compared with agricultural holdings which are small in comparison with pastoral lands.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: That adds a further dimension. If the honourable member is simply saying that the State should always proceed very cautiously before it freeholds vast areas of land to a particular individual, I certainly agree with that perhaps mildly socialistic comment.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am not suggesting freeholding of the pastoral lands; the Minister would be well aware that I have never suggested that. It might have been promoted in that manner by certain people some three years ago, but in no way did I present anything to the House in that fashion.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: That is understood, nor, for my part, did I ever represent the honourable member as doing so.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It was argued that that was the thin end of the wedge, which it was not; we had no intention of going down that track. Briefly, I refer to page 81 of the yellow book in relation to Monarto management and disposal, as there was a major undertaking by the Lands Department to wind up the Monarto project and, as effectively as possible, dispose of the Monarto lands. I notice that the recurrent expenditure has dropped dramatically. Can the Minister indicate just what is the current status of Monarto?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Yes, I certainly can. I see from the information in front of me that the last parcel of land placed on the open market has been sold. That was 18 hectares, unsold as at 30 June 1984 but now sold. Something like 2 633 hectares of a total 18 586 hectares has been retained in permanent public ownership; an additional 41 hectares was transferred to the District Council of Murray Bridge; 531 hectares is under long term lease to various sporting bodies; and an additional 925 hectares was retained in public ownership, pending planning and marketing arrangements. Some 14 456 hectares identified for disposal has now all reverted to private hands.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: So, the winding up is virtually completed.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: There is some additional information that Mr Mellen can more quickly describe than I.

Mr Mellen: Some 300 hectares are up for disposal, but disposal is inhibited pending finalisation of the supplementary development plan which is being prepared by the District Council of Murray Bridge.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that we have this vote and two others to vote on. I do not care whether all of the rest

of the time is taken on this vote, but there are two others to be put. Are there any further questions?

Mr MEIER: At pages 54 and 55 of the yellow book appear a couple of items that I would like explained. The first relates to animal welfare. What exactly is that? I notice that it is new. Are we trying to take over the RSPCA? On the adjacent line is 'agricultural resource management'. I notice that the amount spent last year was \$449 000; this year they are getting a vote of \$375 000.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: The RSPCA has traditionally administered the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act for the responsible Minister and has investigated and prosecuted offences under that Act. We have provided that the following money should be spent on animal welfare in the current year: an \$86 000 grant to the RSPCA, \$7 000 for operating expenses and \$24 200 for salaries. That responsibility has come to me as Minister of Lands in the past 12 months, it previously being a charge against, I think, the Chief Secretary.

The officer involved is heavily concerned with the RSPCA and amendments to the legislation, and I would expect that legislation will be presented before the Parliament within the next few months. The grant of \$86 000 is used for funding the investigatory service of the Society and it employs eight inspectors to this end. The Society also raised funds so that it has some private income as well as the grant from the Government.

Mr MEIER: I refer to agricultural resource management. In a sentence or two, what is that about and why the slight decrease?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I missed the second part of the question, but I will call on Mr Scriven, the Director, to answer that.

Mr Scriven: That relates to the management of the dog fence and two people are involved: an inspector and the Manager of the Dog Fence Board. The dog fence is paid for by pastoralists at the southern end of the arid lands, as the honourable member would be aware, and the management of the fence and any innovative measures taken for electrifying the fence as against a purely mechanical fence are taken by the Dog Fence Board.

Mr MEIER: So, it is a slight decrease because so much was spent last year on upgrading it.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Yes, but there was a specific problem at the Muloorina station because of flood damage to the fence and quite a bucket of money had to be spent on that.

Mr MEIER: Page 59 of the yellow book, in relation to issues and trends, states:

The inclusion of a code of ethics in the regulations under the Surveyors Act has and will continue to increase the work load of the Surveyors Board.

I believe that this applies to surveying property boundaries where there is disagreement. I wonder to what extent this will get off the ground and how an ordinary suburban property owner would be able to go about seeking a realignment of his boundaries. Will two property owners have to agree to have it realigned? What if the Department finds that it is wrong and that one chap five years ago bought property that was 12 inches smaller than he thought? Can the Minister comment, considering it seems that it is becoming a greater work load on the Department?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Again, I will ask Mr Mellen to address himself to this.

Mr Mellen: I think that the matter raised has nothing to do with the Surveyors Board. The Surveyors Board is there to look after surveyors rather than survey, and I think that that would be a matter that would have to be referred to the Surveyor-General.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I will undertake to get a detailed reply for the honourable member as the hour is getting late.

Mr MEIER: It is the code of ethics, but someone said to me that it is the realignment of boundaries. However, that is not correct.

Mr Mellen: It refers to surveyors, not surveying.

Mr MEIER: Page 61 of the yellow book, in relation to issues and trends, states:

The number of road plans lodged has stabilised at a lower level than in recent years but this has been offset by the increasing complexity of processing them.

Can the Minister explain why there has been an increasing complexity in processing road closure or road opening proposals?

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: I am afraid that we will have to obtain information for the honourable member in regard to that question.

Mr MEIER: Page 63 of the yellow book, in regard to issues and trends, states:

This area of activity is self sufficient in funds.

However, page 64 states that the outcome for 1983-84 was \$53 000, the proposed figure for this year is \$58 000, and the capital expenditure has also gone up considerably from the outcome. It seems almost a contradiction to say that it is self sufficient, but we have voted more money.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Mr Elleway will answer that.

Mr Elleway: This account is run as a deposit account and the account borrowed \$300 000 from the Government in order to get started some years ago. Last year we paid back \$100 000. The account is still very liquid and we are able to spend from it in lumps and get back the money in lumps that do not necessarily coincide with the financial years.

Mr MEIER: I refer to page 65 of the yellow book. Has the Government any plans for a change in policy on shacks? It is a political issue with private occupation of waterfront

shacks. One of the 'Broad objective(s)/goal(s)' is 'To manage the land in accordance with the public's interest.' I would be interested to know how the Department is going to determine the public's interest in that context.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: Briefly, one aspect of the public interest would be to ensure that continual public access is available to river fronts, to coastlines and to lake frontages. From time to time one finds a situation where shacks have been built in such a way as to severely limit the rights of the public to access to public areas. In looking at shack relocation, or the propriety of freeholding some of those shacks, the classifications have been drawn in such a way so as to ensure that in time the rights of the public for access can continue. That is one example of the sort of criteria that apply.

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

Works and Services—Department of Lands, \$3 600 000—
Examination declared completed.

Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, Miscellane-
ous, \$852 000—Examination declared completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.57 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Friday 28
September at 9.30 a.m.