

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 September 1986

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. Ted Chapman  
 The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
 Mr R.J. Gregory  
 Mr J.H.C. Klunder  
 Mr M.D. Rann  
 The Hon. D.C. Wotton

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** The procedure will be relatively informal. However, I request that the questions line up with the Estimates of Payments and the other budget documents can be used. Membership changes will be notified as they occur. If the Minister undertakes to supply information that is to be inserted in *Hansard*, it must be submitted no later than Friday 31 October. I propose to allow the lead speaker for the Opposition and the Minister to make an opening statement for about 10 to 15 minutes if they desire. I will take a fairly flexible attitude towards the asking of questions: I will allow three questions from each member as well as supplementary questions before the next member is called, provided that that does not go for too long. Subject to the convenience of the Committee, a member outside the Committee who wishes to ask questions will be permitted to do so once Committee members have exhausted a line of questioning. I would appreciate advance notice by members outside the Committee who wish to ask questions.

Questions are to be based on lines of expenditure in the Estimates of Payments, although reference may be made to any of the documents. The questions are to be directed to the Minister and not to the advisers. I assume that Committee members are happy with those arrangements.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is unfortunate that the Minister is under scrutiny only on this day when he has three such important community portfolios. The times are fixed, but at least environment and planning and water resources have a certain time allotted to them. The discussions will be relatively cursory compared with what might otherwise have happened. I will be asking short questions and not making long statements in order to make maximum use of the time available.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In response I undertake not to be unduly prolix in any answers I give and my opening statement will be brief.

Police, \$139 945 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D.A. Hunt, Commissioner of Police.  
 Mr J.A. Humphries, Manager, Resources, Police Department.  
 Mr D.J. Hughes, Director, Administration and Finance.  
 Mr F.E. Bowering, Chief Finance Officer.

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In the context of the budget and the way in which Ministers generally have been treated, it would be reasonable to say that the Police Department has received pretty fair treatment. In part, that reflects the agreement entered into shortly before the budget was put in place in relation to the 38-hour week. The Government has accepted a responsibility to maintain police strength, notwithstanding the 38-hour week, and I believe that is accurately reflected in the estimates before us.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Police Department has recently been extensively reviewed, and this is recorded in the report of the Management Practices Review Steering Committee, handed down in August 1986. There are 56 recommendations under major headings of equipment, human resources, work conditions, pay rates, management consultation, planning and education, promotions, careers, occupational safety and health, selections, transfers, and miscellaneous. I understand a number of the recommendations are already actionable. Has the Government refused to accept any of the recommendations or has it modified them? If so, in what manner?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The procedure to date has been as follows: I have referred the report to the Commissioner to recommend to the Cabinet a strategy for implementation. As the honourable member said, some of these matters are available for immediate implementation, and some are already in the course of implementation. Some are arbitral matters that will have to go through the normal machinery. Some have resource implications which would have to be looked at very carefully by the Cabinet. The Commissioner has the matter under active consideration. If it were the Committee's wish, I would be happy to invite the Commissioner to give a brief overview of the way in which he sees these various matters proceeding.

**Mr Hunt:** There are three major phases for advising the Government. The first would be those matters which can be done as a matter of policy or practice and which will cost neither time nor resources, and those are a number of matters that can be put into effect *in toto* by perhaps the end of March 1987. Other matters will require some research but can still be contained within current resources. Those matters, because of their complexity and changes in general orders and police regulations, would not be achievable perhaps until the end of June 1988. Other matters are just as complex and will require added resources, and those matters can reasonably be expected to be achieved in the next Estimates process. We are currently in the advanced stages of determining the details of that strategy to be able to advise the Minister, and we expect that to be in the very near future.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Minister has said that there has been a reasonable apportionment of funds to the police for this year, and that is reflected in the increased number of personnel required for the 38-hour week and other initiatives. Is the Minister of the belief that that manpower involvement will be on schedule, having regard to the fact that the documents show that there were fewer people on force at 30 June than had been anticipated? What measures is the Minister or the Police Force taking to

provide not only manpower but also the immediate resources that are required for those people, having regard to the fact that it is no good having manpower if one does not have the other resources such as vehicles and equipment that are necessary to make the police effective in the field?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I am not shy about deferring in this way and I assume that it would also be the wish of the Committee that its members should be able directly to question officers on matters of detail. What the honourable member for Light was referring to was the fact that in the last budget, what one might call Jack Wright's last budget, an additional 51 positions were funded; however, some were not immediately filled because of the higher rate of separations that we have had in historical terms. That was one of the things that led to the setting up of the committee that brought down the report to which the honourable member has referred. The separation rate has settled down. There was the move to the six-month training course, which is providing for a quicker flow of recruits into the service. In fact, I will be at the academy tomorrow welcoming graduates into the force. We expect that the steadying down in the separations rate will mean that we will be able to translate the budgeted dollars into manpower. Again, perhaps the Commissioner might like to comment briefly on those matters.

**Mr Hunt:** With the 38-hour week and trying to catch up with the number of resignations, which left us with minus 117 positions at 30 June, we have introduced a strategy of accelerated training courses. By the end of the year those courses will have closed the gap and brought us up to strength. In fact, tomorrow some 80 cadets will graduate; somewhat in excess of 20 cadets will graduate in November, and another 20 will graduate in December. By that time we will have made up the leeway for the total separations that have occurred over the past year.

In relation to the equipment and resources needed to make those people operational, they will be filling positions which have been vacated by others, so the cost is not great. There have been added approvals by the Government in the past few months to enable us to make up the leeway in communications as a result of the introduction of the community policing concept and metropolitan reorganisation.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The report which has been brought down and alluded to makes quite a degree of play of occupational safety and health, and rightly so. Recommendations 46 to 48 pick up some quite important issues to make certain of morale. In relation to housing and accommodation, if the Freeling example is any criterion, the police will have no difficulty in accepting the role that they play. It is a very commendable result. Health, welfare and medical, naturally, is a high profile area at the moment as far as other Government areas are concerned.

One area involving deployment of staff is associated with the helicopter service. At the moment I will not refer to the miscellaneous line in relation to the helicopter as much as I will the health and welfare aspect of the deployment of staff into a facility which is claimed publicly and quite technically as being inadequate for the immediate needs of this State. Recognising that there is only so much money to go around, what areas within the general police budget took priority over the service which was going to be more adequately capable of safeguarding the health and welfare of the deployed staff?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I am not sure whether the member refers to what might be the sort of shuffling of priorities within my overall portfolio area or within the police budget itself.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Within the police budget.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The actual cost of running the helicopter is a charge against the miscellaneous line; it does not arise within the narrower confines of the police budget. I am quite happy as Minister to address the question in terms of that broader concern and in relation to the total resources available to me. After all, it is something which could have both capital and recurrent implications. I guess I saw the priority being very much in terms of communication equipment for the police service and what is after all a very ambitious program, which has now been running for some time, and which has some way to go, sufficient to raise from time to time what are sometimes called environmental objections about where we build communication towers and things like that. I think that has been a very important area.

The member refers, for example, to the Freeling station. Work has still to be done at places like Norwood, for example. I do not know whether work has been completed at Glenelg, but I have looked at what must be done there. There are reasonably bad examples of accommodation that we make available to police officers around the State. Basic accommodation and communications is what I thought were important. If the member indicates that he will raise this issue again under the miscellaneous line, I will stop there. If the member wants me to comment further on the adequacy of the helicopter, I will proceed.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It could be disposed of now, from my point of view.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The instruction to those operating the helicopter is that it is to be operated within its operational limits. No problems of safety arise provided that order is taken into account. There is some problem as to the adequacy of the machine being asked to do everything that this community might ask of it, but no community can ultimately fund against every contingency that might arise. I will not allude to my recent personal experience in the use of the helicopter in a rescue situation, other than to indicate that it was perfectly adequate for what was demanded of it.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On that occasion.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Yes, and indeed on most occasions. When the helicopter is asked to operate outside its limit, the instruction is not to operate at all or to operate in an ancillary role. The health, safety and welfare aspects of the operators does not arise in that circumstance. In future, it would be nice to have a more adequate machine. The specific matters that have been raised in relation to the hoist and the relativities between the twin engine and a single engine have been addressed. It would be better for me to make that information available to the honourable member rather than taking up further time at this stage. Those matters are canvassed adequately in that statement. The honourable member has the further forms of the House available to take up any inadequacies that he sees in the statement.

**Mr GREGORY:** How much does the Police Department realise from the sale of horse manure? If horse manure is not sold, what happens to it?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** There is an arrangement with Adelaide City Council that provides for a nominal return. It is not technically a sale, and I will get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr GREGORY:** Why is horse manure not put out for sale by tender? It is excess to requirements and should be dealt with in the same manner as any other excess material.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I will have to take advice. It is an historical thing. I am not sure that there is a ready market. I will obtain that information.

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the Minister provide an overview of the department's commitment to tackling organised crime and white collar crime? More specifically, will he indicate whether the Police Force has moved to a high tech situation to combat the problem?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will refer briefly to the high tech aspect and then ask the Commissioner to give a brief run-down on the overview. The most interesting innovation, apart from some of the communication areas in which we have been involved recently, is the National Fingerprint Data System, whereby the Police Departments around Australia have made all their records available to a central repository in New South Wales. This information is digitised and can be accessed by the various departments around the country. For example, if a latent fingerprint is found on a stolen car, the tedious problem of having to manually inspect every file throughout the country is done away with and we can immediately determine whether that fingerprint is available in repository and who is the proud possessor of that fingerprint. We were the first department to hook into the facility.

There is, of course, experience in this overseas, where they claim something like a 20 per cent success rate for all latents discovered under all circumstances. That is a success rate through to prosecution. Our commitment to this whole program is \$1.2 million, so I assume around the country something in excess of \$10 million is being put into a facility which will enormously increase our efficiency in the area of crime detection. As to crime protection overall, perhaps the Commissioner will comment on that.

**Mr Hunt:** So far as technology is concerned, it may be recalled that some three years ago we made a public statement to the effect that our South Australian Police Force was second from the bottom in development of technology of any kind. The major breakthrough in the last three years has been in the area of computerisation. That has been through the agency of the Australian Police Ministers Council and the Commissioners of Police conferences in the development of the national exchange of police information, which is a computerised network; the fingerprint system, which the Minister has already mentioned, combined with an upgrading of the National Fingerprint Bureau which is in New South Wales; and the more recent connections between the bureaux of criminal intelligence in each State with their direct connections with the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence, which is the central repository in Canberra operated by the Commissioners of Police and the Police Ministers Council in Australia for the purpose of combating organised crime.

The resources of all these agencies are brought to bear when discussing with the National Crime Authority the targeted areas under consideration nationally which itself forms joint task forces and utilises the information from each police agency and the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. In other areas of what we might call high technology, there have been improvements also in the ability to lift latent fingerprints by the acquisition of a xenon arc lamp and also the upgrading of photographic facilities within the Police Department.

**Mr GREGORY:** Is it intended to proceed with the crime inquiry units and, if so, what is the level of resources that will be allocated to this proposal in the current financial year?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** They are split across the various divisions, and at this stage we do not have a composite picture. I will get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr GREGORY:** At the conclusion of the question asked by the member for Light, the Minister indicated that he would give the member a statement. I would appreciate it if that statement could be more widely distributed by being incorporated in the minutes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am happy for it to be incorporated in *Hansard*. Is the Minister prepared to do that for us at a later stage?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Yes.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** My questions on this subject are confined to the miscellaneous portion, so unless you want me to raise them now I will leave them until later.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We will come to them in chronological order.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Regarding drug crime, what specific advice has the Minister received from police relative to the proposed on-the-spot fines for marijuana? The police have made public utterances relative to the difficulties and other community comments have been made. I refer to articles in the *Advertiser* of 31 May 1986 under the heading 'Fines planned will encourage pot use, say police'; the *News* of 12 June headed 'Pot spot fines unworkable, say police'; the *Advertiser* of Monday, 18 August headed 'Police try to block drugs fines'; and the *News* of Wednesday 10 September headed 'Police members slam spot pot fine'. There is also editorial comment and direct quotes from individuals to substantiate those public statements.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** First, it is always very difficult to get the media to distinguish between the Police Department and the union. I am not quite sure why—I cannot think of any other area in public administration where journalists have any problem at all in distinguishing between the union on the one hand and the department, and one example is the E&WS Department and the Miscellaneous Workers Union. This matter arises time and time again where, because of sloppy shorthand, a statement by the union is attributed to the police. I want to assure the honourable member that those statements to which he refers were made by the union or individuals within the union and do not in any way have the sanction of the Commissioner or the Police Department.

Quite properly, any discussions that I have had with the Commissioner and his officers have been not about policy in relation to this matter but purely about the mechanics of the whole business. The questions raised include whether on-the-spot fines will be more or less efficient in the detection and punishment of drug offenders in the minor sort of field on which we are focusing basically, not the big fines for drug pushers, and so on.

I understand that on the one hand the Police Department would be quite happy about the fact that its officers will not be involved in what is sometimes the very tedious process of having to go to court, give evidence, be cross-examined, and that sort of thing—(although of course it is open for the offender to still go that course if he or she feels it is the better way to go).

Where there have been any concerns, they have been in relation to an assessment of the quantum of the drug that has been detected. The Commissioner may like to comment briefly. Clearly, there is a cut off point at which the on-the-spot fine cannot take its normal course, but obviously my officers would err on the side of caution in that matter. The matter can always be resolved, keeping in mind that the Act provides certain protections for the alleged offender that cannot be done away with. Where there have been discussions with the department, they basically have been about the mechanics rather than policy matters, and the

issue that springs to mind is the ability to gauge the amount of the material that is found in a person's possession.

**Mr Hunt:** I agree with what the Minister said. We have put forward views for consideration and they relate to the expectation as to what the proposed legislation will mean. The mechanics are of vital interest to us because of the workload factor, and we recognise that there is a need to be very specific in determining what will result from an on-the-spot fine or what will proceed into a full investigation requirement. We must ensure that there will be no blurring between the two to avoid court problems that may come up at a later date. The administrative impact system has been addressed because notices will have to be served, and so on. We are very keen to ensure that there will be no deficiencies in the eventual legislation that would compromise the expectations of either the community in regard to the policing of these things or the officers who do the actual policing. This is similar to other social type legislation where there must be a very clearly delineated line about police operations.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** A statement in the *Advertiser* of 20 September indicated that the Federal police had run out of money for surveillance purposes in a drug case. At a time when the Commonwealth and the States are combining in a \$100 million project to seek to come to grips with the overall drug problem, is it likely in relation to the resources now available to the police in South Australia that a similar headline could appear sometime between now and 30 June 1987?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** That is very unlikely but, if it did arise, I would have a good case to go to my colleagues and say that I wanted further subvention to cover the situation. All the State Governments with the Commonwealth Government have seen the war against drugs as being a very high priority. If such a situation eventuated, I believe I would have a case to put to the Treasury and my colleagues. Of course, the other possibility is that when particular matters arise there may be some opportunity to reallocate funds to ensure that we cover this very high priority.

**Mr Hughes:** At this stage we do not envisage any problems.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Given that the Commonwealth is playing a major part in the overall project, the admission by the Special Minister of State, Mr Young, as recently as 20 September, that that situation exists must be a cause of concern regarding the eventual effectiveness of the joint program. The Minister may not be able to comment further other than to confirm that it would be a concern.

As part and parcel of drug and crime surveillance, it has been consistently reported that an essential ingredient is the ability of the police to become involved in phone taps, and an undertaking has been given by Ministers of the present Government, both before the last election and subsequently, that the police would be given such responsibility, albeit with the necessary protections. What point have we reached in assisting the police in overall surveillance with a phone tapping system? If that is already operational, will the Minister or the Commissioner indicate how effective it has been and how frequently it has been called upon as an aid to the desired end result?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First, all I can say in relation to the statement made by the Special Minister of State is that we will continue to do our part, and I expect the Special Minister of State would be trying to settle some accounts with his Treasury to ensure the availability of resources. Regarding phone tapping, the South Australian approach has been to not duplicate the facilities that are available elsewhere but to have an arrangement with the Common-

wealth authorities so that effectively we can run surveillance without duplication. The Commissioner will give the details of how that operates. The specific details of how it is being used in terms of arrests and so on is information that we must treat with a great deal of caution.

**Mr Hunt:** The only time we become involved in any organisation or investigation that involves this procedure is with the Federal police, who have the power, where we act as an adjunct or part of a joint task force. Agreement has been reached that if we proceed with it, it should be done in the initial instance through a central agency; that is, not setting up a separate organisation in South Australia. Costs and administrative factors are involved, and these would be outside our current scope at the moment, and a phased approach would be a useful way to go about it, first, by using a central agency.

**Mr RANN:** The Premier, during the second reading stage of the Appropriation Bill, indicated to the House that an amount of money had been set aside for use during 1986-87 by the Police Department to improve security on STA rail and bus services. This issue has attracted enormous attention in my electorate with concerns about hooliganism and vandalism on buses and trains. How much will be spent in 1986-87 on this important initiative and how is it intended that the money be spent? Will the Minister inform the House about the operation of the proposed transit squad?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The total amount allocated is \$79 000. The transit squad will comprise six members (a sergeant and five other ranks) working on the STA systems. It will be accommodated in an office to be provided by the STA at concourse level at the Adelaide railway station. The squad will be attached, at least at the time of implementation, to Region B and act as a proactive policing group paying specific attention to trouble spots in the public transport system and coordinate the assistance from local police and STA security staff.

There has been a good deal of discussion with the STA about the way in which this squad will operate with existing security staff, and I believe we have now reached an amicable working arrangement.

I confirm what the honourable member has said: there has been real concern about security on late night trains, usually as a result of hooliganism. I recall once being on a late night train where a young woman tried to throw herself off the train—not as a result of hooliganism, but through a drug-related matter. We hope that the transit squad will go some way to resolving these problems.

**Mr RANN:** There is enormous interest in this year's Operation NOAH in terms of South Australia's component in the national NOAH. Last week the Minister outlined to the House the enormous success of last year's operation. Will the Minister outline what cost will be involved this year? What deployment of resources is likely to be incurred?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will ask Mr Hughes to detail that. We have a table relating to last year's costs and we understand that this year's costs will be much the same.

**Mr Hughes:** The total cost to the Police Department in 1985-86 of the 1985 Operation NOAH was \$55 000, made up of \$50 148 for salaries and \$4 856 for other costs. We expect the costs in 1986 to be much the same, and we have made the appropriate provision.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It is very much a community effort. Not all the costs are charged against the Government. The pamphlets associated with Operation NOAH last year were provided by Lions clubs, and we hope that element of private sponsorship will be retained.

**Mr RANN:** Concerning the forthcoming visit of His Holiness the Pope and in relation to the Grand Prix, which is

only a month away, what special arrangements will be made in terms of costs and resource allocations to cope with the special needs of those two events?

**Mr Hughes:** The normal costs associated with the provision of personnel and other services are met from the department's existing budget. For additional costs over and above, which are usually identified during such an operation, we place a claim on Treasury if we do not have the ability to reallocate, and that depends on the stage we are at in the financial year.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Visits such as the Papal tour have been well known to us for many years, whether it is the royal family or other tours; and a plan goes into operation. I guess that the Papal tour is likely to involve more people than the average tour of a person from overseas, so we are assuming approximately 600 police will be involved on each of the two days of the visit. The estimated total cost will be approximately \$210 000, \$80 000 over and above what might be regarded as a reasonable provision for such things.

**Mr Hughes:** Looking at the 1985 situation in relation to the Grand Prix, the total cost to the department of the Grand Prix and associated events (such as the Expos and other events arranged around the Grand Prix) was \$235 000, of which \$54 000 was additional cost to the department that year. At this stage we expect the costing and deployment of personnel to be on a similar scale.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I note under that Support Services a new site for the administration headquarters of the Police Department was pursued but no definite conclusions were reached. Under Specific Targets and Objectives that pursuit is to continue, recognising the absolute need for that to occur. Some suggestions have been put forward, and I commend the site behind what used to be the old tram barn, and directly opposite. What priority is placed by the Government on the need for a new police headquarters in this State?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Clearly, there is a need for a new headquarters. It is the Government's decision, advised as we are by the Government Office Accommodation Committee and others, that any rebuilding should be confined to the southern side of Angas Street, and that the car barn should be used for other Government or other purposes. At this stage a decision has been made to proceed with the communications centre. We are already purchasing equipment for this, as I understand it, and it is important that that equipment be properly housed. There is approval for that to proceed, but that will not preclude the possibility a little further down the track of a more ambitious redevelopment of the space on the southern side of Angas Street.

I have here a report which indicates that the Police Department and officers of the Department of Housing and Construction have commenced work on a major report to overview the significant buildings and accommodation requirements of the department for the next 10 years, looking at both metropolitan and country needs. No doubt it will further refine the Government's ambitions to ultimately transfer most of the existing operations of the police at Thebarton, out of what is, after all, a parklands site, although Commissioner Tomkinson in his report indicated that certain facilities (the mounted cadre and the band) should remain on that site.

I have to say (and this is no news to the Committee), that it will be some years before we will have the resources to be able to go into that ambitious program, but that has some bearing on what is eventually redeveloped on Angas Street.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What ramifications are there on the Police Department for that decision being delayed for that length of time? I refer to the space provided. Is it adequate? I understand that it is not, and as a result there must be ramifications that will occur during the intervening period.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The main ramification is that some of our facilities, which are spread around the city, will remain spread. I refer, for example, to Citicorp buildings. These facilities might otherwise have been brought together under one roof. That is not unusual in public administration. The Lands Department, for which I had some responsibility until about 18 months ago, is spread through a variety of locations. It might be of interest to say that we have at this stage leases on, or in two cases ownership of, a number of properties at Greenhill Road, Eastwood; 3 Wright Street; 19 Wright Street; Hindmarsh Square; Angas Street; Citicorp Building, King Willing Street; Greenhill Road, Dulwich; and the Thebarton Barracks. The last two are not lease operation.

The Government has accepted that it makes good fiscal sense to own its property wherever possible rather than to be paying rent, so we are trying to move along that route. That is an overall ramification for the Government as a whole. For the Police Department, it would make more sense in operational efficiency to have these various areas under one roof. However, there are no glaring inefficiencies in the present situation.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It is stated that the Neighbourhood Watch pilot scheme has been implemented and is being evaluated. What stage has that evaluation reached? The report goes on to say:

There is a need to significantly expand Neighbourhood Watch programs into each metropolitan subdivision following the evaluation of the pilot scheme.

What are we talking about where we refer to metropolitan subdivisions? What is the Minister's reaction to what appears to be a community request for this program to be established everywhere? Within my electorate I have had requests for a Neighbourhood Watch program to be established in five areas. How far does the Government envisage the use of this program? What resources will permit the program to be expanded?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Neighbourhood Watch program relies in part on the degree of community sponsorship, and if it is to continue to have that reliance, that will be one of the limiting factors. I notice that the Commercial Union Insurance has sold sponsorship rights in return for funding at \$50 000 a year for three years.

It is estimated that each new 600 house area will cost \$2 000 to establish and maintain. If we were to move rapidly into a total coverage of Neighbourhood Watch throughout the metropolitan regions, the capacity of the private sector to give that important sponsorship would be strained.

Following the Flinders Park experiment, we have selected 30 programs which are well spread throughout various centres of our activity. The most recent one, announced on 2 September was the Henley Beach scheme, so that would be dear to your heart, Mr Chairman. We try not to select target areas ourselves, although initially targets were partly chosen on the basis of available statistics and demography and on the initiative of the local people where there are citizens groups that are interested in overseeing the implementation of the program; obviously, we will try to treat with them. I cannot tell what the logical end to this program is, although obviously a very much broader spread than we are currently able to provide is what it will turn out to be.

We must be careful not to raise too many expectations about what can be achieved under the program. The pro-

gram suggests that there have been positive results. I hope, (and I think that this is borne out by the statistics) that we are not simply displacing crime from one area to another. It is by no means a cure all, but it is important in that it brings community resources into the policing task. As to evaluation, I do not know whether the Commissioner wants to add something.

**Mr Hunt:** The value of these things cannot be measured simply in tangible terms of crime statistics. The indications are that there has been a lessening of crime in the pilot area, but another intangible benefit is the degree of public confidence in the law enforcement process in the community. To ensure that there is an even spread, as a prelude to the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch, which is one of the crime prevention programs, we had to reorganise the department, and that why a metropolitan review was put in place on 2 January—to create the neighbourhood contact point with the 16 new subdivisions that are in place. In fact, we are fast approaching stage where each new subdivision will have a Neighbourhood Watch program going in its area and the expansion will carry on from there.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I note also that staff resources and equipment strategies have been reviewed with regard to red light camera implementation. What are the results of the review? Does the Government intend that the program will be expanded, recognising the community concern that has been expressed, or the media concern, at least from one major State newspaper campaign, against the program? Generally, is the Government satisfied? What did the review produce, and where do we go from here on this matter?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There was testing of the red light cameras at three metropolitan intersections late 1984, and following that testing a working party was formed with police, highways and Department of Transport officers to make recommendations about the ultimate introduction of cameras into South Australia. Some problems need to be overcome—in particular, the concept of owner onus legislation. Without that, the person would probably argue before the courts that he owned the vehicle that was detected but that he was not driving it and so is not guilty. Obviously, it will be necessary for legislation to be introduced to overcome what otherwise would pretty well set at nought a promising initiative in terms of road safety.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** When will the legislation be introduced?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is for the Minister of Transport to indicate. Work is now being done on it. Whether it is with the Parliamentary Counsel or whether work is being done at departmental level I am not sure. I see that legislation as the simple question of the successful operation of red light cameras. At this stage the department has been asked to advise on the resources needed to implement a reasonably ambitious system covering a number of intersections throughout the State. I am not sure that it is quite appropriate that I say in this public forum exactly how many will be involved, but I am quite happy to give the member that information privately. The resources will be met from this budget once they are quantified.

**Mr GREGORY:** A recent review of police management practices revealed that the average length of service of female officers is considerably shorter than for male officers. The report also suggests that the attrition rate of female officers is growing more rapidly relative to the male resignation rate. I understand that the Police Department recently reviewed the admission back into the Police Force of police officers under the age of 30 years to facilitate the return of former female officers who left the force to have children. How many female police officers are currently employed

and are any specific strategies proposed to attract and retain women in the Police Force? Supplementary to that, how much does it cost to train a police officer under the current scheme and how much did it cost under the previous four year cadet training scheme?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** A variety of matters are imbedded in the question. First, in relation to the whole question of separations, I was involved in this when I was Minister of Education. The difference with the police situation is that in those days we were rather embarrassed that the resignation rate was as low as it was because there was a long standing training system in operation through the College of Advanced Education. So the more teachers that left the department each year meant that there was more opportunity for the employment of young graduates. On the other hand, with the Police Force we have had a system which has been fairly neatly tailored to a fairly realistic appreciation of demand rather than simply saying, 'Come all who have the academic qualifications.'

A rise in the rate of separations in the Police Department was somewhat of a temporary embarrassment to us. I mention that because it has been a feature in the teaching profession also that the resignation rate is higher among women than it is among men. That usually relates in part to the basic biological differences between the sexes, as well as other matters. I have some information which indicates that of 134 resignations in the 1985-86 financial year 34 (or 25 per cent in round terms) were females. The average length of service for males was 9.7 years and 4.6 years for females.

The member also asked about the recruitment of women to the Police Force and strategies for trying to reduce the number of resignations from the force. I will invite the Commissioner to speak to that matter.

However, those matters which are common to most areas of private and public employment and which relate to the higher level of female resignations are matters that we have a great deal of difficulty in addressing. We are only able to address those factors which are peculiar to employment in policing and which lead to a higher rate of resignation among women.

**Mr Hunt:** In relation to strategies, the strategy generally with all applicants and recruits is non-discriminatory. So, I suppose that, if the member is asking whether or not we have any specific strategies to encourage career development for women, it is exactly the same as it is for men. I will refer the cost of training to Mr Hughes. As members are aware, the re-enlistment policy has been reintroduced. Up until about a year ago a policy had never been defined to allow permanent officers who had resigned to come back, although on occasions that did occur. In considering women, we changed the policy to allow people to come back into the department after they had considered their career requirements.

Of course, a number of factors relate to this: age, suitability, training or retraining requirements, the time elapsed between resignation and the time of seeking re-entry; the relative level of seniority on re-entry, and understanding on that; consideration of previous training, examinations and leave entitlements of the person who had resigned; and, of course, the deployment of the person wishing to come back into the force. From memory, not many female officers elect to come back into the service. In fact, I know of only two or three, and even one or two of them have resigned again. I was advised informally the other day that at least three police officers who have resigned in the past 12 or 24 months have made application and are returning to the Police Department.

**Mr GREGORY:** As a comment, it is my view that the age of 30 years is too low, particularly for females. From my knowledge of the Police Force, female police officers want to establish themselves within the force before having children. Women are having children later in life these days so it may be that those female officers wishing to resign and then re-enlist after having children will find that 30 years is too low. I urge the Police Department to reconsider that age limit. I think the cost of training is such that, if people were to re-enlist, particularly males (perhaps after finding that civilian life was not as they imagined it, given that some might never have worked anywhere else), consideration of officers wishing to re-enter the Police Force should include the fact that they have served a four year cadet training course. I believe that re-employing those officers and giving them a brief refresher course would be cheaper and more valuable than employing someone who had never before served in the Police Force.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I point out that we did not answer the member's previous question about the cost of training. The Commissioner will respond to the point just made by the member, and I will then ask Mr Hughes to give that information.

**Mr Hunt:** The cost of a six month course is \$17 123, and for a 12 month course it is \$24 034. In relation to the member's previous question, in the past there were difficulties with officers coming back into the department, particularly in relation to age, because of the proportionately higher superannuation contributions required. In fact, many years ago one officer did resign and then came back but, because the superannuation payments were too high and he could not afford them, he continued in the force without the benefit of superannuation. That was a purely voluntary arrangement.

**Mr GREGORY:** Last year the Government announced its intention to proceed with the establishment of a police Aboriginal aid scheme. I understand that it was designed to quickly train Aborigines for appointment as special constables to fill a community policing role in remote Aboriginal lands and at Port Augusta. How far along is that proposal and what developments are planned for the current financial year?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** In regard to police aide selections in the Pitjantjatjara lands, there are four Aborigines from the communities of Indulkana, Fregon, Amata and Ernabella. The Commissioner tells me that he signed their authorities only this morning. At Port Augusta no selection has yet been made from the 11 written applications received, but that is proceeding.

The supervising police officers to be stationed at one of the four communities have been selected. Of the 22 applicants for these positions, 15 were interviewed before final selections were decided. There have been negotiations on salaries regarding police aides and supervisors, and I think that matter has been resolved.

As to communication, the old fashioned telephone will be used initially, but the possibility of high frequency radio communication is being investigated. I have further information about housing, vehicles, uniforms, the operation and exercise of powers, appointment, training and supervision but, rather than taking up further the time of the Committee, I will make that information available.

The inaugural Police Aides Training Course is to be conducted at Echunga from 6 to 31 October this year, and the annual combined refresher/new intake course will be conducted at Echunga depending on the success of this initial implementation. The scheme will be formally implemented

in early November in the communities of Indulkana, Fregon, Amata and Ernabella. That is proceeding quickly.

**Mr GREGORY:** Can the Minister's written information be included in *Hansard*?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** As I cannot see why that cannot be done, I seek leave to have detailed information about the Police Aide Scheme inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### POLICE AIDE SCHEME

1. In line with Commonwealth and some State funding, the following matters outline this scheme's progress at this time:

(a) Police aide selections:

Pitjantjatjara Lands—the four Aborigines from the communities of Indulkana, Fregon, Amata and Ernabella have been selected. A report seeking approval of selection is to be submitted.

Port August—no selection has yet been made from the eleven written applications received. It is intended not to implement this scheme at Port Augusta until 1987.

(b) Supervising members:

The supervising police officers each to be stationed at one of the four abovementioned communities have been selected. There were 22 applicants, of which 15 were interviewed prior to final selections being decided.

(c) Salaries:

(i) Police aides—as a result of negotiation with the Public Service Board, police aides will be paid a salary of approximately \$256 per week. Additionally, an annual locality allowance of \$3 736, plus a call-out loading of 18.9 per centum shall be paid (\$18 000 p/a).

(ii) Supervisors—shall be paid the equivalent base salary of Senior Constable First Grade. Additionally, the locality allowance and loading as above shall be paid (\$31 000 p/a).

(d) Communications:

Initially, the means of communication by each police aide office will be by telephone. Later, the implementation of high frequency radios will be instigated.

(e) Housing:

The transportable houses, ex-Woomera, in which the supervising members will reside for 12 months are arriving at each of the communities. At this time houses have arrived at Indulkana and Fregon. A maintenance crew, to improve and attend to required additions, is to follow the arrival of each house.

(f) Vehicles:

Initially, the Police Department will provide four vehicles to enable the scheme to become operational. Negotiations will then follow to ensure replacement vehicles will come from within the local communities.

(g) Uniforms:

The police aide uniform will be khaki trousers and shirts, dark brown polyester jacket, approved 'Silver Spur' hat and desert boots. The relevant checkered hat band and badge, and 'S.A. Police' sleeve patch and 'Police Aide' patch will be worn on the upper sleeves. The supervising members shall wear an identical uniform, excluding the 'Police Aide' patch.

(h) Police powers:

The police aides will have limited police powers within their respective communities. These powers will be identified and thereby ratified by notice in writing during the latter stages of the training course. Their powers will increase in line with their skills after attending annual refresher courses.

(i) Appointment:

Police aides will be employed by virtue of a yearly contract. Such contract will contain inbuilt terms and conditions.

(j) Training and supervision:

(i) Training—police aides will receive the initial four weeks of training at Echunga, followed by a further 12 months 'on the job' training by their supervisors,

(ii) Supervision—the scheme co-ordinator (known as the Police Aide Liaison Sergeant) shall continually monitor each aide and the scheme. On a daily basis the aides will be supervised by the Officer in Charge, Marla Police.

(k) Training course:

The inaugural Police Aides Training Course is to be conducted at the Echunga Reserve from 6 to 31 Octo-

ber 1986. Annual combined refresher and 'new intake' courses will be conducted at Echunga depending upon the success of this initial implementation.

(f) Implementation:

It is intended that the scheme will be implemented in the Pitjantjatjara communities of Indulkana, Fregon, Amata and Ernabella on Monday 3 November 1986.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The community policing concept is hailed universally as being highly desirable. It has been criticised because it was not completely effective at the time of delivery, albeit through lack of staff and so forth. What changes, if any, are contemplated to that policy and, even if no changes are contemplated, when is it expected that it will be fully operational in all those areas where it had been intended to be effective?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I never accepted criticism about lack of staff: what I did accept was criticism that in some cases the resources were not in place to service the staff redeployed as they had been in some particular areas. It is true that in one or two limited areas we are still coming to grips with all the resource implications. I mentioned earlier what had to happen to Norwood police station, and that is one example of where there are some resources to be provided, and they will be provided. It has been more of a planning problem than anything else. The reorganisation is in place. It became operational on 2 January this year. There has been widespread acceptance of the reorganisation. There is a monitoring role that is being undertaken and a post implementation review on which I will ask the Commissioner to comment.

**Mr Hunt:** Just to set the scene for that: there are two parts to this concept of community policing. One is the restructuring and reorganisation to identify the police and the community one with the other. The other is putting into effect, through that, geographical redeployment and identification of the crime prevention strategies.

Those two operations are working hand in glove and they are proceeding as we had planned with the catch up of the manpower and equipment difficulties that we had. To give a more direct answer, to say when we will know when the total scheme will be finally assessed again, we are now in a pre-plan six months post implementation review, and that review has been ongoing for over a month. We have about 4½ months to wait until we get the final report back on any inefficiencies or insufficiencies in the total system.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Turning to another aspect, last year we saw a commitment by the Attorney-General, given in his Ministerial statement of 13 August, that there would be the provision of full immunity from prosecution in return for fresh evidence in the Duncan case. Has the Police Department given any advice to the Government on this matter, and has any such immunity been granted? Concurrent with that statement was the provision by the Government of a reward. Has any reward been made or is it likely to be made?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I do not recall that there has been a specific recommendation to Cabinet for any release of money resulting from any information coming forward. I will have a thorough investigation made and get any pertinent information to the Committee. I can say this: there has been no claim to the \$25 000 reward offered by the Attorney in the 13 August statement. As that is all I can say now, I will make absolutely certain that there was no other advice tendered to me or my colleagues. There is nothing that I can recall.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I notice that on pages 49 to 52 the moneys appropriated to the department come under 11 separate programs and that in 10 of those programs the amount made available for recurrent expenditure is the same as the amount stated in the yellow book. However,

in regard to 'crime prevention and general police services' the amount proposed is \$60.023 million whereas in the yellow book at page 122 the amount shown is \$60.223 million. Why is there \$200 000 difference?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I ask Mr Hughes to explain that.

**Mr Hughes:** In addition to the program funding shown in the line estimates, we must add for program budget purposes the deposit funding to be received from the Commonwealth for the part establishment of the Aboriginal Police Aide Scheme—that is \$200 000. That takes the line estimate expenditure from \$60.023 million to the PPB figure of \$60.223 million.

**Mr KLUNDER:** Where is the \$200 000 mentioned in the line estimates?

**Mr Hughes:** The line estimates do not include the cost of funding and the program budget estimates do: that is the reason.

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

Works and Services—  
Police Department, \$8 141 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. Ted Chapman

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

Mr M.D. Rann

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D.A. Hunt, Commissioner of Police.

Mr J.A. Humphries, Manager, Resources, Police Department.

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

Mr F.E. Bowering, Chief Finance Officer.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** We have no questions from this side of the Committee.

**Mr KLUNDER:** Can the Minister indicate whether the amount set aside under computing equipment is in fact the Justice Information System and, if it is, what is the status of the Justice Information System at the moment?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There is a separate line under the Attorney-General's budget for the Justice Information System, so only a portion of this in fact comes within my control. First of all, Mr Hughes will explain how that is split up, and then I will ask the Commissioner to give us a brief overview so far as the Police Department is concerned.

**Mr Hughes:** The only expenditure in the police budget for the Justice Information System is for linking some of our existing equipment to the total Justice Information System, which will be funded under the Attorney-General's lines. That amount is as shown in the budget papers. Within the amount of \$967 000 is \$150 000 for the linking to the



Justice Information System. The other expenditure relates to the National Fingerprint Bureau system, phase 2 of the criminal intelligence system and the vehicle fleet management system.

**Mr Hunt:** So far as the development of the system is concerned, contracts have been let and software acquisition is in place. The hardware contracts have been finalised and in fact the hardware is being installed. The site area has been for the most part completed and only minor matters are now being dealt with in conjunction with the fitting of the hardware into the site. Work is progressing at programming and remote terminals will be installed towards the end of this year. The system will be available for operation in its first stage early next year.

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

Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous,  
\$9 386 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. Ted Chapman

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

Mr M.D. Rann

The Hon D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood, Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D.A. Hunt, Commissioner of Police.

Mr J.A. Humphries, Manager, Resources, Police Department.

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

Mr F.E. Bowering, Chief Finance Officer.

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

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I draw to the attention of the Committee the situation surrounding the Victor Harbor/Goolwa Sea Rescue Squadron, which was formed in 1976 and became affiliated with the Marine Rescue Association of Australia. The work in that south coast region between the Murray mouth and Cape Jervois has, I understand, over a period been fairly consistently associated with other emergency services (in particular the police located in that region) on those occasions when rescue work has been required. Without reflecting other than most favourably on that decade of association with the Police Department, in order to cover out of pocket expenses by the volunteer group from the south coast, each year for a number of years the Government has made an allocation to the squadron.

Last year there was voted, and in fact paid, \$4 200 to the Victor Harbor Sea Rescue Squadron and, in addition, last year and in previous years on those occasions when special work has incurred expenditure, particularly in relation to fuel, negotiations have been undertaken to receive special amounts from the Government. As I understand it, major rescue operations have incurred significant expenditure on

occasions over the last few years, and this has caused the locally based group to make special requests. This time we find that the same amount as was allocated last year has been allocated again without reference to whether it is a grant or subsidy. The Metropolitan Sea Rescue Squadron's allocation, albeit a substantially higher amount, has been identified as a grant and, as well as that, the supply of fuel is listed in its own right. For the first time in the history of allocations to sea rescue squadrons in South Australia, Whyalla has qualified for a grant, as defined, of \$3 000, and there is a line for the supply of fuel amounting to \$2 000. My first question to the Minister is: why is the detail associated with these three identified groups described for the purposes of allocation in different ways?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Perhaps I can assist the members of the Committee if I explain my understanding of the way that this has developed. First of all, I am not aware that in the last financial year other than what was voted for Victor Harbor was in fact paid to it. Those estimates would suggest that we voted \$4 200 to the Sea Rescue Squadron last year, and in fact that was the payment they received. There was no specific allocation for fuel, although the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron did have a specific allocation voted for fuel, and the honourable member will note that most of that was expended. I am not aware that in these estimates we were proposing to pay any less to Victor Harbor than what had been paid in the last financial year. If the member has evidence to the contrary, I am prepared to take it on board. That should be shown in these figures if it is so.

I was first alerted to this whole matter by a phone call I received from the south coast in which a gentleman associated with that organisation indicated that in fact Whyalla was to get a specific amount for fuel as was the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron, and in those circumstances it seemed not unreasonable that Victor Harbor should also get a specific allocation. I accepted that argument. It seems to me that the Victor Harbor squadron is operating in potentially far more hazardous conditions than the South Australian squadron is operating as it is in this gulf or the Whyalla squadron operating as it is well to the north of Spencer Gulf. At that stage, these estimates had already been set, so the best I could indicate was that we would certainly have a look at it and see what could be done. I am prepared to make available to the Victor Harbor squadron, from wherever I can obtain the resources, an amount of between \$1 000 and \$2 000 for fuel which will be in addition to the \$4 200 indicated here as the normal subvention to those people. It should be shown in the estimates, but it was not drawn to my attention until fairly late in the piece. Resources will be found for that additional amount to be made available.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Can I take it that, although the word 'grant' does not appear at page 53 of the Estimates of Payments, in fact the \$4 200 will be a grant this year (as it was last year) and not a subsidy?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The \$4 200 is for capital items. It is based on a subsidy system, but I am prepared to make a commitment that the \$4 200 will be available come what may.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** That has been the case in previous years.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** That will continue to be the case.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** There has been correspondence, and it has been indicated that this year will be different, that there will be a subsidy, and that to qualify for the ordinary capital expenditure for the year they will have to

find \$4 200 locally, and that has frightened the pants off them. The practice in other years has been identification of an allocation for fuel specifically in the metropolitan region but there has been only negotiation and arrangement in the interim each term in relation to Victor Harbor. On top of that, the new region to qualify has an allocation for fuel over and above capital expenditure, suggesting that if not the busiest then certainly the second busiest sea rescue squadron in South Australia has been left hanging on the hook. I say that against the background of its activities: in round figures, there were 50 call-outs in 1985-86, and a similar number in the previous year, and that demonstrates the scope of activities.

#### Membership:

Mr Gunn substituted for the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I hope that the honourable member is reasonably comfortable with the assurance I have given. I have had to make policy on the run in this matter, and I am never comfortable doing that. I would be a little disturbed if what we are putting into place removes the incentive for people to obtain private sponsorship wherever possible. Obviously, the justification for this activity being a charge against the general taxpayer is that an overall community benefit results from the activities of this group and I do not want in any way to write down that benefit. Clearly, there is also a local benefit which is over and above the total community benefit, and it would seem to be a darn good thing if that additional obligation could be discharged by local subventions from either local government or commercial interests. The benefit of a subsidy system is that it provides incentive for greater community support.

I am quite happy to make the commitments which I have made to the honourable member and which I have indicated to the two people who contacted me from that area will be made (although I do not think that they have received anything in writing from me—they will receive a reply shortly, as will the honourable member), and we will proceed from there.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I want to be sure about the details of the commitments made by the Minister—that, for the current year 1986-87, \$4 200 will be made available to the Victor Harbor Sea Rescue Squadron by way of grant and that between \$1 000 and \$2 000, from whatever source the Minister is able to glean it, will be available for fuel.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Neither of those two being for capital equipment.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I appreciate that. I acknowledge the Minister's comment that we seek to preserve the subsidy principle to ensure local input to the extent possible. I acknowledge the importance of that principle being raised in this forum, and I have every faith in the community doing its very best in that direction. I am sure that on that basis the squadron will be somewhat relieved in comparison to its understanding of the situation to date from, I believe, Mr Cormack, an officer of the authority who looks after that region and who, I understand, gave the squadron a slightly different understanding in accordance with his view for this current period. It is considerably more comforting than the information conveyed to the squadron by Mr Alexandrides, another of the Minister's officers, who would not have the authority to go further than he has gone. From that point of view I am pleased that the position has been clarified. It is especially relevant to raise this matter at this time because there has been another loss.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I do not want to restrain the Committee, but I believe that the honourable member's col-

leagues are anxious to ask questions before the luncheon adjournment. The Committee would appreciate the honourable member making his questions a little shorter.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** This matter is especially relevant as another person was lost on the coast at the weekend. The Sea Rescue Squadron at Victor Harbor incurred expenditure of more than \$250 for fuel for that call-out exercise alone.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The reduced allocation for the Police Complaints Authority, which was established recently, reflects the fact that the first allocation for 1985-86 included expenses for equipment, office equipment, and so on. In answer to the member for Morphett on 16 September, the Minister provided documentation about the number of complaints raised to 30 June 1986. Has the number of complaints since 30 June increased or accorded with the figures for 1985-86?

The Minister would be aware of the number of recent newspaper reports that tend to suggest an element of collusion in the determination of the police to 'get' certain people. Unfortunately, publicity accorded to Mrs Tucker has not necessarily assisted the high opinion that the majority of the community hold of the police. Her case is not the only such case, and the Minister will be aware that a Federal member of Parliament has recently asked for information about action taken against a Western Australian person who was in this city. There have been other cases involving people from Athelstone and elsewhere. Will the Minister give an assessment of the situation?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The figures for 1985-86 have gone through the Police Internal Investigation Branch, but the 1984-85 figures would not have been processed through the Police Complaints Authority. However, they indicate the general trend. In 1984-85 there were 123 investigations pending and 369 complaints were received. In relation to the outcome of 349 investigations, 21 (6 per cent) were substantiated; 201 (57.5 per cent) were refuted; 103 (29.5 per cent) were unresolved; and 24 (7 per cent) were withdrawn by the complainant; the total in terms of outcome of investigations during 1985-86 dropped. The total number of complaints received that year was 442, which was an increase: the number pending was 248. In relation to the outcome of 317 investigations, 37 (12 per cent) were substantiated; 174 (55 per cent) were refuted; 69 (21 per cent) were unresolved; and 37 (12 per cent) were withdrawn by the complainant. The figures before us are based on a reasonable assessment of the way in which the traffic will go. Perhaps Mr Hughes will comment on the way in which they reflect the figures that have been given to us.

**Mr Hughes:** The actual expenditure for the Police Complaints Authority was \$300 000 for 1985-86, with a reduced figure of \$265 000 for 1986-87. It must be remembered that the 1985-86 figure included establishment costs that will not recur in 1986-87.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has any attempt been made to assess the results of the authority's activities so that lessons can be learnt of public perception, or any deficiency that might exist in the training of personnel can be assessed and introduced into in-service advice for members of the force, but more specifically included in material given to cadets, albeit to the short-term cadet as applies at present; in other words, making use of the evidence to further improve the Police Force so far as the community is concerned, and to overcome the necessity of so many complaints?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The Commissioner will have to assist me in relation to how much of that has worked its way into the courses and training available for cadets. Cer-

tainly, Mr Cunningham and his people work very closely with the Police Department. All the information and his reports are made available to us and we endeavour to take them on board in the ongoing counselling and training of our officers. I will have to rely on the Commissioner for information as to the actual training courses.

**Mr Hunt:** There are two avenues by which education or information is given to trainees and to people who are undergoing other courses. First and foremost, our Internal Investigations Branch, which works closely with Mr Cunningham, gives formalised lectures on the process of discipline, regulatory controls, and so forth, throughout the department and complements that with the total training program. We involve Mr Cunningham very happily in his capacity talking to other areas in the training program, particularly at the senior levels. I understand that he is extremely happy to do that and to have a continued input into doing it.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Is there any alteration of thrust by either the Australian Crime Prevention Council or the Australian Fire Protection Association or a suggestion that their usefulness has concluded? Whilst I acknowledge that there is no provision for victims of crime—and that may well be taken up under the lines of the Attorney-General—it is another miscellaneous area that impacts on the police in the sense that Mr Whitrod gives course material to the cadets.

**Mr Hunt:** The Police Department has a formal representative on the Crime Prevention Council (Superintendent Sampson). In the role in which he is engaged, in developing programs for the Police Department on crime prevention, information and/or associations he has with the Crime Prevention Council are brought to bear in the necessary planning for our strategies for crime prevention.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The re-formed body is based in South Australia. It is important that we support it not only for the tangible benefits but also for the fact of location.

**Mr GUNN:** In the miscellaneous section there is a line concerning the Steering Committee of Review of the South Australian Police Force with a proposed sum of \$9 000. Is the department reviewing the number of country police stations currently in operation? It was recently drawn to my attention that the police station at Minnipa may not continue as it currently is, and that the operations of the Wirrabara station will be altered. Is this a general trend? Local communities would like to see the police remain basically as at present. They believe that it is in their interests to have a fairly high police presence and from my experience this is invaluable and contributes towards making the general behaviour in the area far better. Can I have an assurance that there will be no downgrading of the police station at Minnipa and that services in the Mid North will not be diminished?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The specific situation at Minnipa is not a part of this report. The provision of the new police station and residence is programmed for 1986-87, and the Department of Housing and Construction is preparing a feasibility report on the project. That will proceed and there is no problem with it. Country policing has been the subject of a separate review which has been completed to try to determine how we can better make use of our resources. An implementation scheme is to be set in operation. The first of those phases will be finalised at the end of this month. They include all the recommendations of the review that do not require additional funding. The second phase will take place in the ensuing three years. Some of the initiatives we have had to look at are the review of the police air wing, the reintroduction of the

highway patrols and the need to increase the number of breath analysis units and operators throughout the country area. It is not clear to me, because I do not have the matter immediately in front of me, to what extent the disposition of police stations in country areas was taken up in the report. Perhaps the Commissioner will comment.

**Mr Hunt:** I do not have the detailed information with me. From a country policing point of view not only do we always take into account the static type factors that always have to be taken into account, such as growth in industry, population trends, traffic boundaries, road buildings, and so on, but also we see whether there is a strategic requirement for a police station. Again, I cannot say whether any specific station is to come or go. Generally speaking, we are loath to close police stations.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Coming back to the police complaints authority: is it possible to advise the Committee of the categorical nature of the complaints that have been lodged? In other words, is there any research consistent with the information which has been given to 30 June and which would identify particular types of offence that are occurring and any other general information which has been conveyed to the Minister from the Commissioner and which would show the satisfaction of the Commissioner as to the terms under which he functions, or any variations that might be necessary to give greater effect to, and therefore greater public acceptance of, the end result?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I have to apologise to the Committee. I said earlier when we began that we could deal with police complaints under the miscellaneous lines before lunch. I find that Mr Cunningham was invited to be here following the lunch break. Only he can give the specific information to which the honourable member for Light refers. I seek direction from the Committee as to what we do about the matter. The Committee may want to address questions about police complaints after lunch, or we could tell him not to come and get the information to the honourable member.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** That would be the best way because of the relatively limited time for questions on the fire services and the Auditor-General. Perhaps the question I have placed could be made a question without notice.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Yes.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I move on to the South Australia Sea Rescue Squadron. My colleague, the honourable member for Alexandra, has indicated the situation in relation to the Victor Harbor Goolwa Sea Rescue Squadron, and he mentioned the other group at Whyalla. Has the Minister, having responsibility for expenditure in this area, given any consideration or called for a report on the effectiveness of the service that is given by the volunteer groups? Is there a need for more coordination than there might have been in the past? Is concern felt by the Minister or the Police Commissioner as to the number of occasions on which these people have been called on false report? I refer to the relatively frequent media reports of the sighting of flares when subsequently nobody could be found. I believe from the lack of follow through that nobody has gone missing and that therefore it was possibly something spurious. What is the general thrust of the situation?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There is bit of concern about the number of times that this arises, but at the same time one cannot ignore any such reports. I have not had from the sea rescue people—the channel of communication tends to be the State emergency people within the Police Department—a request for such a review of procedures. As far as I can see, the way in which the system operates is quite satisfactory. Probably, we will eventually have to look more

closely at what I might call the southern metropolitan areas—Aldinga area and such places—as these areas become more built-up and there is more boat traffic. We are more than two years from the establishment of O'Sullivan beach boat haven. I anticipate more activity from the Rapid Bay area. There is a small and in some respects not satisfactory—when I last saw it—boat haven along the Wirrina coast. There will be more boating activity, and more work will have to be done there. I am not aware of any real concerns except the traditional one that people would like more resources.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** What is the degree of direct liaison between these groups and the police in respect of the water police and, more particularly, the use of the police rescue boat?

**Mr Hunt:** The communication links in an event are between the police communications centre, as a coordinating centre, and the Sea Rescue Squadron. The other arm is the State Emergency Services, which has a more direct operational contact with those people. Normally, it is the practice that police only man the police launches, although we get involved with the rescues.

Dr Eastick asked earlier whether we had any concerns. Naturally, we are concerned at the number of call-outs, particularly false alarms, because that parallels police concerns with false alarms in other areas. However, it is difficult not to respond to requests or sightings, and we cannot ignore them. There are two avenues of communication and operation—one from the police communication centre for coordination and the other operational assistance with the State Emergency Service.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.57 to 2 p.m.]*

#### Membership:

The Hon. D.C. Wotton substituted for Mr Gunn.

#### Additional Departmental Advisers:

Mr A.D. MacArthur, Director, Country Fire Services.

Mr B.M. Barker, Administration Manager.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The figures at page 53 show an increase from \$2 730 500 to \$3 715 000. That is a sizeable increase for the CFS and something which should make everyone within the service happy. Suffice to say that not everyone in the service is happy at the moment. In fact, we have received an avalanche of paper from district councils, voluntary organisations and elsewhere. How will this additional money be spent, particularly in relation to the subsidisation of equipment and the provision of funds for maintenance? The area of maintenance probably has been criticised as much as anything else. I am led to believe that perhaps some of the figures relating to maintenance were never introduced to the department in recent years so that it could approach the distribution of funds for this year.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I anticipated that this would probably be the major area of concern by the Committee. Before asking Mr MacArthur to comment on the maintenance aspect, I will describe what we are doing. The figures quoted by the member are those in the paper. Not all of that increase represents an increase in the subsidy that will be available. It is something like a 30 per cent increase. The amount available for subsidy in effect has gone from \$2 187 000 to \$2 500 000, or something like a 14 per cent increase. The remaining money involves quite substantial increases in, for example, training with \$275 000; regionalisation, \$250 000; publicity and promotion, \$210 000; communications, \$120 000; our contribution to the

supplementary development plan for the hills in relation to fire hazard, \$80 000; and research and development, \$65 000. There are also subsidiary amounts which I can make available to the member.

The member referred specifically to maintenance arrangements. The actual subsidy system and the way it operates proceeds in part from recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee, with the money being allocated according to need and priority. No doubt there will always be arguments as to where the needs lie and where priorities should reside. However, what we have and the present allocation of funds are the result of a recommendation from the board. I have had many approaches about the way this operates and I have asked the board to look specifically at a couple of cases where people have claimed that indications of support were given (but were not forthcoming), probably based on the old subsidy system. In the meantime, some commitments were entered into. I understand that the board is considering this at present and will report back to me on it. As to the specific matter of maintenance, perhaps Mr MacArthur can comment further.

**Mr MacArthur:** The specific item referred to as maintenance was difficult to come to grips with. In the past, the CFS Board paid maintenance from the funds available at 50 per cent of the claims that had been put in on a broad range of bits and pieces. Not all of it was for maintenance, because it included minor items of equipment, lumped together sometimes as a lump sum and sometimes clearly identified. Under the new scheme, based on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee, a subsidy will be determined that will be payable to every brigade in the State according to its classification. This will take in what we call consumable items such as telephone, fuel, running costs, truck servicing, tyres, and so on. On top of that, a similar sum of money has been allowed for what we term extraordinary claims for maintenance where a brigade may incur substantial costs in the replacement of major component parts and equipment. That sum of money is set aside to deal with those claims.

It has been realised that making a lump sum payment to councils or to the brigades, or whichever way it goes, in December for maintenance is much cheaper to administer. It allows every brigade in the State to receive an equal share of the subsidy moneys for maintenance, irrespective of their claims. We will then review their claims or their merit as they come in for extraordinary items.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Is that last point clearly made known to brigades and/or councils?

**Mr MacArthur:** It was part of the original documentation that went out. Already two substantial claims have been identified, and they will be paid; a third claim is in the pipeline to be dealt with. When I say 'substantial' I mean between \$7 000 and \$10 000.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** It is fair to say that there was some confusion in the minds of brigades. The member may be aware that a little while ago one of his colleagues brought to me a deputation comprising a number of councils. I think that is one of the things on which Mr Barker was able to reassure them. It was something that they were not quite aware of.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the funds to be spent on the purchase of new equipment, it has been claimed that many brigades entered into purchase arrangements on the basis of their claims having been lodged through the regional office, in the expectation that those claims would be met. Happy Valley was one (as the Minister would know) and East Torrens was another, and several others have been

identified. What is the situation in respect of the contracts that have been entered into, albeit on a very tenuous agreement?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I think Mr MacArthur might like to comment specifically on this matter. As I said earlier, this is the matter on which I have requested specific advice from the board, and that will be forthcoming in due course. In the meantime, if there are technical matters or matters of fact that have to be cleared up here and now, I am sure that Mr MacArthur will be happy to do so.

**Mr MacArthur:** In relation to Happy Valley (and I think the other one mentioned by the member was Onkaparinga), the regional officer of the CFS, in carrying out his normal functions, suggested to both those brigades or councils that they should budget for a new fire appliance in the coming season. In one case it was put in writing that they should budget for this. It is the interpretation of the word 'budget' that is under dispute. It may be an implied condition legally binding, or even morally binding, the CFS Board. These situations were not known to the CFS Board until the new policies were put in place. They will be looked at closely and discussions will be held with the Minister on the basis that we treat them as old agreements, or that we treat them as new agreements; they will fall into either one of those two categories.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Because of the great interest in this matter throughout South Australia, and as I understand that statistical information is available indicating what funding has been expended on various brigades over the past five years, and bearing in mind that that statistical information is not generally available, will the Minister consider having that material inserted in the record because of its significance to the ongoing debate?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The information is available, and, if that is the wish of the Committee, I will look into that.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Running a close second, if not of equal importance to the question of subsidisation and maintenance, is the belief that a new Country Fires Act is about to be introduced with some rather draconian provisions that include allowing for equipment that has been paid for by district councils or community effort to be directed to other areas of operation on a permanent basis. Can the Minister or the Director indicate what is contemplated in regard to a change to the Act and the effect it is likely to have on the spirit and morale of volunteers and districts which have in the past worked for the provision of that equipment? I recognise that no such change would be contemplated before the current fire season because the confusion that already exists would only be exacerbated by trying to introduce further measures at this late stage.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is fair for me as Leader of the House to say that such is the time table for the introduction of measures to this place that it is unlikely that I would be in a position to introduce legislation before Christmas. We intended 12 months ago that something should definitely be put in place before this fire season. The separate matter is the cover of people who place themselves at risk because of their public spirited action in being part of the CFS Brigade. That is being picked up in separate legislation and will certainly be introduced in short order, but the more general rewrite of the Act which Mr MacArthur discussed with me soon after taking over his present position is proceeding, although I am not in a position to legislate on it before Christmas. I can give the honourable member that assurance.

As to the content of that legislation, at this stage my discussions with the board have been general in scope.

Further, I would not be happy if Mr MacArthur put into the hands of this Committee any more information than my Cabinet colleagues currently have, but I am happy for him to indicate to the Committee any matters upon which there has been a degree of consultation thus far with local government or anyone else with whom we should consult. Within those parameters, I am happy for the Director to comment.

**Mr MacArthur:** No doubt the Minister will pull me up if I go too far. Basically, there are two outstanding issues that need to be resolved with the CFS management structure. One is the total funding, and the other is the ability for a fire service to move, control and co-ordinate the functions of its fire brigades Statewide. These two issues are wrapped up in strengthening the existing legislation or rationalising or changing it to make those functions happen. Until the issues of the funding of the fire services are resolved—I think I can speak on behalf of my colleague the Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Service in this—the issue of control and co-ordination of fire services cannot take place.

There were strong criticisms of the Coroner after the last Ash Wednesday fire about the lack of a co-ordinated control function. They are very interrelated, and for that reason there is some very rational thinking in terms of suggested legislation, including the setting up of a working party between the Local Government Association and members of the CFS Board. The legislation has got around on a much wider parameter than was originally intended and it has caused some of the concern that the member has expressed.

Generally, if we are to address the real issues, involving the criticisms of the past in terms of lack of co-ordination and control functions, there needs to be some radical change in the role that local government plays in the CFS and the control function of the fire brigades on a Statewide basis. By no means will brigade equipment be taken away from brigades, especially those that have contributed funds towards the build-up of appliances. They will remain. In the longer term, flexibility has to be built into the system to be able to take appliances from one area to another where it may not have the degree of activity in the brigade, and put the better appliances in the more active brigades.

**Mr GREGORY:** One of the criticisms of the Public Accounts Committee is the lack of resolve by the CFS to complete the study relating to fire safety standards. How far, has that matter progressed? If it is to be used as a tool, how will it be used to address the issue of subsidies to brigades?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I ask Mr MacArthur to address that question.

**Mr MacArthur:** The member refers to the document 'The Standard of Fire Cover', which has been developed on a data base of brigade activity, the hazards brigades must cope with and a whole list of issues related to the density of fire brigades across the State—whether they are in the high hazard or lesser hazard areas. That document is being used as the basis of allocations in the future. It is a complex document that still needs refinements, but the basic thrust is there for us to use as a management tool.

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the CFS force some council areas to upgrade equipment where obviously it is inadequate?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We are not in a position to force councils to do anything. We hope that the new subsidy system, whether or not it is modified to take account of these couple of carryover problems, will provide some sort of incentive for councils to do this, anyway.

**Mr GREGORY:** I understand that an additional \$1.8 million has been provided for the CFS. How will these funds be spent?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I have in part addressed that in my opening statement about additional moneys for training, regionalisation, and so on. Perhaps it is worth while completing that list that I started. There is an additional \$65 000 for fire operations, for example, \$40 000 in addition to the Bush Fire Prevention Council; there is \$175 000 for a salary restructure, which I assume arises out of arbitral procedure that has been concluded. At this stage we have set aside \$105 000 for additional volunteer compensation (we do not know how much will be spent—we hope that none will be spent, but one can never tell). An additional \$205 000 is allocated for administration and a further \$70 000 for contingencies. The total subvention to the CFS is up by about 30 per cent. Of that, the amount available for subsidies to councils and brigades is up by 14 per cent.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I take it that there is a clear intention—a desirable one in the view of those in charge of CFS—to redeploy in time of need, but not on a permanent basis, any equipment that exists.

There is a view abroad that a lot of firefighting equipment has been downgraded, in other words, built to a price rather than, being, say, a Rolls Royce model. Is this a matter to which the board is giving attention, and more specifically, arising from a number of questions that have been raised on notice some of which have been answered already, has any member of the Country Fires Board in any way been involved with any of the equipment that has been placed in the field?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Again, that is a technical question that I should refer to the Director.

**Mr MacArthur:** Answering the last question first, to my knowledge nobody is involved in the Country Fires Board in a permanent capacity that has any interest, if that is what you like to say, in any commercial enterprise that is in any way associated with the production of firefighting equipment or appliances. In answering the earlier question on the basis of what you term downgrading of equipment, we have a situation in South Australia where there are 700 or 800 appliances of various standards, shapes, sizes and degrees of age. In my view, I believe that some rationalisation should take place in the numbers of vehicles. It is also my view that there are some Rolls Royces out there which the subsidy system in the past has allowed the councils or brigades to fund over and above what is deemed to be a reasonable standard of appliance.

There is definitely no thought of downgrading in any way at all from what would be a standard acceptable to any other fire service in other States. There are certainly plans developed for the standardisation of equipment, and hopefully we will be calling tenders for the construction of those appliance bodies in the very near future. There is no intention to downgrade the equipment, but it may be, in the eyes of a few, a slight modification. Generally speaking, it will be a strong upgrading of the general average standard in South Australia.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I realise that this matter was referred to previously, but, with the changes that have been made in policy regarding the decision to provide subsidies, etc., to brigades, can it be taken for granted that the change now being implemented will continue, or are we looking at further changes in policy in regard to subsidies being provided by the board?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I have had no specific advice tendered to me. The only matter which I have asked the board to consider are those so-called anomalies which relate

to Happy Valley and Onkaparinga. I am quite happy to allow Mr MacArthur to speculate a little.

**Mr MacArthur:** If the Government looks at the total funding of its fire services, the method by which the funds are raised and the methods by which both services are funded, then they will most probably find some inequities and inequalities in it in terms of the community pay or user pay principle, if that is the way we are going. If the funding issues are resolved, then perhaps the right thing would be for the subsidy system as a whole to go away. I think we could well do without it. If the service was centrally funded, how Treasury raises the money is another issue. While the subsidy system remains in place, the current newly introduced policies will continue until we get rid of some of the inequities in the system and upgrade some of the poorer standard appliances.

**Mr RANN:** There has been some publicity in recent times about the extra growth caused in the Hills and elsewhere because of heavier than usual rains this year. Could the Minister outline the provision in connection with bushfire prevention publicity over the next coming months and say whether it is believed that already people in the Hills are taking notice of the need to clear undergrowth?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We have provided an additional \$140 000 for publicity and promotion, and that will be very much directed towards the Hills area and the necessity for ensuring that growth—particularly weed infestations, and so on—is cleared as much as possible. Perhaps again the Director might like to give some indication of the sorts of ways in which this finance will be expended.

**Mr MacArthur:** The Bushfire Prevention Council, which is still in an interim stage of its development, has come to grips with some of the problems associated with high fuel loadings in the Hills, and the CFS existing staff are taking very positive steps to persuade councils to encourage land-owners to clean up these hazards and, if necessary, use some of the provisions of the Country Fires Act to make sure that that happens. There will be an extensive advertising campaign launched very shortly to highlight the problems of high hazards in the Hills, and I just hope that the public will listen and take heed of the warnings.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Could the Minister indicate, in changes that will be effected in the Country Fires Act in due course, whether there will be complete consultation with the local government bodies and volunteer organisations?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Yes, I am quite happy to give that commitment. Once there is a document which Cabinet feels is adequate for consultation, we would want the widest consultation possible. Given that we are not in a position to introduce the general fire legislation before this fire season, we would take the opportunity to get full consultation with a view to legislating perhaps early in the new year or very early in the budget session later next year.

#### Additional Departmental Advisers:

Mr A.W. Bruce, Chief Officer, Country Fire Services.  
Mr B.K. Treagus, Manager, Finance and Administration.  
Mr D.A. Grubb, Deputy Chief Officer.  
Mr B.J. McNeil, Systems Officer.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** In the program estimates, much consideration is given to manpower development. What is the basis of the manpower development policies within the MFS, and how do you identify people for promotion?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is very much a management matter. I am happy to let the Chief answer that one.

**Mr Bruce:** First, the whole impetus of training and manpower development, as far as this service is concerned, has been based on changing previous systems. Under the previous operations of the Metropolitan Fire Service, all training was done during on-shift periods.

This placed severe limitations on the ability of the service to develop good standards: there were constant interruptions by emergency and fire calls. This sort of training must continue and in fact it has been more intensified than ever. In order to achieve the type of development that is needed for a modern fire service, we must consider transferring people from shift operations to day working courses. This has been done, and with the use of Brookway Park over the past 12 months about 150 officers and firefighters have been transferred from shift duties to extensive training courses at various levels. Those courses involve training firefighters for senior firefighters, senior firefighters for station officers and station officers for district officers. This is the first time that this type of operation has been tackled in our service, and we are very pleased with the progress in the past 12 months.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Regarding manpower development policies generally, what are the criteria for promotion, and how does the appeals system provided under the Act work in relation to the promotion policy?

**Mr Bruce:** The promotions system has been developed in conjunction with the unions. Previously, there were two unions—the firefighters union and an officers association—but as recently as two months ago the unions combined into one organisation called the United Firefighters Union of South Australia. In the past three or four years extensive discussions have been held at every level of promotion. Bearing in mind that there were two unions, the promotion of firefighters and senior firefighters was a concern of the firefighters union and the promotion of station and district officers involved the officers association. We developed various promotion policies that laid down criteria which related clearly to the job requirement, ensuring that the level of competency at examination and on assignments, testing and courses was appropriate at all levels.

From the outset a trainee advisory committee was established under the chairmanship of the Deputy Chief Officer, Mr David Grubb. Both unions were represented, and they worked diligently towards putting together the scheme. The appeals system was brought in by amendment to the Fire Brigades Act in January 1985, and the provisions are quite clear. A nomination is made by the fire service for any appointments to a higher rank and within 14 days of that nomination being made other candidates have a right of appeal. Under those circumstances, the appeals tribunal would be convened.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I believe that the fire service is about to instal computers in its communications centre. What is the purpose and what are the operational advantages of that, and what will be the cost?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The manual systems, on which the service is operating at present, are very limited: they are difficult to operate under trying conditions, which obtain for the most part. Most fire services throughout the world and the major brigades in this country have encountered similar problems and have adopted computers to assist in this function. We are dealing with changes in the level of sophistication of alarm technology and we are trying to achieve increased defence in the early stages of fires. Thus we have investigated an Australian developed computer aided mobilisation system which has proved to be an ideal solution and which is relatively inexpensive. The finance for the project totals \$204 000, made up of \$124 000 carried

over from the 1984-85 capital budget, \$60 000 included in the 1985-86 budget and a further \$20 000 allocated in the present budget.

The computer aided dispatch (as it is called) will reduce the call handling overhead and the response times, and the latter is one of the aspects recognised by the Cox working party as a major factor in determining the rationalisation of locations in the metropolitan area. That rationalisation takes into account the fact that we are moving to computer aided dispatch in our operations.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What is the cost?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The total cost is \$204 000, spread over three budgets.

**Mr GREGORY:** The Fire Service Coordination Committee has been operating for about two years. Are specific measures proposed in cooperation between the two fire services in the forthcoming year?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I guess that in the forthcoming year we will largely build on the gains made in the past. I suppose one of the real gains has been the common training facilities at Brookway Park and what has developed there. There have been some other gains, quite apart from the use of the facilities at Brookway Park. First, regarding communications in the field, there are two field communication vehicles equipped with CFS and MFS radios. These vehicles have been commissioned for use during large bushfires in which both services are involved. Discussions are being held with consultants with a view to upgrading the radio communications throughout the State for both services.

In relation to operations, regular meetings and exercises are taking place involving the police and the MFS and CFS staff to improve and upgrade the operation of JESFIC and also mutual aid procedures. Mutual aid has been provided between the fire services on several occasions, such as the Black Hills fires, the Teringie Heights fire, the Banner Hardware fire at West Lakes and, of course, the fire at the Shell Company at Birkenhead. The major things before us relate to what has already been initiated in part, and there is a good deal more to be done.

Fire prevention is also involved, and the Chief Officer and the Director are currently examining the feasibility of combining activities of both fire prevention divisions to provide the community of South Australia with what might be called a fire safety bureau. This will ensure that advice and recommendations from the fire services on fire safety will be consistent, and that must be an advantage in terms of the way in which we respond to those recommendations.

**Mr GREGORY:** The Metropolitan Fire Service has a responsibility as the major combating authority in dealing with dangerous substances (and one recalls the major spillage of copper chrome arsenate at Gillman): what measures has the fire service undertaken to improve the effectiveness of operations in this area?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There has been a good deal of work on training. After all, this is a developing field in fire services. A considerable effort has been put into place to upgrade the skills of our people in handling these spillages, and that will continue. Most members would have seen exercises carried out specifically by the MFS to ensure that these skills are upgraded. Members of the Committee may be interested to know that throughout the State in 1985-86 the MFS responded to 850 incidents involving dangerous substances ranging from minor vehicle petrol spills to more serious incidents such as the spillage at Gillman, to which the honourable member referred. We have access to a computerised chemical information data bank to assist in handling incidents involving chemical substances. That is provided by the Australian Chemical Industries Council and

it is seen as an interim measure pending a completely independent national system, which will have to be developed.

**Mr GREGORY:** What is the progress in relation to plans for relocating fire stations in the metropolitan area?

**Mr Treagus:** In 1986-87 it is planned that Port Adelaide, Rosewater and Gepps Cross stations will be relocated to sites in line with the Cox report recommendations. During the next three or four years we will relocate another five or six stations. Money has been put in our capital budgeting. Planning for the three relocations this year is well down the path to finalisation, and we are obtaining suitable land.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Page 140 of the yellow book under 'Implications for Resources' states:

Recommendations for the Fire Services Coordination committee could result in a new method of funding both metropolitan and country services.

What is the schedule for implementation of any change? Will the Minister give a thumbnail sketch of the discussions taking place?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There is no specific timetable. I guess that that comment is in response to calls on successive Governments for some years in relation to the nature of the funding. We have put together a working party under the direction of the Fire Services Coordination Committee, to examine the present method of funding the CFS and the MFS and to see whether something can be done to enable a more equitable method to be introduced. This matter is still under consideration, and I imagine it will be some time before specific recommendations come before the Government in relation to it. The insurance companies would be keen on a different method of funding. We would be keen to ensure that such different method of funding did not lead to any net reduction in the resources available to do the basic job.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Last year there was difficulty with interpretation of red alert days. As a result a number of schools found themselves at variance with the official red alert day, and children were left stranded at metropolitan schools and were not able to be delivered back to the near hills. Has this matter been addressed? Can we be assured that during the 1986-87 fire period there will be one voice?

**Mr Bruce:** We are aware of the concern over the use of the words 'red alert'. This is probably a question better directed to Mr MacArthur. It comes up in the joint operations of the two services from headquarters in Wakefield Street. The term 'red alert' will be used, as it has in the past, only on days when the entire State is in a high danger/high hazard situation—in very rare and extreme circumstances—to avoid any panic. The occasions when the term 'red alert' will be used will be rare.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Was that the same definition which ETSA used in its annual report and on which it placed so much emphasis?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The question is out of order, but I will allow it.

**Mr Bruce:** The term 'red alert' is used in a number of reports, in our planning and the schools' plans as well. It is widely used. I imagine that ETSA's term would be the same, in fact. It is based on the information provided by the Bureau of Meteorology and the CFS work from that in determining whether or not it is a red alert day.

**Mr RANN:** Are there any specific proposals to deal with the assessment of fire risks in nursing homes and private hospitals? These institutions are generally regarded as high risk buildings given their function and the infirmity and low mobility of residents and patients.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** We are aware of the location of these places. We have a set of keys available so that we can have immediate access to them. I have information in relation to health buildings generally although it may be not quite as specific as the honourable member wants. I will try to get further information for him if he requires it, but this information will certainly cover it and be broader. There are 470 health buildings on record and 191 have still to be inspected. Of those already inspected 68 inspections occurred before 1981, the year in which the code for fire safety in health buildings was introduced. During the last three years 101 buildings have been inspected, and there are more to go. All the major hospitals in the metropolitan area with the exception of the Royal Adelaide Hospital have now been inspected and the fire prevention officer of the CFS has similarly inspected 22 health buildings in major country centres. Reports for all of those are available. There have been lectures to our personnel and demonstrations concerning the evacuation procedures which would apply where any of these buildings require that to occur. We will proceed with the balance of the inspections as soon as we possibly can.

**Mr RANN:** What progress has been made in the upgrading of the Brookway Park Training Centre? Some mention was made of this in last years' budget and during the Estimates Committees.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** A new training tower has been erected and commissioned. The in-service courses for MFS and CFS personnel have been successful in promoting mutual aid between the services. During 1985-86 capital works to the extent of \$100 000 were undertaken, including the upgrading of a training area and the sealing of a roadway suitable for the use of heavy fire vehicles, together with a hot fire LPG module. In the planning stage further development will include upgrading buildings, accommodation and training rooms, together with extensions to the recently completed training pad at the rear of the complex, also the installation of a pumping well and a reusable water system. There is \$100 000 in this capital budget for that project.

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

---

Auditor-General's, \$3 289 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. Ted Chapman

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

Mr M.D. Rann

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD, Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr T.A. Sheridan, Auditor-General.

Mr J.S. Abraham, Deputy Auditor-General.

Mr K.A. Cotter, Administrative Officer, Auditor-General's Department.



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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I compliment the Auditor-General and his staff on two things. One is the independent report which was circulated this year and which gives an overview of the operation of the Auditor-General Department. I, and I believe other members, have found it to be quite beneficial. I refer, secondly, to the presentation of the Auditor-General's Report and the use of pie charts and other methods of presentation, which gives a better appreciation of the machinations of Government than has been the case in the past. I hope that those and other innovations will be forthcoming as time progresses.

More particularly, we shall be talking to the report on operations. There is a section relevant to fees for audit, which outlines a general philosophy that the Auditor-General would like to see introduced once the new Act is proclaimed. I ask you, Mr Hopgood, whether any extension can be made of the report in the document. Also, can you indicate when the Acts of Parliament referred to will be before the House?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I ask Mr Sheridan to indicate what he intends to recommend to me.

**Mr Sheridan:** The new Act is to be a combined Public Finance and Audit Act, which will bring together the Public Finances Act and the existing Audit Act. That has been drafted and it is with the Premier and Treasurer. I understand that it is scheduled to be presented in this session of Parliament, although I am not sure just when. However, it is at that stage of development. In that Act there is provision to give wider scope for charging fees. The old Act merely said that fees could be charged to outside bodies, which pretty well restricted it to statutory authorities, and so on. The new Act is wider. It gives the Auditor-General, with the approval of the Treasurer, the opportunity to charge fees for all audits that he undertakes. If that proposed legislation is passed, it will be my intention to recommend that fees are charged not only to statutory authorities but also certainly to Government departments that levy fees for their services, and probably to some Government departments that do not, from an accountability point of view. I refer to accountability from their point of view and from the Auditor-General's point of view—because his fees and the costs that will be incurred for a particular department will be seen up front.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Auditor-General made mention of the recovery of costs from statutory bodies and others. From time to time there has been a series of questions in the House as to the adequacy of legislation which provides for the Auditor-General to look at all statutory bodies. Is the Minister able to tell the Committee whether it is intended to provide for the Auditor-General to overview the total of what might be called Government and pseudo-government activities? I raise the point against the background of the recent questions about SAFA, where there has been a clear indication of some quite major changes in financial procedures or activity. This is almost an unknown quantity to the populace in general and understood only superficially by many people in Government, and not at all by other people in government.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** All that I can say, given that the legislation is still in the course of preparation (it will in due course come before the House), is that I see it as desirable that there be a broader role for the Auditor-General. At this stage, I am not in a position to say the extent to which the legislation will spell that out. It will come before the House in due course.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has the Minister had representations from the Auditor-General or his officers that suggest that the Auditor-General's brief needs to be upgraded to allow for compulsory or some other follow-up activity to determine that deficiencies within departments that are identified by the general auditing are brought into a correct position rather more rapidly than at present? I mention that against the fact that comparisons have been made on how many Auditor-General's Reports have drawn attention to particular deficiencies in some departments which, three, four or five years later, are still recognised as deficiencies in the accounting sense and therefore in the accountability sense?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This matter has been raised from time to time and certainly before I was Chief Secretary, so I shall ask Mr Sheridan briefly to outline the history of this and what has been achieved.

**Mr Sheridan:** I can speak only for the time that I have been in the position. I have not found difficulty in matters that have been raised being attended to by the department or the Government. I have two examples, both of which I raised last year and both of which are well down the track to being attended to. One was in the Department of Housing and Construction. The question of the efficiency and management of the department were referred to the Treasurer. Steps have been taken which I believe have considerably enhanced management in that department. In the Health Commission and the central office in particular, an inquiry has taken place which confirmed that savings can be made, and it is now a matter of achieving them. Steps have been taken in that direction.

Usually, when there has been tardiness in attending to some systems it has been more a question of the department having the staff to attend to that. I can think of a couple of examples, one of which is the Department of Technical and Further Education, where it has been a question of staff being able to attend to the problem and fix it, rather than a reluctance on the part of the Government or the department to do something about it.

So, generally, I have experienced no difficulty with that. I am not restricted by the present legislation in seeing that it happens, and I feel fairly comfortable about it. Occasionally, there will be difficulties, and generally these will be overcome.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** What about restrictions in relation to full statutory bodies?

**Mr Sheridan:** In terms of doing the audits, we cover a tremendous number of statutory bodies. I refer, for example to a couple in the State Bank, although that is a financial institution, and we are not responsible for the audit in that case. For all the major statutory bodies, we have audits, and I believe that new suggested legislation will probably strengthen this area.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I refer you to page 47, Dr Hopgood. I note that in program 1 for general administration expenses, last year \$31 500 was voted, and \$60 777 was spent. This year's proposal is for \$114 000. Would you explain that increase?

**Mr Sheridan:** During 1985-86 the department took over, under the Health Act, the audit of a major metropolitan hospital, the Adelaide Children's Hospital, which was previously undertaken by a private accounting firm.

A combination of two things is involved: first, the private accounting firm was doing the audit adequately; and, secondly, there was the question of staff resources in the department. The audit was contracted out to the private firm working for the Auditor-General under his guidance, and with him determining the scope of the audit and what

needed to be done and his signing the relevant certificates for the hospital. That caused an additional cost to that line which, of course, is matched by a similar amount on the receipt side of the budget. In 1986-87 the Queen Victoria Hospital comes under our audit, and the same arrangement will apply: the audit for that hospital has been contracted out to a private sector accounting firm; the costs paid to that firm are reflected under the payments referred to by the member; and there will be a corresponding receipt on the other side of the budget.

**Mr KLUNDER:** Has an adjustment been made to the health budget to compensate and has the Auditor-General checked to see whether that has occurred?

**Mr Sheridan:** We will take that one on notice.

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

Environment and Planning, \$27 324 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr G.M. Gunn

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

Mr M.D. Rann

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood, Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Dr I. McPhail, Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr J. Hill, Director, Management and Administrative Services.

Mr B. Leaver, Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Mr G. Inglis, Director, Pollution Management.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the vote open for examination.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Because of the very broad scope of matters covered by the department, and not quite knowing the order in which members may wish to address these matters, we will call forward divisional directors as they are required.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I will commence by asking the Minister a question which requires a broadly based policy answer. On page 88 of the yellow book there are highly detailed lists of issues, strategies and the implications for resources. Looking through the Estimates of Payments, it is clear that the department and all the various divisions within it are hard pressed to hold their own in terms of the budget when inflation is taken into account. Obviously there is a very ambitious program and a number of extremely important issues at stake. What is the Minister's budgetary policy to enable the corporate management objectives, issues and strategies to be implemented on what amounts to a standstill budget and, in some cases, a substantial reduction?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I guess it is to get what I can from my colleagues and the Treasurer. These budgets are a

year to year proposition. I do not know of any situation in which it has been possible to sustain on any sort of long term basis an approach to budgeting for any instrumentality or Government department. Given the way that some departments have been treated, I think I have done reasonably well in the environment area. It has certainly necessitated a good hard look at the way that we deploy our resources. We believe it is important that we maintain this set of policy objectives and to work towards them to the extent that we are able to do so. It simply means that in some cases we are moving more slowly than we would see is desirable.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I refer to the 'Implications for Resources' on page 88 of the yellow book, as follows:

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

Most people who are interested in the national parks area would say that resources are not only limited for the future management of additional areas but are also extremely limited for the present management of existing areas. In respect of staffing for national parks, what is the establishment and the present number of staff in national parks? How many park rangers have resigned from the department in the past 12 months, and how many have been replaced or will be replaced?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I think Mr Leaver, the Director of National Parks and Wildlife Service, might like to address this matter. First, establishment is irrelevant. Establishment is an historic figure that no longer has any real relevance to what we are doing. What really counts is just exactly how many we have in a particular financial year and how many we have in the new financial year. To me, that seems a more relevant way of looking at how well we have been treated as part of the budgetary process. As to the total resources available and what ideally should be available to address these concerns, that is very difficult. When I first came to this portfolio I initiated a procedure whereby, in the writing of the management plan for a conservation reserve or national park, the staffing implications of that area were to be spelt out in the management plan. That has been done. It is no secret that we have not been able to meet those prescriptions as set down.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** What are those prescriptions?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The prescriptions would be along the following lines: if you are writing a development plan for, say, Wilpena or the Flinders Ranges National Park, as well as setting out weed control measures, fauna conservation measures, access, and so on, you also set down what seems to be the ideal staffing complement to carry out that program. If the member looks at some of the more recently written reports or plans, she will see that those staffing resources are set out in those documents. It is no secret that we have not yet been able to find the resources to meet all those matters.

I will ask the Director of the division to comment further, particularly in relation to resignations. There has been a small and gradual increase in the number of actually funded positions over recent years. I notice that on 1 July 1983 there were 237 weekly paid public servants and 140 public servants; a year later, it was 241, with 145 public servants. A year later, on 1 July 1985, it was—

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Is this actual or approved?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** These are funded positions. On 1 July 1985 the total was 241 but the number of public servants—the rangers and other positions—had increased to 156.5 and on 1 July 1986 the total was 246.4. The Public Service comprised 156.9 of that complement. We see through that period a small increase. The percentage covered under the Public Service has increased at the expense of the non-Public Service positions. That in part reflects a decision taken a little more than 12 months ago, when a number of weekly paid positions were upgraded to Public Service positions. As to the other more specific matters raised, I will ask Mr Leaver to comment.

**Mr Leaver:** I have been in my position since February, and I am aware in that period that there were three resignations from ranger ranks. The three officers have gone to promotional positions elsewhere in the Public Service. Looking at the numbers I recall that there may be two or three in the same financial year late last year. At the moment I am not aware of any more in that figure.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** There is one other point to raise. The figure I gave for 1 July 1986: the effect of this budget is an additional five ranger positions that will be added to the positions that I gave the honourable member.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** When I referred to establishment numbers, I was seeking, and I still seek, the number of staff in the NPWS which the department considers to be the ideal staffing complement as against the number actually employed. The Minister referred to the management plans, and certainly I could go through each plan, but I have no doubt that the information is known by officers here. I want to know the number of staff the department considers to be ideal, the number approved through the management plan in total as ideal. I will seek a breakdown by Question on Notice later. What is the aggregate number of ideal staff for the service, and what is the present number employed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I have no desire to avoid any question or hide any information, but I have to say to the honourable member that there is no such figure. For example, getting back to what I had to say about management plans, I indicated that the more recent management plans have had spelt out in them what we see as the staffing implications of what we are trying to do in those areas. They represent only a fraction of the plans that have been brought down. A considerable number of plans were brought down by the honourable member's colleague when he was Minister. Those plans at that time did not spell out the staffing implications of what was being provided.

I guess that some of those plans were originally conceived under Ministers Cornwall and possibly Corcoran. We do not have that information. I come back to the point that the honourable member raises about establishment positions. I have had discussions with people in the department about this historic figure. It does not in any way relate to what we as a department see as a desirable staffing complement. If the Committee wants to explore this track further I can ask Mr Hill to give historical background because he and I have gone through it three or four times. However, it has no bearing on what we see as an ideal staffing position and certainly it is not at all related to or derived from those figures that we have in recent years put into management plans.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I do not want to pursue historical figures, but I find it extraordinary that, despite the fact that a management plan needs to be developed for all parks, and it is not possible to do that simultaneously for anyone here, the Minister with a department which allegedly has a corporate plan is in such a position

that he apparently has no idea about what he and the department regard as the desirable staffing level in the NPWS. Most people associated with national parks and the general public would find that hard to swallow.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I was Minister of Education for some years and no-one was ever able to tell me what was a desirable teacher/pupil ratio or what was the amount of out of classroom time that teachers should have or the spread of courses that should be made available, all of which have an impact on what the Education Department would see as the desirable number of teachers employed. I understand that that debate is continuing. I do not see that NPWS is any different, except that staffing numbers are so much smaller.

We concede that we need more resources to do the tasks set down in the yellow book, but I do not know what an ideal figure is. What I have said about the management plan was an attempt at least to come to grips with it. What about support staff? What about head office staff? For example, we have assumed that it is reasonable and within this budget wherever possible we have deployed resources from the centre to the field—that is what we are trying to do. Some of the responsibilities handled in the centre go to the field. However, I do not know what the real resource implications of that should be in an ideal world. I know what I have been given to work with.

**Mr RANN:** On what basis does the noise monitoring unit provide an after hours service, at what cost and during which hours? Can the Minister or his staff advise the Committee whether it is normal for the unit to take readings after midnight?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** It would be appropriate for Dr Inglis, Director, Pollution Management Division, to address himself to this question.

**Mr Inglis:** The Noise Abatement Branch does not undertake routine after hours surveillance. It undertakes it on a case by case basis when we cannot measure noise during normal office hours. If a particular type of noise occurs only at night—for example, a rock concert, which is held only at night—special overtime would be authorised for officers to go and measure it. Although I cannot tell you specifically how many hours were worked last year, the overtime bill was about \$5 000. I expect that in the coming financial year that figure will be reduced, because we no longer need to take certain types of measurements like those we have taken in the past. We do not operate a 24-hour on call service. For some months we operated a recording service to take people's complaints as they rang in after hours. We found that that was not effective. All after hours complaints are now directed to the Duty Sergeant, Central Police Force. If necessary, he can call out a noise officer.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I refer to page 101 and the program 'Flora, fauna and park management'. Under 'Issues/trends' it states:

An increasing responsibility is occurring in the management of leased concessions within various reserves.

The same target is referred to under 'Targets/objectives' namely, that the department's goal is to:

Investigate and implement, where appropriate, concession and leasing developments in Cleland Conservation Park, Kelly Hill Conservation Park, Innes National Park and Flinders Ranges National Park.

What kind of concessions has the department in mind? What kind of leases and at what value? What kind of land use will occur in the parks resulting from these concessions and leases?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I thank the honourable member for the question because it is an important initiative that we are getting under way. Our preferred model wherever

possible would be to arrange for tourist developments to occur adjacent to parks, with concessions available for people who are willing to put in the risk capital for this to happen. Not only would the whole tourist scene in South Australia benefit but there would be some return to the coffers of the NPWS, which would enable us to do our job more effectively.

We are deliberately seeking land adjacent to the parks rather than within the parks, perhaps for obvious reasons. In most of these cases we are dealing with very significant environmentally sensitive areas, and we believe there would be a good deal of criticism if we were to place these developments within the parks themselves. The effect of that has been, for example, that we purchased the land adjacent to the Mount Lofty summit, off park, with a view to being able to get a development in there, and we would look at dedication of the area following a finalisation of the nature of that development. We similarly purchased the Hunt land at Flinders Range National Park at an off park location with a view to an eventual rationalisation of boundaries which might eventually place that area within the park, but following an indication of exactly how we would run the show and what modifications might be needed to the management plan.

Similarly, on Kangaroo Island we are looking at an off park location although adjacent to the Flinders Chase and the Kelly Hill Caves reserves which will enable us to better do that job. It might be useful if I ask Mr Leaver to comment, because his experience in the national parks system before coming to this State was in an area of Australia where perhaps this whole concept has been pushed more than in any other, namely, the Kosciusko area.

**Mr Leaver:** The principle is that the private sector is in a position to provide visitor facilities that normally cost a great deal of money through leasing arrangements in parks, and what the national park agency can offer is a development opportunity in an area of outstanding tourism interest and attraction. In return for making that offer, private enterprise can develop a facility that could range from a modest accommodation development right through to a major resort development, depending on the nature of the market. It also gives the conservation agency the opportunity through its planning to ensure that such a development is undertaken in a manner that is sympathetic with those fairly sensitive environments, so you do not get some of the ugly eyesores that the North American park system had fallen into in the development of major facilities.

It appears to me that there are opportunities at the Flinders Ranges for a new development following some Department of Tourism studies. The Minister mentioned the Lofty development and the Kangaroo Island precincts. It has been clearly identified by the Department of Tourism that an accommodation facility is needed on the western end of the island. The Innes National Park in the Stenhouse Bay area provides an opportunity for development, and other parks that we may look closer at down the track include the Coorong and Coffin Bay. Generally, the principle is private enterprise providing the capital and operation of the facilities in exchange for development rights.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** A number of questions arise out of this issue that are not solely related to tourism when one is talking about leasing and concessions. If the Government is proposing to acquire land adjacent to parks for the purpose of establishing, in this instance, tourist operations, where will the capital come from? The only provision that I can see for capital expenditure, under flora, fauna and park management, is on page 91 of the yellow book. I cannot see, under any other heading, funds that

might even roughly equate to the sum required for the acquisition of land adjacent to the Flinders Range National Park, Flinders Chase or any others.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Committee must remember that the total amount of finance available around the place for this sort of investment is fairly limited, so I guess the tactics that we employ could be wrong if we proceed on too many fronts at the one time. We have in fact purchased the three areas that are of immediate interest to us, namely, above Cleland, at Flinders Ranges and at Flinders Chase.

I have not had put to me that there should be further purchases specifically for this use at this stage. Our next responsibility is to work through the implications of those purchases as we have been doing in two of those three cases for some time now, to try to develop them to their maturity. I would imagine that, if we can get those three projects off the ground in the next couple of years, we will be doing pretty well. Then is the time to look at whether we need to purchase land in the vicinity of the Coorong or somewhere near Coffin Bay for the next stage.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Extending the question of leases and concessions beyond tourism operations, into mining and pastoral operations where obviously the Government would not be purchasing land adjacent to the parks, what is the Government's policy in respect of leasing land for grazing purposes or for cropping in any of the national parks, and what is the policy of the department in respect of mining within national parks that we already own and that land which the Government intends to acquire?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Both these activities, whether it be pastoral or mining, have the potential to have an environmental impact on these areas. Therefore, the compatibility of those activities with reservation for conservation purposes has been queried from time to time. The mining policy is very clear: we will not tolerate mining activity in existing national parks. The Committee will be aware of the fact that a couple of years ago we allowed a very low level exercise in the exploration to occur on the western edge of the Flinders Range National Park. That involved no more than some mapping and collection of samples by hand: less impact than a day's tourism activity would have on that area. We have always been clear on the fact that we would not allow mining to occur in existing national parks. As to new areas that might be set aside for national park activity, the Government would be very reluctant to enter into a reservation of an area for a national park purpose where it was quite prospective.

The classic instance, of course, is the north of the State with the Cooper and other basins. What environmentalists have to accept is that the price we pay for putting those areas under a national parks reservation is that we should allow exploration, particularly for hydrocarbons, to proceed for some time in the future. Theoretically, we could finish up with no areas to explore at all, since most of those arid areas are environmentally sensitive and there is always an argument that they could be put under reservation.

As the honourable member well knows, in a couple of recent cases we have provided for joint declarations under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Mining Act which on the one hand allows us to use the powers of the National Parks Act against casual vandalism or against perhaps more insidious forms of environmental impact, while at the same time allowing for control of exploration activity to continue in the future.

Pastoral activity tends to involve a slightly more muddy area. I am aware that from time to time there has been some limited grazing allowed in some parks areas, but I do

not see it for the most part as being a very desirable way to go.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I notice that there are 11 programs, and in programs 10 and 11 the amounts given in the white pages correspond to the amounts given in the yellow book. There is no such matching of the figures in relation to the first nine programs. What different methodology was followed so that different figures resulted?

**Mr Hill:** The Estimates of Payments shows a listing of the State funded activities on a program basis, and the PPB document includes funding from all sources, such as income, Commonwealth funding, national estate grants, and the like. Some of the figures are the same because those support services programs do not attract other than State resource funding.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This problem arose in relation to the emergency services budget. It is for the Committee to determine whether a request should be made to Treasury on the way these documents are put together.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I am happy, provided I know how to reconcile the figures. There is certainly an improvement over last year. Where, in either the yellow book or the Estimates of Payments, do I look for a reconciliation? I cannot find where Commonwealth money has been paid?

**Mr Hill:** It is spread pretty widely throughout the programs, and not identified separately. And of course not only Commonwealth money is involved. The most obvious source in relation to the heritage area would be the national estates program, but there is a proliferation from all sources.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** If the Committee wants that information we will provide it.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I note that the allocation for program 3 is \$591 000 more than actual payments for last year. The yellow book gives an explanation in terms of the fact that the native vegetation management subprogram has been transferred from program 6 to program 3. Unfortunately, the allocation for program 6 is reduced not by \$591 000 but by only \$70 000, although at page 101 of the yellow book for recurrent expenses a figure of \$95 000 is shown in that regard. There was also provision for an extraordinary fire-fighting expenditure of \$245 000 in 1985-86, but there is no corresponding provision for 1986-87. I am not entirely clear as to how much extra spending has taken place or will take place under program 3 with the borrowed funds for the native vegetation management subprogram from program 6.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** What we are talking about, in layman's jargon, is the transfer of the vegetation retention people from the national parks area to conservation programs, complicated as it is by the fact that that area was underspent in the last budget. That may be partly what is reflected. Dr McPhail will comment further.

**Dr McPhail:** It is an exercise in detailed reconciliation, and that could be provided for the honourable member. It involves the transfer of the vegetation retention unit from the national parks area, and the additional funds required for staff come from money provided as a compensation fund to farmers under the vegetation clearance arrangement. That led principally to the increase in that allocation.

The honourable member said that he did not detect the same decrease in the allocation for program 6, but that is complicated by the fact that we had to fund firefighting overtime, SAMCOR redeployees and wage variations, which accounted for the substantial increase. As well, there was a transfer of State Planning Authority reserves into that area for management purposes. Again, there was a transfer from another area within the department. Therefore, there were

moves from about three or four areas of the department in relation to those two programs.

**Mr KLUNDER:** How much extra will be spent on the native vegetation management subprogram now that it has been transferred into the conservation policy and program development area?

**Dr McPhail:** Nothing extra will be spent in terms of the management of that program, but we expect that the full year allocation for compensation payments will be expended. In other words, we envisage an expenditure of about \$100 million for compensation under the fund.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I note that there has been no allocation for the Black Hill nursery for recurrent expenditure or for capital. One assumes that the nursery has closed. Is the research, information, education and propagation program continuing or will only retail sales not continue? What has happened to the staff who were engaged in that area? I am particularly concerned with the research, information and education services, which are very highly regarded and which the Opposition believes should be maintained and indeed expanded at Black Hill.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Basically, this function has been transferred to the Botanic Gardens. The details of that decision were finalised after these budget papers were put together. Mr Leaver has had the carriage of this move and will explain how the arrangement with the Botanic Gardens will work.

**Mr Leaver:** I initiated discussions with the Director of the Botanic Gardens a couple of months ago about rationalisation of that facility. We were particularly concerned about the point raised by the honourable member, that is, that there is a considerable investment in research. There is some interest from private industry to enter into joint venture arrangements on that research and, of course, there is the whole issue of the botanical asset of the State in the context of protection of rare and endangered flora. I believe it is important to ensure that that protection continues, notwithstanding some of the budgetary problems that I was facing regarding that facility.

The facility does not really rest very well with the national parks responsibilities and, as it is really a horticultural responsibility, it seemed to me that it would be far better managed within the framework of the Botanic Gardens. Those discussions were fruitful and it is now proposed that key research staff be transferred to head a separate section within the Botanic Gardens, together with the herbarium and a very valuable seed collection. It is proposed to lease the whole Black Hill complex to the Botanic Gardens, so that it can maintain the research function and perhaps expand the role of the nursery so that it is more in accord with its horticultural responsibilities, not only at Black Hill but also elsewhere within its interest.

The discussions with private enterprise on a joint venture arrangement have continued, mainly with the biotech industry in using the valuable research knowledge that has been accumulated in the past few years. While this is now a matter for the Botanic Gardens, I would be surprised if arrangements were not entered into in the near future with a South Australian biotechnological firm.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This is not without implications for North Terrace: it will enable the Botanic Gardens to transfer to Black Hill some operations that do not fit comfortably with the visual aspect of the Botanic Gardens.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** If the object of this exercise was rationalisation and cost efficiency, what funds have been made available to the Botanic Gardens to continue this work? Under what line of the Estimates of Payment has the allocation been made? What savings, if any,

are being made? What pressure will be put on the administration of the Botanic Gardens to absorb this additional responsibility?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The savings largely arise from the suspension of sales, which was a loss area. In relation to the redeployment of staff, people carry their salaries with them.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Are any staff to be retrenched?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Not that I am aware of.

**Mr Leaver:** The proposal is that my staff establishment will be reduced. This was the position I negotiated because I felt it was more important that the function and knowledge be preserved and the senior research officer and technical assistant will be transferred from my establishment to the Gardens. It also transfers to the Gardens through its management arrangements the opportunity to explore and exploit revenue earning opportunities that under my financial arrangements I was unable to do. For example, if I entered into this biotechnology arrangement, it would have meant my staff would have done the leg work and the revenue would have gone into the general revenue of the State. It would have been a double loss as far as my budget was concerned. Under the more independent financial arrangements of the Gardens it would be possible to manage any revenue through its trust fund arrangements so that revenue earned could be offset against the cost of raising that revenue through the payment of salaries and other things.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Given the potential significance to the State in terms of revenue of benefits of some of this research, is the Minister in a position to advise either the names of the companies or the general nature of the companies that might be expected to enter into joint arrangements with the Botanic Gardens concerning research? The Minister did not pick up my earlier question about information and education facilities at Black Hill. Can that be pursued after the reply in relation to the private sector involvement?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** In relation to the private sector, the company is called Phytotech, and the negotiations are proceeding. The arrangements as to the educational function remain much as they were. Mr Leaver perhaps could give the Committee information about school visits to the area—I know there has been a fairly high level of school visits—and the use of that facility, and I assume there is provision for that to continue under the Botanic Gardens arrangement.

**Mr Leaver:** The difficulty I have in talking any further on this is that it has been handed to the Botanic Gardens Board, which is an independent body responsible for its range of activities. What it does is a matter for it to determine. I do not feel that I am qualified, nor do I have the knowledge to know exactly what is in its mind in relation to how it will manage the details of the facility. It has been handed over to them mainly for the research investment. I am not aware how it will incorporate that function into its general public visitor and public information activity.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In relation to Coastal Management (page 99 of the yellow book and page 42 of the Estimates of Payments). I note that a small provision is made for the purchase of plant and equipment and that there was a similar small provision last year. I understand that a computer has been purchased by the department for the Coast Protection Board. Will the Minister provide details of the purchase, the use to which that computer will be put and the number of staff who have been engaged or directed to use the computer?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Mr Wynne, who has just joined use, might like to give the details.

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr T. Wynne, Senior Engineer, Coast Protection Branch, Conversation Programs Division.

**Mr Wynne:** I am not sure which computer you are referring to. The Coastal Management Branch shares the use of a small IBM personal computer within the Conservation and Management Programs Division. This is a small basic computer which is used for project planning, budgeting and routine administrative work. We intend to use it for some coastal engineering work, but we are still investigating the software available. However, this is fairly minor.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I understood—and my information could be wrong—that a computer costing some hundreds of thousands of dollars was purchased for use in this coastal protection area.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Certainly not.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The only computer used in the coast protection area is a small IBM, as just outlined?

**Mr Wynne:** We also have a small Apple computer, but that is all.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** How about for general purposes in the department? Will the Minister identify the department's computer capacity?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Director can give a full overview of the computing facilities, and some of that would be available to the coastal area as well as other areas of the department.

**Dr McPhail:** I will require the Director of the Technical Services Division to respond in detail. The department has a major computing facility for its internal purposes not only in terms of the conventional departmental management and management information but also having applications available for some of the specialist uses in the department. We are in the process of upgrading that equipment and it is possibly that to which the honourable member is referring to. We will be happy to provide full details on the upgrading of both hardware and software that is presently under way. This is being done to update what was very much a miscellaneous collection of computer hardware, to bring it into a compatible form, and provide a facility to give the department as a whole the management information required.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Will the Minister advise what funds have been made available in this current year for the update in terms of capital and what, if any, consulting services will be required to get it on line? Will departmental staff be used for that purpose?

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr G. Stafford, Director, Technical Services Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am sure Mr Stafford has that information.

**Mr Stafford:** The total funds approved for the upgrading of the computing facility totalled \$420 000. No consulting is involved with the installation of the equipment, which will be installed by the people supplying it and our own employees.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** That \$420 000 is getting near the mark of what I understood to be the Government's expenditure in this area. How old is the computer and what was its original cost?

**Mr Stafford:** We have two other computers in addition to the proposed upgrading. The initial computer that was installed was a PDP 11/44, which would be in the vicinity of four years old and it would have cost approximately

\$60 000 to \$70 000. The second major computing facility we have is a VAX 11/750, which was bought specifically to carry out work associated with the environmental resource survey and evaluation program conducted by the department. That machine is approximately two years old and its capital cost was in the order of \$120 000.

The need for the upgrade stems from two areas mentioned by the Director-General—management information systems and associated work in the environmental resource survey and evaluation area or geographic information system applications, such as bush fire modelling in the Adelaide Hills and work associated with the preparation of management plans and fire plans for the national parks. Also, there is a general need within the department to establish a proper data base rather than the mixture of systems that had prevailed for two or three years under the current department.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** On page 99, under the heading 'Issues and Trends', there is listed 'Off-road vehicles in coastal areas'. Can the Minister advise the Committee of the Government's policy in relation to permitting off-road vehicles on beaches, notably along the Coorong in the South-East? Can the Minister advise what plans, if any, the Government has to make provision for restricted areas? What staffing, if any, is involved? This could be extended to other park areas, notably Kangaroo Island, where off-road vehicles are doing extensive damage because of their now ready access to the island as a result of the *Philanderer*. I am told that the damage is intensive in the parks and along the beaches there and along the Coorong, to the point where the matter needs to be addressed as a matter of policy. What is the Government's policy?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We have to divide this into on-park and off-park areas. The controls that we seek to maintain in on-park areas are quite clear. Where we can catch them, we prosecute. On one or two occasions there have been problems in relation to the nature of the reservation of the area which has made it difficult for our rangers to be able to prosecute adequately. The classic case was the Coffin Bay area where there was a series of proclaimed roads through the area. Nobody knew too much where they were. Our ranger in charge knew darn well that the defence in the courts for anybody caught on a sand dune in an off-road vehicle in the park would say that they were on a proclaimed road, and proving otherwise would have been very difficult indeed. The excision of proclaimed roads certainly helped considerably in maintaining control in that area. I hope shortly to have the opportunity to look at Kangaroo Island parks with this and other matters in mind. I am not aware that there has been extensive damage, but I am aware that the nature of the tourist to the island has changed as a result of the *Philanderer*. It is part of the normal duties to protect these areas from off-road vehicles. We shall continue to do that.

In the off-park situation, it is far more complicated. The honourable member will know that in the late 1970s there was a proposition for comprehensive legislation on the control of off-road vehicles. That was not proceeded with because it was felt that we needed alternative areas for that activity before we could effectively get comprehensive control. Already, one of these areas has been officially set aside, I think it is called the Red Banks area and is to the north and east of Balaklava. A good deal of work has been done with a view to setting one up in the Port Gawler area, and more work is to be done that will involve not only our people but also those in the Department of Recreation and Sport. Until we can set aside some of these areas, a general scheme of legislation along the line envisaged in the 1970s

probably would achieve very little because of the problems that we would have in policing the legislation.

**Dr McPhail:** We have a full-scale study going on into possible legislative provisions in the off-road vehicle area. The problem is that the interstate models have proved essentially to be unsuccessful. Some have used special registration for vehicles that would not be permitted on roads but would be permitted within reserved areas. Generally speaking, only a handful have been registered. The other reality is that people who misuse off-road vehicles will not use reserved areas. We now have these people wandering at large across the State. The problem is whether legislation can effectively provide a control over the use of these vehicles. That has much to do with attitude and education. We are investigating the legislative possibilities fully and, when these have been properly reviewed, the department will be placing before the Minister recommendations on possible steps. It is one of those areas where the possibility of having legislation that is essentially unenforceable is very real.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I wish to pursue that matter a little further. Tourism organisations in the South-East and environmental organisations are deeply concerned, because the Victorian legislation must be at least effective enough to drive people over the border on to our beaches. A number of Victorian number plates are being seen on beaches there. Legislation can only be as effective as the policing of it. Apparently, Victoria must be able to police it effectively enough to drive people over the border to use our beaches where there are no restrictions and where considerable damage is being done. I know that the rural council of the Liberal Party has passed a resolution calling for statutory controls on the use of off-road vehicles.

I continue from that question to that of the major resource variations from last year to this year. I refer to capital funds for coastal management, which are down by \$500 000 on last year. Will the Minister say what projects are in the pipeline and would have been implemented this year had the capital budget for coastal management not been so reduced?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Before answering that latter point, I shall answer the question about off-road vehicles. It does not necessarily follow that the appearance of Victorian number plates on our beaches means that their legislation is working effectively. Our South-East coast is a prime tourist target for the Victorians. Robe, I understand, has the highest tourist statistics per population. Many of these people would be reasonably well-heeled Victorians and others who come across the border to do the acceptable, as well as the unacceptable, things. However, I take on board the honourable member's point and I look forward to her support for legislation when it is introduced.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Depending on how it is phrased.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Yes. It is true that there has been a significant reduction in the capital allocation for the Coast Protection Board. The area that we have been able to protect from the pruning knife is the sand replenishment program, which will continue, although probably at a slightly lower level because of the success of the program in the past few years, which has meant that we perhaps do not have to be quite as active in that area.

Basically, it is the Government's coastal improvement grants to councils on which there will be a significant reduction of effort. I do not have specific information in front of me, typically because these matters come forward from local government and we try to pick them up as they place their requests before us. There may well be in local govern-

ment files various projects that are languishing because they know that there is no chance for funding in this financial year. That is the general area of reduction, certainly.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In my experience with local government, it would be most unusual for it to wait until new funds were available before applying. I find it hard to understand that the department would not be aware of applications that were already before it. Given that I feel that this information must be available, can the Minister advise whether the main proportion of applications is coming from metropolitan councils or country councils and, if so, what are the major projects that are being held in abeyance as a result of the cut in funds?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I thank the member for that correction. I was thinking in terms of approvals rather than applications. Certainly, councils put up their requests well in advance. I think that for this year, with a greater effort, a fair amount of funds would have been going into council projects outside the metropolitan area. Mr Wynne may be able to give us further information about the disposition of these projects as between city and country. I am advised that the details are not here, but it may be possible to make a general observation.

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr T. Wynne, Senior Engineer, Coast Protection Branch, Conservation Programs Division.

**Mr Wynne:** We do not have the details, but we can provide them later. The trend is that metropolitan councils seek fewer larger grants in the \$30 000 to \$50 000 range. Country councils seek many more grants in the range \$5 000 to \$20 000.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I would be grateful if the officer could give the Committee an indication of the range of projects that local government is looking to implement with those funds.

**Mr Wynne:** There are two types of grants: first, there are grants for facilities including car parks, public toilets, small boating projects, boat ramps, and so on; secondly, there are grants for restoration projects (funding which we hoped to retain but which the budget did not allow) for fencing sand dunes, trying to provide assistance for off-road vehicle damage, and for projects that local councils themselves are not keen to do without more help from us.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I return to the national parks area. Do I take it from what has been said that from now on all those people who have been concerned (and I am one) about any future mining in the Flinders Ranges National Park, for example, can rest easy; and that, as a result of the exploration work carried out there, that is all behind us; that there will now be no further mining; and that you, as Minister, are prepared to give a commitment that your Government will not mine anything in any national park in the future?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Let us make clear what we are on about in relation to what happened when the Flinders Ranges situation arose a couple of years ago. There are prospects in the strata between the Flinders Ranges and Lake Torrens for silver and lead deposits (I believe they are the minerals concerned). Of course, that is where the rock strata dips down quite sharply, but it outcrops on the western edge of the Flinders Ranges. If one wants to do exploration at a fairly low cost and with minimal impact on the environment, one starts where it outcrops. That is the only reason that it was necessary for any activity in the park whatsoever.

As I understand it, all this has been taken on board by the Department of Mines and Energy, and it now has a

better appreciation of what is there. I am not aware that it requires to do any further activity within the park to obtain a better idea of the nature of the off-park deposits. I can certainly give the member that assurance. What future Ministers and future Governments do is another thing. Given that what the Act says is clear, that does not altogether preclude the possibility of some mining activity in existing proclaimed parks. However, that is not what we have in mind. In any event, the vast majority of parks in South Australia are in areas that are not significantly prospective for minerals or hydrocarbons.

Our special problem has been in those areas to the north of the State where there is environmental sensitivity, where there is a role for national parks but where we would be blocking off the possibility of future hydrocarbon discoveries if we applied the full might and majesty of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. So, the joint proclamation has been the way to go. In relation to existing parks such as Coffin Bay, Flinders Chase, and so on, it is certainly not our intention as a Government to allow either exploration or the mining of minerals or hydrocarbons in those areas.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** With respect, that seems to be a bit of a day-by-day policy. I am not interested in what might happen in individual parks; I am interested in an overall policy. Either you have a policy that permits mining, or you do not. What you are saying is that you have a policy that does not permit mining but there may be occasions, if the right sort of resources turn up and there is a necessity for them to be mined, when that will occur.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I did not say that at all. I said that we have made a distinction in relation to areas which up until a year or so ago were dedicated under the National Parks and Wildlife Act (they were mostly in the agricultural regions of the State), and that we are opposed to mining and exploration in those parks. In the case of the Flinders Ranges, there was never any ambition on our part to mine within that park. We simply thought that what was happening was not much more than a Geology I mapping exercise that students might do with their professors up there and, in fact, that was the case, effectively. There was never any indication, no matter how prospective that exercise turned out to be, that mining would occur in that park.

Since then, our activity has largely shifted from the agricultural to the pastoral regions of the State, where there are considerable prospects for hydrocarbons. We have felt that the joint declaration is the way to go. So where there is a joint declaration over a park (that is something fairly new and it applies only to those new parks), there is the possibility of some exploration and mining activity in the future. Where there is no joint exploration, there is no possibility of mining activity or exploration in the future. That is my policy.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Perhaps I can follow up with a question on notice, because it still seems to be a gobbledygook policy. On the subject of national parks, and fire management particularly, has there been any change in the fire management policy for national parks in the past 12 months? How will you go about forming a policy when determining which park should be closed on which days during the fire danger period?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There certainly has been some minor reallocation of resources in relation to this matter. Again, I ask Mr Leaver to comment on that matter, particularly in relation to fire management of lands.

**Mr Leaver:** I certainly have not effected any changes since being appointed as Director. As I understand it, the fire management policy remains that large parks in agricultural areas have boundary fire break construction and access



networks put in; this is done mainly through the CFS, in conjunction with local people who are concerned with fire management. In the urban park areas, access tracks continue to be maintained, albeit at times with a little controversy. Hazard reduction burning is undertaken in any park where potential fire intensity in the event of a wildfire poses a threat to life or property.

With regard to the suppression of fire, the policy remains that, as soon as a fire is detected, the full resources of the service and other Government resources available are directed to extinguish that fire, particularly during the fire danger period (we probably would not worry much during normal conditions). That is the general policy that I found when I took on the job. It is a sensible policy and one that I intend to continue.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The question I asked was how will the service determine on which days parks will be closed because of fire danger.

**Mr Leaver:** It is a matter of judgment according to the circumstances. It would be those parks where there is the potential of large visitor numbers causing fire which could spread to threaten both the park and our neighbours. Generally, they would be the forested parks in the Adelaide Hills and perhaps the more rugged parts of the Mid North.

**Mr RANN:** Does the Government intend through this year's allocation to extend the function and scope of the Remote Sensing Unit at Technology Park, perhaps to include areas such as marine pollution and other areas?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First, we have to keep in mind that that is now basically funded through my colleague the Minister of Transport, responsible for services and supply, so the only way that we can be involved is through any business that we put in the unit's direction. We will have to get that information and make it available to the honourable member. That facility is available to all agencies of Government and we use it from time to time. As to the specifics of what work we would put in its direction, I will get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr RANN:** Does the Government intend to extend and upgrade the Port Pirie lead monitoring program in the coming year through the unit?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** We are involved in the program with the Health Commission. Dr Inglis will give us information about our specific input with the Health Commission on the program.

**Mr Inglis:** I will just add a short note to the previous answer because the area of marine pollution is one over which I have some administrative responsibilities. I have no plans and no funds allocated to undertake remote sensing activities through the centre in that function this year.

With respect to the Port Pirie program, we have just completed a major review of all the data that we have collected over the past 18 months, and we are in the process of putting that data into some statistical form so that we can advise the Health Commission whether the program should be expanded or potentially contracted. At present it looks as if some of the monitoring activities can be reduced.

**Mr RANN:** Is it intended to continue with visitor surveys at our national parks in the coming year? Also, what plans have been made to promote our national parks as both a tourism and an education resource, particularly those parks that may be under utilised?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will ask Mr Leaver to respond.

**Mr Leaver:** A number of parks conduct visitor surveys as part of their normal duties when it is easy to do so, that is, where visitors come through specific areas and are reasonably counted. There is an ongoing visitor survey in the Innaminka area which is not a park at this stage, and I

cannot think of any other formal visitor surveys undertaken now.

With regard to the second part of the question, the service maintains an interpretation section within its organisation, and that works in conjunction with the departmental community information service to produce an ongoing program of visitor information through pamphlets, booklets, posters and other programs and interpretation facilities in particular parks. Unless the member is interested in particular examples, that is regarded as an important function under the Act and, notwithstanding tight fiscal circumstances, funds will continue to be made available to that.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I would like to turn to development management and to the specific targets and objectives outlined on page 104, with the recurrent expenditure identified on page 92. The subprogram 'Formulation of planning policies' has a reduced provision for recurrent expenditure this year. Actual expenditure last year was \$1 095 000, and expenditure this year is reduced to \$969 000. Under 'Specific Targets/Objectives' is listed a review of the long-term development options for metropolitan Adelaide to continue.

It has been put to me that the department's planning capacity is diminishing, that is, its staff of planners is diminishing at the very time when planning is becoming critical for metropolitan Adelaide. The reduced provision of expenditure in the formulation of planning policies seems to indicate that the Government does not propose to redress that situation, and I would like the Minister to advise how many officers in his department are professional planners engaged on the formulation of planning policies at present as distinct from two or three years ago? What is the Government's proposal for reviewing long-term development options for metropolitan Adelaide—the continued review? Since that document was released about nine months ago, although it was released for public debate, I am not aware that there has been any formalised opportunity for public debate and the only initiative that has been taken was that of a member in another place in arranging a small seminar: in other words, the document is just sitting without apparent public debate.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First, in relation to resources, I will leave it to Mr Hodgson, Director, Development Management, to indicate the way in which staff are deployed for the various projects available to us. I point out that the FTE equivalents for this year are 98.7 as against what was proposed in the last budget of 98.2. There are some ups and downs in the various areas but overall we finish up in effect with the same funded staffing as we had 12 months ago. As to the long-term options for metropolitan Adelaide, that is an important initiative. It is one in respect of which we have had a considerable amount of feedback from community organisations and local government, particularly local government involved in the six areas designated as possible options for future metropolitan growth. We are in the process of digesting all that community feedback. I would expect to be in a position in the near future to identify where we go in terms of those areas that require additional work and those areas where we can say we are no longer interested in them so that the normal planning provisions can apply.

The honourable member may well be aware that not so very long ago we shifted the burden in respect of all those areas from section 50 to section 43 of the Act which enables a more flexible regime to occur, but that could only take place once we had done the basic work necessary for us to be able to say something under section 43. So, we are proceeding with that work, and we see it as being important for public comment. We are keeping it open until October

of this year, and early or towards the middle of the next calendar year we think we will be in a position to go to the next stage. I think I should ask Mr Hodgson to comment on some of the specifics of that problem.

**Mr Hodgson:** Perhaps I could comment first of all on the resources question. I could not give the honourable member offhand a total figure for the number of qualified planners on my staff. I think it would be about 23 or 24, but I could get that information for her. In relation to staff allocated specifically for policy, it is important to understand the way in which the division is organised. We do not have a specific policy group as such: we have staff allocated into 12 sectors covering the whole of the State. There are usually two or three staff per sector, and they have the responsibility for policy advising in relation to that geographic area, developing control in relation to the function of the State Planning Commission, provision of advice to Government, local government, members of the public and so on. So, each member of staff within a geographic region has a policy responsibility as well as a range of other functions. Those people provide input to policy tasks such as the Metropolitan Strategy Review from time to time.

In addition, we have a forecasting land monitoring unit which performs a range of policy tasks as well as demographic forecasting work for the division, the department and the Government. We have access to a small consultancy fund as well to support that kind of work. In relation to the Metropolitan Strategy Review in terms of what had happened subsequent to the Kinhill Stearns report, the honourable member is quite correct in pointing out that there was no formal public invitation issued to respond to that document. However, there was an invitation issued with copies of the document that were sent out to quite a large number of bodies to respond, comment or make submissions.

In addition, we have had a number of requests for copies of the document for the purposes of various groups and organisations making submissions, and we continue to receive those. As the Minister indicated, we have decided that the end of October is about the time at which we will have to cease taking on board any representations we will receive on the Metropolitan Strategy Review because it will be necessary to start to wrap up the process and take that comment on board.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The local government regions responding to this plan, according to my discussions, feel that it leaves a great deal to be desired, and one of the reasons was that the resources made available to the consultant for its preparation were very inadequate indeed. It has been pointed out to me that the term 'urban consolidation', which is used in various places under the 1986-87 specific targets and objectives, is nowhere properly defined in that document. Each of us may have an idea of what we think 'urban consolidation' is, but there is no way a Government can develop a policy for urban consolidation unless it is based on a precise definition of what we mean by 'urban consolidation'. This whole question of urban consolidation is probably one of the most critical facing the Government and the city, the State and the department in terms of the wellbeing, comfort, convenience and desirable planning objectives for dwellers in metropolitan Adelaide from now until the end of this century and beyond. Can the Minister give the Committee his definition of 'urban consolidation'?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** First of all, I am not quite sure of the extent to which the honourable member wants to link this with the future options report.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I want to link it quite closely.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I think it is important to realise what in effect the document said to us, and I have no criticism of the document at this point. It stated that urban consolidation, however desirable it may be, will not be, in the time frame we have set down for us, an alternative to at least some further development of the broad acres, no matter how successful we might be. The inner western suburbs project, which we commenced soon after we came to office, was a response to what we saw as the demographic decline of those areas. Hindmarsh, I think in a period from 1976 to 1981, had declined in population by about 3 000 people, although I may have the figures wrong.

Obviously, what we have in mind by 'urban consolidation' is making better use of the existing urban infrastructure in terms of settlement, in terms of housing. If an area not so long ago supported 14 000 people and suddenly it is only supporting 10 000 people, the question is what can be done, given that for the most part the infrastructure is still in fact in that area, to have a better allocation of the bodies to the infrastructure, such as we once had and now seem to be losing. I see urban consolidation in that broad framework. People often see it in a far narrower framework, which usually means knocking down something and building something in its place.

Our sad experience in this country has been when you do that you end up with fewer people living in these areas rather than more, and if you make better use of existing urban fabric, that is the way to go. Dr McPhail, Chairman of the working party on this matter, might like to comment. I will give a statistic which I may have given to the Parliament once before, and it relates to when I asked a member of my staff, 'What is the most densely populated local government area in Adelaide in terms of the number of people per dwelling?' The answer was Happy Valley because of the younger age structure. I then asked, 'How many more people could we fit into the existing housing structure in metropolitan Adelaide if in fact we could bring every local government area up to the level of Happy Valley?' which is hardly Asiatic or Mediterranean in terms of statistics. The answer was '250 000'. I would see that as being one of the important tasks. How could we get rid of this almost generation apartheid, which tends to occur whereby the Prospects of the world have one person per house, and it tends to be an older age group, and the Happy Valleys have perhaps 3, something or other, and they tend to be younger people? We can attack that, and that seems to be one of the important things to do in relation to urban consolidation.

**Dr McPhail:** I certainly do not want to take the time of the Committee with a lengthy discussion on this issue. Certainly, urban consolidation, which carries with it some overtones in the use of the words, is very much part of a metropolitan strategy. However, some of the leading authorities in the field point out that, even if we were to go to some theoretical maximum increase in the number of houses available, the number of accommodation units available, we could only pick up about 20 per cent of the potential metropolitan fringe growth. What we are talking about essentially is urban infill which is operating really to provide housing choice. It is an interesting reality that over half of the households in metropolitan Adelaide have two or fewer people, and the traditional nuclear family now represents slightly less than 30 per cent of the households.

Consequently, what we are talking about in terms of urban consolidation or urban infill is the provision of housing choice within the inner intermediate ring of suburbs.

Probably the suburban areas with the greatest potential for urban infill are not those we consider to be classically suitable, like Kensington, Unley, Norwood or Prospect. It is the next ring of council areas including Marion, Enfield and Brighton—those council areas where there are low densities and now small populations.

Statistics suggest that the housing stock in any local government area must be increased by 5 per cent a year to maintain the existing population. In terms of urban infill approaches or urban consolidation, we are providing a sufficient range of alternative accommodation possibly to maintain populations but more importantly to offer choice to what are now distinctly different households in the metropolitan community.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I thank Dr McPhail for elaborating on some of the information contained in the report. With respect, the Minister's definition of 'urban consolidation' was not a definition but a goal of urban consolidation, namely, to make better use of existing infrastructure. Despite the responses, the Committee is still none the wiser about the definition of 'urban consolidation' upon which the Government's policy of urban infill will be based. I doubt that a definition will be given here and now, but I suggest that, unless one is developed, any policy is standing on very shaky ground.

If we are to aim for the ideal of three generational communities where there is a choice of housing that will be appropriate for any one or all of those generations, in order to avoid forcing out longstanding residents from those perimeter areas by means of a so-called gentrification development, what taxation policy does the Government propose to pursue by way of incentives that will ensure that elderly people, pensioners and young families can afford to remain in those areas and thus either establish or maintain a three generational community, which is the ideal social mix?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First, in relation to the honourable member's concluding remark following the previous question, again I point out that there is a goal and we develop strategies—that is what is important. What the honourable member has asked me to talk about are the strategies that will enable us to flow on to that goal. Basically, I see that one way of achieving gentrification is for the public sector to take a very active role in the provision of housing, and that is what we are trying to achieve in the inner western suburbs. Where we can encourage private capital into those areas, we are only too happy to welcome it, but we accept that for the most part the Housing Trust will have the principal role to play either in terms of new housing stock (and there are some unique opportunities for that to occur) or, secondly, by the purchase of houses that might otherwise be sold for commercial or industrial purposes. Those houses can be refurbished so that they remain part of the rental stock—indeed, they would be additions to the rental stock.

We see housing stock to suit the need as being more important than tax incentives. I guess it is a question for the whole of government not simply for me, as Minister for Environment and Planning, as to the future of the concessions that are available to pensioners for, say, water rates, land tax and local government rates. I am not really in a position to answer that question at this stage. I guess that I as Minister have some responsibility to try to ensure that the essentially social welfare policies are also directed in such a way that they might strengthen or reinforce our planning policies.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Regarding the development management issue, the major resource variation for the current year results from a substantial increase

in the 1986-87 program for development works in the inner western suburbs redevelopment scheme. Will the Minister provide specific details as to how that \$2.7 million capital increase is to be spent? Where will it be spent?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I have before me an overall picture that really does not go into the specifics of some of these things. For example, I can say (and it may be possible for my officers to provide further details) that we are looking at \$3.7582 million for the Bowden/Brompton/Ridleyton redevelopment; \$1.124 million for Thebarton; \$130 000 for West Torrens; \$12 500 for the Highways Department in relation to land disposal; and an additional \$7 300 for general administration. That makes a total of \$5.032 million. I do not have before me the specific details, but Mr Dixon, the officer who is primarily responsible for the implementation of this program, will comment further.

#### Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr Hugh Dixon, Manager, Inner Western Suburbs Program, Department of Environment and Planning.

**Mr Dixon:** The increase to which the honourable member referred for the inner western metropolitan program for 1986-87 results, on the capital side, mainly from a carryover from the previous year. The inner western metropolitan program is an ongoing project for which the Government approved expenditure in the Bowden/Brompton/Ridleyton area for a three-year capital works program, which started last year. There were some delays in getting it off the ground, and the initial budget was underspent by \$1.2 million. That sum has been carried over to this financial year and it included about \$500 000 that was underspent in Hindmarsh due to work not being undertaken to upgrade Hawker Street. That sum has been carried over to this year. In Thebarton there is a capital works program of \$1.1 million. The allocation was made in the budget last year, and it appears that last year the budget was underspent and there has been a large increase this year. That accounts for about another \$500 000 being carried over into this budget.

At the same time, we have increased the allocation for land purchase in Hindmarsh and Thebarton by about \$400 000. Most of the work being carried out in the Bowden/Brompton/Ridleyton area is upgrading of capital works, such as roads and drains. The area had no stormwater drainage and we could not redevelop until that work was carried out. Consequent on that, of course, was the rebuilding of a number of roads. Similar road works are proposed for Thebarton. The land purchase allocation in the budget is to enable us to purchase land adjacent to Government owned land so that we can consolidate parcels and make more attractive development sites available.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Regarding the consolidation of land, does the Government propose to put up that land for sale by tender to developers or use it for public housing, or a mixture and, if so, what proportion of land will be used for public housing and what proportion will be sold by tender for private development?

**Mr Dixon:** At present it is intended that in the Brompton/Bowden/Ridleyton area the mixture will be about 60 per cent for public housing and 40 per cent for private disposal by tender. Previously we have been following roughly that proportion, but we have found some of the land we are selling by tender is being purchased by design and construct companies that are building for the Housing Trust; they buy the land privately and then sell the scheme later to the Housing Trust. Our intention in future is to pursue a 60:40 split. A number of sites we are consolidating are not in residential areas. For example, they are along the Port Road

and will be developed for commercial purposes and community facilities.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I take it from that that technically it is possible that if all the land for sale by tender is bought by design and construct companies and sold back to the Housing Trust the entire 100 per cent of the area could end up as public housing, which, as I understand the Minister's overall policy goal as expressed in answer to a previous question, would not result in that desirable mix of urban consolidation in terms of three generations and a mix of incomes and backgrounds that ideally we should be seeking.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** First, the income mixture may indeed not be there, although the problem with income mixture in a place like this is that there could be a degree of gentrification, which the honourable member concedes is undesirable. In terms of urban consolidation I would have thought that where there is public investment in housing we have a better opportunity of ensuring a greater percentage of families than if it is private enterprise, because the trust will determine the nature of the tenants who go into those premises. I think it is unlikely that we would see a 100 per cent development of this type. The 60:40 split to which Mr Dixon referred has been chosen with our general goals in mind.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In relation to pollution management (page 102), in particular the management of the Murray River and land surrounding it, my colleagues and I have received representation from a resident of Waikerie who has owned freehold title land, part portion 49 of Paisley, Waikerie council, Blanchetown, Murray River, for approximately 10 years. Eight years ago he applied to erect a shed. Permission was granted from the council but refused by the State Planning Commission. Subsequently the resident's neighbour erected a shed, which was constructed before approval was granted by the State Planning Commission. The summary of the story is that the neighbour has been given permission to construct on his property whereas the resident who wrote to us has not. What is Government policy in respect of applications for construction on the Murray River flood zone? It appears to be applied inequitably, if the experience of this man is any guide.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I do not know that my officers have the specific details of this case before them. We have been operating on the 1956 flood plain and for most purposes such applications are prohibited development and would lie to the Commission. It would have to get my concurrence because of the prohibited nature of the development. There are minor instances where this is necessary. This matter is regarded as a development management rather than a pollution management issue in my department. Mr Hodgson can give the Committee further information.

**Mr Hodgson:** There has been a prohibition in place for some three or four years within the flood zone of the Murray River as defined by the 1956 flood levels. That being the case, by and large the development of any structures defined as 'development' under the Planning Act is prohibited and is generally not accepted by the Planning Commission. However, there are some minor alterations and additions to existing structures that are not considered to represent any additional problem in terms of potential pollution of the Murray River, of impeding flood flows or of danger to life and property in flood situations. Where that is the case the commission generally has given approval to those very minor alterations and additions—for example, a minor

extension to an existing structure or the addition of a verandah.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It is certainly hard to believe that the construction of a tool shed could lead to any pollution. I can only make further representation to the Minister outside the Committee in an effort to assist this person.

Under the Minister's Miscellaneous line there is provision for a grant of \$17 000 to the National Trust, which is an increase of \$1 000 over the previous year. In light of the trust's enormous voluntary effort, which is highly significant in acquiring, maintaining and promoting the heritage of this State, this amount, to many people (certainly to the trust and anyone concerned with the State's heritage) seems, to put it bluntly, to be a puny amount in terms of the cost effectiveness of taxpayers' money and the good uses to which it can be put. There is no doubt that the trust, with its 20 specialised committees and 50 country branches, which account for hundreds of thousands of hours of voluntary effort, needs some professional back-up in the central office if it is to be fully effective.

What is the basis of the \$17 000? Is it purely a random amount which is bumped up by a minuscule amount less than inflation each year, or does the Government intend to conduct an analysis of the cost effectiveness of providing additional funds to the National Trust to enable it to have professional back-up and coordination for this vast army of volunteers who perform services of untold value for the heritage of South Australia?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The \$17 000 is not the total of the subventions which will be made available by the Government to the National Trust as a result of this budget. The National Trust originally received a grant from the Government through the Minister for the Arts, and I think it came to me two years ago. At that time the annual grant to the National Trust from the Government was \$5 000. Irrespective of what its real needs are and of what might have been shown up by surveys or anything like that, I have not done too badly to increase in the space of two years the amount available through my miscellaneous line to the amount that is specified here.

However, I have had some talks with Mr Lewis, for whom I have considerable regard and who I think has done a very good job during the short time he has been at the hilt of the trust, and I have indicated that in addition to what is in the miscellaneous line we will provide an additional amount of money from the Heritage Fund which would simply be regarded as part of the ordinary grant. These discussions took place at a time when the miscellaneous line was all but set in concrete and it seemed to me it was going to be very difficult to get more from the miscellaneous line without taking from one of the other bodies that is responsible for a Government grant.

The total amount that we have indicated to Mr Lewis will make available to the National Trust is \$26 000, and the additional \$9 000 will come from the source that I have indicated, although it is not specifically laid down here. We see the trust as being an important body. Through the various committees that it runs it does an enormous amount of good work. As far as I am aware, as a Government we have not had a root and branch examination of the value of all that it does so that that could be quantified. If we were to do so, I have no doubt that we would generate a figure very much in excess of this, and that could be said of every one of the organisations that is a recipient of a grant under this line.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I return now to pollution management, on page 102, and to the Govern-

ment's policy in respect of the extensive use of hard chemical fertilisers. This issue is causing considerable concern to a range of people, not only conservationists but also health professionals and all those concerned with the production and consumption of food. Has the Government any guidelines, or does it intend to develop any, on the extensive use of hard fertilisers? I am advised of the extensive damage to the River Murray flats in the Taillem Bend area, where the soil is degraded to the point where it is pure slush in the winter, because there is no body in it as a result of its having been broken down by the use of chemical fertilisers. Is there any concern at departmental level about possible potential pollution of the food chain as a result of the over-use of fertilisers and the fact that they do not break down and find their way into food products?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The honourable member will be aware, because on a couple of occasions I mentioned this, that we are working with the Commonwealth Government with a view to bringing in a national system for identification and transport marketing of hazardous chemicals generally. There have been one or two problems at the national level, for example, whether agricultural chemicals should be included at all, because the Department of Primary Industry suggested that it did not need outside help on those chemicals. That was not and is not the view of this Government, and there has been some breakthrough there.

The second part, having identified the chemicals appropriate for treatment under the legislation, was exactly where would we go from there. Where, at the Commonwealth level, would administration lie? That has been resolved in that it is Mr Willis's department, whatever it is called. Basically, it is the Commonwealth equivalent of our Department of Labour, and it will have prime responsibility. So a national system is being worked out. At this stage, our Dangerous Substances Act must bear the brunt of the business, which it is not really capable of doing, and we are working with the Commonwealth to resolve the matter as soon as we can. As to the specifics of particular chemicals in a particular environment, I shall ask Mr Inglis to comment.

**Mr Inglis:** I seek clarification from the honourable member for Coles. She mentioned the use of hard fertilisers. I do not completely understand that term.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I cannot say that I do, either, but I had representations from a market gardener who claims that the Murray Bridge river flats is devoid of the normal content of natural or friendly bacteria, with the result that in winter it is a quagmire of oozing muddy so called soil, and in summer it is as hard as rock thus degrading areas for dairy farming and the growing of vegetables.

**Mr Inglis:** This is more properly a question for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to answer. In general, the over-use of fertilisers, particularly phosphatic fertilisers—

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** My constituent is probably taking about superphosphate.

**Mr Inglis:** Yes. This can cause a degradation of the types of grass that grow in the wetter areas around the Murray, and it is probably this that is being referred to.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I would say so.

**Mr Inglis:** There is no way, other than by counselling of agriculture producers not to use inappropriate fertilisers or improper quantities, of improving this situation. Fertilisers are not seen as hazardous chemicals in their own right, and therefore they are not to be included in any scheme of

control of chemicals such as is being brought in for the more hazardous and toxic chemicals.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I have a further question on pollution but this time noise pollution. Last week, in the House of Assembly, the member for Elizabeth questioned the Minister about the pursuit of Hexagon Engineering Pty Ltd, which, according to residents, is many times over in breach of the order that the Minister has placed on the company in terms of noise control. This has been a long-running problem, and several honourable members, myself included, have had substantiated representations from residents of Devon Drive. One can only commend their determination to protect themselves from a noise nuisance which is destroying the quality of their lives.

In his reply, the Minister said that he could not proceed to prosecution without the necessary evidence. The evidence has been amply documented by the residents, but I assume that that is not sufficient for the purpose of prosecution and that there must be documentary evidence from the department. On that basis, what resources are provided for acquiring evidence on which prosecutions can be based when it is abundantly clear from the representations to the Minister that a company is breaching a noise control order?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I must be very careful how I choose my words, because it is being suggested that prosecution is appropriate in the light of allegations that this company is in breach of the exemption that I gave it up to a particular date.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I may be using the word 'prosecute' inappropriately. Has the Minister given thought to some action as Government level to ensure that sanctions are imposed and the noise reduced?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I do not want to signal my punches on this, so I shall leave it to the specific question as to what resources are, or can be made, available. Again, Mr Inglis might like to indicate how our people go about what they have to do in these matters.

**Mr Inglis:** I am familiar with this case. My inspectors have investigated the matter and attended the premises on numerous occasions and have documented those visits. They have also interviewed a number of residents who live adjacent to the premises and taken documentary recordings of the discussions. We have spoken to the people who are the main complainants to us and have asked them to keep a diary of what they consider significant noise events. Those diaries have been made available to us, and we are considering what action should be taken on that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out that we have three lines to dispose of before 6 p.m. I give notice that at 5.30 p.m. Mr Rann will be discharged from the Committee and the Hon. Mr Slater will take his place.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It seems to me that the evidence is so overwhelming and that breaches of the order have been so blatant over such a period of time that I think these people are entitled to an explanation as to why no action has been taken to require the company to comply. This matter has been going on now for weeks since the order was imposed. The breaches have been blatant, they have been almost daily and yet they continue. It appears that either the Government is powerless to control the company (and I cannot believe that that is the case under the Statute) or that it is not prosecuting the matter (and I use that word in the broad sense) as diligently as it should. Either way, these people are being subjected to intolerable pressures, and the company appears to be getting away with blatant breaches without any sanctions being applied thus far, and there being no result from the Minister's order.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Given that there have been allegations of breach, those allegations have been placed before the company, in effect, in a 'please explain' situation. Given that there are allegations of continuing breach, if those allegations are well founded, the only course open to the Government is to prosecute. There is really nothing that can be done, short of prosecution, to ensure compliance from people who will not comply. Really, that is all I can say at this stage.

I understand that certain recommendations are in the course of being made to me by my departmental officers. As I said earlier, I do not want to canvass in a public forum exactly what might happen as a result of that. All I can say is that I am determined to ensure that people comply with the Act. The normal legal process is something that takes some time to activate. I am particularly concerned that, where an exemption to the Act is given for a period of time, we should be concerned that that exemption is properly adhered to.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Where are we with the monstrosity that we are told may eventuate on the St Michaels property at Mount Lofty? When can we expect an environmental impact statement to be prepared, and where do we go from there?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We do not prepare an EIS until we have a proposition. At this stage, we do not have a proposition. What we have is a consortium which came to us and, against competition from several other consortia, was able to demonstrate that it would be in a better position to perform than its rivals. So the Government agreed that it would be given a clear run, as it were, to the development. At the time it indicated the general nature of the development that it had in mind, we were far more interested in its capacity to perform, irrespective of the nature of the development. Mr Leaver has had detailed consultation with these people. I do not know that it would be proper to reveal any commercial information at this stage.

If Mr Leaver is in a position to give some idea of the time frame with which we are dealing, I am happy for him to make that information available to the Committee. Then, once we have a detailed proposition, of course, we will require those people to prepare an EIS which my officers would then properly assess before placing a specific recommendation before the Government.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** To carry on from where the Minister left off, he referred to there being a general form of development. I suggest, from the description and the sketches provided through the media, that it is far more than a general form of development. In fact, I suggest that the public of this State were led to believe that that was the development that would proceed—or very close to it—subject to an environmental impact assessment being carried out.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** No, what those people put before us was a for instance. I remind the member that what was put before the public of South Australia was a premature announcement from a body or bodies unknown. It was quite irresponsibly written up by the morning newspaper with a caricature of the proposition that was designed to engender opposition.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister of Tourism find that exciting.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is for the Minister of Tourism to say. I am not aware of the circumstances in which that statement was made. Of course, the Minister of Tourism was with me when we originally announced the purchase of the property that would eventually be turned over to some sort of tourist developer. Again, I make the

point that I certainly cannot be associated with any advocacy for the specifics of what was only a 'for instance' proposition that had been placed before the Government. Our concern was with who was most likely to be able to perform and with whom we should now have a term of exclusive negotiation that would be likely to lead to a sensitive but also commercially successful development, which is what we set out to do. I cannot be held responsible for any misapprehensions that might be in the public mind as a result of what I say was an uncharacteristically irresponsible piece of journalism by the *Advertiser*.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** If that is the case, I presume that we are yet to see an example of the type of development that will be there and whether that will provide the opportunity for absolute and total consultation with local government and any other body that may have an interest in the type of development that will appear adjacent to the Mount Lofty summit.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is exactly what sections 49 and 50 of the Act provide. If there has to be an EIS, that will be subject to all the necessary checks and balances, and it will be open to public exhibition, as is the case with all environmental impact statements. I instance Jubilee Point as an example of where from the developer's point of view we have been prepared to have public consultation until the cows come home to ensure that the community perspective is taken into account.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** From what the Minister says, I take it that we are to totally disregard what we have read in the newspapers as far as the type of development is concerned. Do we then wait for an EIS to be brought out and for people to comment before we know of the type of development, or is it a situation where, yet again, we will read in a newspaper somewhere or other about the type of development that will be there and at a later stage an EIS will be prepared for assessment?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** First, we cannot totally disregard what was in the original 'for instance' that was put before Government. It is not impossible that some form of cable car will be associated with a development that is put forward. It is not impossible that the development may be in part perimetal in form. It is not impossible that there could be some co-masting of the structures which currently grace, or disfigure, the skyline, according to one's aesthetic sensibilities in these matters. I cannot altogether predict what might come out of the whole situation.

In saying that what we had before us was not an absolute blueprint, I am not saying that we will necessarily abandon all aspects of that proposal. What normally happens in these matters is that, having got to something that is reasonable for an environmental impact statement, it is put before the public and the public is also told that it will now be necessary for the developer to prepare an EIS. That has to go on public exhibition. The public has full rights of consultation and reaction to that and eventually it has to come to me for the Assessment Branch of the Development and Planning Division to provide an assessment, which is also a public document about which there is no doubt further debate before formally under the Act the Government places a recommendation before His Excellency.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Given the Minister's responses to the member for Heysen, I would like the Minister to say, on the basis of the plan that was made public, whether the department analysed that plan in respect of the hills face zone regulations. If it did, how many of those regulations would be breached by the plan presently outlined? If it has not, why has it not?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Certainly, if what we have before us was specifically a proposal to go through the normal planning procedure it would have to be treated as a prohibited land use and would have to be subject to the normal procedures that apply with prohibited land use. Given the nature of the land we are dealing with, I assume it would be an application to the Planning Commission which, in turn, if it was of a mind to approve it, would seek my concurrence.

The Government has determined that this is a development of such a magnitude that it requires more rigorous treatment than the normal treatment applied under the Planning Act, that is, one uses section 50 of the Act—the EIS procedure—rather than normal planning procedures. I make no bones about it: if that was the proposition, there is little doubt that it would have to be treated as a prohibited land use. No-one is trying to hide that. It does not matter how many regulations it breaches: it is clearly non-permitted land use under the set State plan as now detailed.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Given that reply and the knowledge that in law it ultimately will rest with the Minister for Environment and Planning if it proceeds, we can assume that it would not have gone ahead this far unless it was Government policy that it should proceed. Therefore, will the Minister advise the Committee about his attitude to the concept, leaving aside the precise details of the plan?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** If by the 'concept' the member means am I comfortable with an idea of a significant tourist development adjacent to the park on the road to Mount Lofty, I have to say, 'Yes, I am.' Were I not, we would not have made the investment in the purchase of land in the first place.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The honourable member asked me about the concept. As to the specifics of the proposal, at this stage I am not willing to commit myself. The whole point of the EIS legislation is that any proposal has to be subject to a rigorous assessment by my officers. They do it according to their professional competence and expertise and they fearlessly place before Government a public document indicating whether in their view the matter should or should not be supported. That is the ultimate protection that the public has. Let me remind the honourable member of the nature of the Government that brought down the legislation originally. I assume it had certain things in mind when it wrote sections 49 and 50 into the Act.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I turn now to the Native Vegetation Management Scheme. On page 32 of the Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer under the heading 'Environment and Planning', it states:

There is an increase in payments to farmers under the Native Vegetation Management Scheme from \$645 000 in 1985-86 to \$1.2 million in 1986-87.

Can the Minister advise how many landowners applied for compensation in 1985-86? How many were granted compensation? If it was not a vast number (say, no more than a dozen) what were the individual amounts of compensation comprising the \$645 000?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I do not know that this is altogether the amount of detail that the honourable member wants and it may be necessary that I go away and get that additional detail. Eight applicants have received financial assistance payment totalling \$597 900. At the time this report was made available for me a further \$271 400 remained to be paid. Six applicants had received a discretionary payment under clause 33 totalling \$51 400, and a further \$47 800 remained to be paid. That meant a total payment of \$649 300, with a further \$319 200 committed for payment

but not actually paid. We can look at *Hansard* to see whether we have actually answered the question and perhaps get any additional information that the member requires.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Given that there is an almost doubling of that sum, has that decision been taken because of a backlog of applications that have not yet been heard, or is it simply a realisation by the Government that there are likely to be more applications in this financial year?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The backlog has been reduced considerably. There is still a backlog of applications—

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** How many?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** There are 212 applications outstanding but, of those, it would appear that there are only 73 that have not at least had an inspection. We are dealing effectively with only a part year of the operation of the legislation from last year. The \$1 million set aside was a finger in the wind job. No-one was in a position to say what the amount would be and the factor of which we could not take account was how many people would apply as opposed to the number of people who were entitled to apply, given the refusals or part refusals under the legislation. That has proved to be a rather elusive sort of matter.

A large number of people have not applied for payment, perhaps because of lack of enthusiasm about entering into a heritage agreement with us on the residual vegetation on their property. As the honourable member knows, this whole matter is under review at present because of the commitment I gave when the legislation went through that within 12 months of the passage of the legislation we would review it and those discussions are proceeding with, among others, the United Farmers and Stockowners.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The information that the Minister has just given is very interesting because, if my additions are correct, about 20 or fewer landowners have been paid \$645 000. We now have 10 times that number but only barely twice the amount to pay them. In short, the Minister is saying there is no way in which the applicants outstanding can be reimbursed from that \$1.2 million allocation.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** That is to assume that in fact all of those people (a) will be refused, and (b) will apply for payment.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** You said 'refused': do you mean 'approved'?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** No, if their application is approved for clearance, then the possibility of payment does not arise. If they are refused, then they are entitled to payment provided that they enter into a heritage agreement. The mathematics are correct, but it is assumed that all of those will be refused and in fact they will all apply for payment. That is not our experience in the last 12 months. Our experience has been of a very high level of refusal from the authority but a reasonably low level of request for payment.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** That illustrates to me that farmers are being gravely disadvantaged. They are not being permitted to clear their land but, at the same time, they are reluctant to enter into heritage agreements for whatever reason, so their potential revenue is virtually chopped off and they have no possibility of compensation. That appears to be the outcome.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** If the honourable member wants to push that argument to its logical conclusion, what she is doing is criticising the vote she cast in this House when the legislation went through. The legislation provides that in the situation where the proponent does not get approval—

otherwise it does not matter; he or she is happy—where approval is not forthcoming, then there is a right for that person to request payment on the formula which we approve, but with the *quid pro quo* that they will enter into a management agreement over that area. If they choose not to do so, I do not really see that that is too much skin off my nose in the fiscal sense. I may still be concerned about that patch of land as Minister for Environment and Planning, because in some respects it is still at risk in that it is not part of the national parks system and it is not part of a heritage agreement either. So, in the ultimate, it is still at risk in some way or other, even though that person cannot legally clear. It is of concern to me as Minister for Environment and Planning, but in terms of fiscal responsibility it is the proponent who has taken the decision not to carry on and claim his or her right.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Turning now to page 96—the Botanic Gardens, major resource variations and notably the tropical conservatory—the estimated cost for 1986-87 is \$3 million. Can the Minister advise the Committee when that project is to commence, when it is forecast that it will be finished (we hope by 1988), and in what manner the work will be conducted? In other words, does the Government propose to call tenders for construction and what, if any, involvement will there be by the Department of Housing and Construction or any State Government authority in the construction of the conservatory?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am sure that Dr Morley, who has now joined us and who has a great level of enthusiasm for this project, will be happy to provide the information that he has available.

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Dr B. Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens.

**Dr Morley:** The construction process is scheduled to begin in January next year, but this is contingent on certain other matters including the project going before the Public Works Standing Committee. The Committee will be aware that, as a bicentennial project, it is 50 per cent funded by the Commonwealth Government and 50 per cent funded by the State Government, and there is a need for the State Government to complete this project by 1988. The project team and the board of the Botanic Gardens are hopeful that that target can be achieved and an opening will occur in about September-October 1988. However, it is a very tight project and there are a number of steps we have to go through before we get there.

We have had close contact with the Department of Housing and Construction. The project team involves the Principal Architect, Messrs Raffin Maron, and a number of sub consultants. It is likely that Raffin Maron will be coordinating the tendering process and coordinating the project through the various stages. The reason for this is that the tropical conservatory is a very specialised building and it was considered and agreed by Housing and Construction that it might be more appropriate for a private agency to undertake the work. This is in fact the way the board has gone.

In terms of tendering for construction, the process that will be adopted (and the board understands that this has the approval of State Government) is that an advertisement will be placed inviting interest in the project. Selected tenders will be called from those agencies who express an interest in the project. The reason for this process relates to the specialist nature of the building and the likelihood of only one, two, three or four major contractors being able to put the thing together.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Has any provision been made within this sum for the contents of the tropical conservatory, and what is the ordering and buying time? I presume these plants have to be acquired well before the opening time. In other words, does the \$5 million include the contents and if so, what proportion of it is for the plants that will be in the conservatory?

**Dr Morley:** The costs include not only the structure but also the plants. In round figures, about \$430 000 has been allocated for the internal landscape, and that will involve the acquisition of plants from tropical Queensland and also Papua New Guinea. That process will begin next week when my colleague, the Assistant Director, will be going to Queensland with one of the consultants to look over material that we have identified in various nurseries for the project.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The provision for heritage conservation, which is a critically important area and one acknowledged in the program estimates as attracting increasing community concern, is in fact somewhat less than what was provided last year and certainly significantly less when inflation is taken into account.

One of the key ways in which this Government could ensure heritage conservation without providing funds in the budget but possibly by forgoing revenue to Treasury would be through taxation incentives. What action, if any, has the Government taken on the report and recommendations that were brought down sometime within the past 12 months from the consultants and the university in regard to taxation incentives? I recognise that three spheres of government were involved in the recommendations, but someone has to make a start. Does the State Government intend to implement any of the recommendations that apply to the States?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Particularly in relation to valuation of properties for rating and taxing purposes, we have already taken initiatives—they are in place. The basis of rating is different in relation to heritage items. This illustrates the very limited nature of the taxation initiatives available to State Governments. There is little more that we as a State Government can do. We have been at the forefront of pressing on the Commonwealth that it should consider income tax relief for the holders of not only properties of European heritage but also native vegetation, and those discussions are continuing.

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

Works and services—Department of Environment and Planning \$4 540 0000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr G.M. Gunn

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

The Hon. J.W. Slater

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.



**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G. Inglis, Director, Pollution Management Division.  
Mr B. Leaver, Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Mr G. Stafford, Director, Technical Services Division.  
Mr J. Hodgson, Director, Development Management Division.

Mr T. Wynne, Senior Engineer, Coast Protection Branch, Conservation Programmes Division.

Mr R. Sautter, Manager, Community Information Service.

Dr B. Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens.

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I refer to the significant reduction in funds for coastal protection and improvements. What funds if any are embraced in that allocation for work on Jubilee Point? Is it expected that funds will be expended in the current financial year?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** No, none at all, and no capital works will be undertaken.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Regarding minor improvements in parks and reserves, considering the state of crisis (and 'crisis' is not too strong a word, I believe, to apply to the condition of our national parks) and the urgent need for not only minor but also major improvements, such as roads, bridges and things of that nature, to which parks will that \$1.6 million be applied? Is it expected that there will be major expenditure in two or three parks or will it be spread thinly across the State?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** At this late stage, the honourable member may prefer that we make available a schedule. We have considerable detail here.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It would be very good if that could be provided. I note that \$8.6 million has been allocated for recreation and open space improvements: what projects will be involved?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** We can provide specific detail on that.

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

Deputy Premier and Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous, \$671 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr G.M. Gunn

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

The Hon. J.W. Slater

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G. Inglis, Director, Pollution Management Division.

Mr B. Leaver, Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Mr G. Stafford, Director, Technical Services Division.

Mr J. Hodgson, Director, Development Management Division.

Mr T. Wynne, Senior Engineer, Coast Protection Branch, Conservation Programmes Division.

Mr R. Sautter, Manager, Community Information Service.

Dr B. Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The allocation for assistance to councils for boating facilities on inland waterways appears to be almost comical in its inadequacy. The Liberal Party's recreational boating policy, which closely linked recreational boating with tourism development and promotion, was picked up quite quickly by the Minister of Marine, who outlined at the Boat Show in 1985 that the Labor Government would pursue a great many of these initiatives. Clearly, \$11 000 will not buy very much. What does the Government propose to do with that \$11 000 to improve boating facilities on inland waterways?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I doubt very much whether the Minister of Marine, whatever else he might have said, would have been referring to inland waterways but to the coastal zone, for which he has his own allocation. This involves a grant to councils for which they must bid and usually there is a reasonable allocation from local government sources as well. To my recollection, last year was probably the first time since I have been Minister that all of this allocation has been expended. We are confident in making that minor increase, because the allocation was effectively all expended last year but in the past couple of years it was not expended. At one stage we thought that we might remove the allocation from the estimates altogether because it seemed to be more historical than anything. However, there seems to have been a return of enthusiasm in this area, so at this stage we are maintaining the allocation at effectively last year's level plus inflation.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I note that \$97 000 is proposed for the Monarto operations of the Royal Zoological Society whereas \$81 000 was allocated last year. The Minister and his colleague, the Minister of Tourism, and I have received a number of letters from the Murray Bridge council urging more substantial progress with the Monarto zoo. Does that \$97 000 reflect only salaries for officers already located at Monarto and, if not, to what use will it be put? What is the Government's timetable for the development and opening of the Monarto zoo?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There has been an allocation for operations as well as salaries. At this stage there is no timetable for the opening of the project, which was discussed some years ago. It is one of the areas that has suffered as a result of the necessary cutback in public sector activities. The facility is very much scaled down, and that has enabled some agistment of animals for the zoo and relocation of the national parks facility that was initially located at Para Wirra.

Certainly in terms of the open range zoo in the full panoply of what was originally unveiled, there is no timetable for that nor can there be any revival of timetable for that for some years in the light of the very stringent regime we have for public sector expenditure. As to the specific matters here, we are looking at certain fauna facilities, including water storages and waterfowl enclosures, an animal hospital and what has to be spent on that. The honourable member would probably prefer that I put it in a form that can be incorporated without taking up further time.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I would appreciate that. What the Minister has just said will come as a crushing disappointment to a large number of people. One might as well say that the Monarto zoo has been put not only on the back-burner but virtually on ice. Given the Minister's response which has enormous implications and which will not be pursued here and now through lack of time, has the Government contemplated developing an operational plan that could enable that zoo to go ahead, through the same motion of concessions that we spoke about under the national parks line, enabling the private sector to participate in what would probably be an Australia-wide and possibly a world first with a series of private zoos? Already in South Australia there are a number of well managed private zoos (perhaps 'zoos' should be qualified in terms of native fauna parks). In the Minister's opinion would it be possible to develop a plan for attracting private investment for a series of coordinated private zoos which could enable Monarto to go ahead, albeit not in the original context that the Government had in mind, fully public financed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** As I understand it there have been very tentative discussions, but nothing has been formulated. I guess that the Government would be interested in expression of interest from anyone who wanted to pick up the ideal and run with it. Certainly, we would not be opposed to that sort of development taking place.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In view of the intense and growing interest by Australians and visitors to this country in zoos generally and, particularly in native fauna, I see that what is now a great disadvantage, namely, lack of public funds, could be an unparalleled opportunity, if turned to good account, to develop Monarto along lines that have historically not been the case for zoos. I realise that a long-term commitment will be required from private investors. One cannot start a zoo and tail off in two or three years time if private money runs out.

Last week's State Tourism Conference stressed very strongly the desire of visitors for authentic experiences and for the acquisition of knowledge about all manner of things. The Monarto zoo could, if properly developed along the lines that I have just outlined, fit in very nicely with the uniqueness of South Australia and would be yet one more unique thing we could offer. I urge the Minister to investigate the feasibility of what I have just outlined with a view to making sure that this project comes to fruition.

The Adelaide Zoo allocation has been substantially reduced when inflation is taken into account. Is this because during the previous year, even though the vote was not actually spent, there was a special project that required an increased amount and we are now dropping back to normal, or has there been a cut? If there has, how does one cut allocations to zoos without either reducing the number of animals or the number of staff?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The grant maintains the ongoing operations of the zoo. Some capital projects which would otherwise have been entered into have been deferred because of the necessity to contain expenditure. I will obtain a specific reply for the honourable member in relation to the differential between that \$668 000 and the \$540 000, which is the base running.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** That reduction comes at a time when the zoo has had its highest visitation ever. When talking about animals, one either gets rid of them or does not care for them adequately. We are talking not about capital funds but about recurrent expenditure. It is important for the Minister to explain why there has been this reduction of more than \$100 000 (one-sixth of the zoo's

budget) when there is unprecedented public interest in the zoo.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I understand we are talking about both. We have to remember that the zoo is not funded like the Urban Land Trust and that an entrance fee provides a good deal of funds for the zoo. Indeed, if there is a higher level of patronage that revenue goes up. There have been considerable improvements at the zoo in the past few years. We have seen the benefit of that and I am sure that what is available at the zoo this year is sufficient to ensure that the standard that has been applied in the past 12 months or so can be maintained.

In relation to a question asked earlier about the number of qualified planners in the Development Management Division, that number is 23, including two vacancies recently advertised.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the examination of the vote completed.

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

Engineering and Water Supply, \$133 201 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr G.M. Gunn

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

Mr J. Meier

The Hon. J.W. Slater

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr R.J. Greatrex, Acting Director, Administration and Finance, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr A.N. Killmier, Deputy Director-General.

Mr K.W. Lewis, Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief.

Mr R.E. Mander, Senior Finance Officer.

Mr K.R. John, Acting Manager, Management Accounting and Budgeting.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I give the Committee an indication of the area on which I will seek information, and that is particularly in the area, once again, of the long-term strategy for the replacement of assets, particularly mains and sewers. This is a major area of concern, which was highlighted by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The points that were made were valid. Many of the points that were made in the article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on 10 August were put to me when I was directly involved with the NWS. It is essential that we know the Government's long-term strategy to come to grips with this problem, and on the Murray River, particularly as it concerns the report of the working group on options for salinity reduction, which is to report to the Murray-Darling Basin ministerial council. That is an excellent report which contains a great deal of valuable information, and it is essential that we know where the Government stands and what action it will take to influence the other three Governments, namely, the Federal Government and the Vic-

torian and New South Wales Governments on the implementation of the recommendations of that report. I ask the Minister where the Government, his department or he stands in relation to the replacement of water and sewer mains and how the Government intends to fund the massive costs involved.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The interesting incident in Victoria Square a couple of weeks ago indicated the necessity for this work to proceed, and it is a concern with which all Governments in the developed world are grappling. At a time when there are calls in some areas for significant reductions in public expenditures, a good deal of the infrastructure that was put in place many years ago needs replacement.

We are trying to get an ongoing program and activity that will be spread over many years to try to get the best information available as to the state of our services. Funds for asset replacement of \$6.7 million have been provided in the current capital works program, and this is in part supported by a works program in the design areas of the department, which will require approximately 15 full-time equivalent staff. This will cover the direct requirements of capital funded projects and additional general investigation. A pump testing program is going on, and it involves items of recurrent expenditure. So, we have an amalgam of current and capital expenditure demands which will be placed on us. Perhaps the Director-General will want to add something to that general picture. It is probably reasonable to say that we see as desirable a higher level of expenditure on asset replacement than we currently have before us, but we are working within the same sort of constraints as are all areas of Government activity.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** What are the implications if assets are not replaced? Ultimately, the whole shooting match will go up.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** There are at this stage no indications of a critical situation. The \$6.7 million is a reasonable level of commitment to this area. We believe that we could be doing the job better with more resources, but certain other areas at which we are looking will have a bearing on the asset replacement program.

**Mr Lewis:** The Minister has covered most of the matters. We are improving our knowledge of our assets by having a proper register of assets showing their condition. The Department is adopting a strategy that has been adopted overseas namely, to make sure that crucial assets such as major water filtration plants, water supply systems, sewage treatment works, pumping stations and major pipelines are in good condition and are kept in good condition. We are not concerning ourselves too much about the condition of the lesser structures within the system, such as the smaller mains. They have a varied life according to the ground conditions and the quality of the laying; some of the older ones were laid with lesser techniques than occurred in more recent years, and for some, lesser materials were used.

It will be a combination approach. If we can keep the crucial assets which, if they failed, would cause disruption to supplies for a significant time in good condition (and that is happening), we need not be so concerned about the assets that are of lesser importance. That is not to say that at present we feel we are making provision for sufficient funds for asset replacement over time, but we will be facing greater difficulties not in the next few years but possibly in 10 to 15 years or so. That gives us plenty of time to develop strategies and place before the Government information that is necessary to make expenditure decisions.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I appreciate the answer, but I shall go back to the article in the *Sunday Mail* of 10 August.

Under the heading 'Multi-billion bombshell for Bannon', the article says:

The former Water Resources Minister, Mr Slater, admitted last year the Engineering and Water Supply Department had \$6 000 million worth of assets including treatment plants and water lines, some of which were 80 to 100 years old.

'We have a capital works program of \$60 million a year and, if we continue replacement of our ageing assets at the current rate, it would be a 300-year program—and they are not going to last that long,' he said.

I think that comment is quite realistic. We are not talking about 20 years—we are talking about a program with funds that the State is currently able to put up for 300 years. If that deteriorates and stretches out to 400 or 500 years, it must be remembered that we are only 150 years down the track as far as European development and settlement of South Australia are concerned, and we are talking about a replacement program of the existing assets of something like 300 years. What percentage of those assets will last for 300 years?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I think we must accept a couple of things. First, with present expectations in relation to public sector activity, all Government departments will be limited in their capacity to do what they want to do, and they must make the best with the resources that are available to them. Secondly, the Committee has heard the Director-General say that we are trying to get better information as to the best way to tackle projects. My feeling is that, if we had the additional resources for an expansive program of asset replacement at this stage, perhaps it could be shown down the track that there would be a degree of wastage in that assets could be replaced before that became necessary. I do not say that that would be the norm; I simply say that, given what the picture might be in the future and given that there will be technological innovations from time to time which may considerably assist us in this area, we should not hasten into such a program without ensuring that all the information that is pertinent to the proper approach to such a program is available to us.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** That is fine, but we still have to worry about the future. It is no good putting it off until next year or the year after and hoping that someone else will find the answer to the problem. The problem must compound year by year. There is no other answer for it. It must deteriorate year by year if we cannot find the resources to do anything about it. It is a problem that we as a Parliament must recognise. It will not go away.

As an example, in the early 1980s we approved a new main from the Barossa trunk main going into the balance tank at Gawler and, if I recall, that was a 27 inch main. Part of the whole project included a 21 inch main continuing on through to Kangaroo Flat, eventually reducing in size to mains of about eight inches or 10 inches going to Two Wells and that area. New subdivisions are being developed in the Two Wells area at the moment with six inch mains being installed and connected up to four inch E&WS existing mains. Obviously the system is completely out of balance. We do not have the capacity even in those areas. The design is right in relation to installing six inch mains in the subdivision, but we do not have the backup supply mains. To be hooking six inch subdivision mains into a four inch existing main clearly indicates that there is a great backlog even in providing the basic service required. That is indicated in material which was brought forward in 1985 and which highlights that this problem exists in the department. Not only do we have the problem of replacing worn out mains: we also have the duplication of mains where the existing mains do not have sufficient capacity.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** In some of these situations where the system is being enlarged or expanded there is an

opportunity for asset replacement as part of a project. We will take those opportunities where they arise. A situation at, I think, Dublin in the Northern Adelaide Plains area was recently brought to my attention in relation to water quality; clearly, there was a new approach to the whole situation. Bringing more people into the system will enable an old main to be bypassed and a new system implemented. In that case, we can sometimes kill two birds with one stone. What the member rightly raises is the fact that sometimes you have to divide resources between the provision of new assets and the replacement of old assets. However, a dollar goes only so far. I believe that we are being responsible in the way that we as a department approach it with the resources that are available to us.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I direct the Minister's attention to pages 64 and 65 of the white book and page 160 of the yellow book. There is an interesting situation in the white book whereby the Murray River activities on behalf of the River Murray Commission are detailed as having an expenditure of \$157 000. However, on page 160 of the yellow book the Murray River activities on behalf of the commission show quite different figures. I presume that there is an explanation for this. The interesting part to me is the recurrent receipts shown underneath the total program costs. Why do the figures in the yellow book and the white book differ so much? Why does the difference between the expenditure and the receipts vary so much between the proposed figure for 1985-86 and the proposed figure for 1986-87?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We have run into some confusion throughout the day with differences between the yellow book and the white book in relation to Commonwealth payments. I will seek advice on this matter as to whether that is the problem. Mr Killmier is chasing up this matter, but I think he requires more information from the member.

**Mr Killmier:** I believe the reference is on page 64 of the white book, where there is mention of \$157 000. Page 160 of the yellow book mentions quite large amounts of \$3.3 million under recurrent and \$1.988 million under capital expenditure.

**Mr KLUNDER:** That is correct. There are two things, if I can assist the Deputy Director-General. First, why is there a almost 20-fold difference between the figures given in the two documents and, secondly, why are the 1985-86 proposed recurrent receipts half of the proposed expenditure, whereas in 1986-87 the recurrent receipts exceed the proposed expenditure?

**Mr Killmier:** The figure of \$157 000 is the administrative cost associated with administering the River Murray Commission's activities on behalf of the River Murray Commission. The figure in the yellow book is the actual work carried out by the E&WS Department on behalf of the River Murray Commission.

We have two situations here. The white appropriation document is the State document which shows an allocation of South Australian Government funds for River Murray Commission activities, and the yellow book lists both current and capital amounts—those amounts that the State is spending on behalf of other Governments. In the case of the current expenditure we are talking about South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, and in the case of capital expenditure we are talking about South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth, and it is the work that South Australia is doing on behalf of the other States. Also in that is South Australia's share of expenditure done in other States: it is a mixture of the two.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Perhaps we could prepare a dissection at the table for the honourable member and present it later while we proceed with other matters.

**Mr KLUNDER:** I ask that the officers also consider the second part of my question: I would be interested to know the reason for the proposed amount for 1985-86, where we get back receipts less than half the total of recurrent expenditure, and in 1986-87 we will get back more than the total on recurrent expenditure. It is obviously a trend that we should encourage.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will try to dissect that information from the documents rather than taking up further time now.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We can incorporate that information in *Hansard*.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will try to provide it before we close.

**Mr MEIER:** In reading the Program Estimates, I note that Yorke Peninsula is conspicuous by its absence in regard to specific programs detailed. I gave evidence to the Yorke Peninsula Coast Management Study some months ago about coastal settlements on the peninsula and especially the water supplies required and problems encountered by settlements proceeding without proper consideration of problems that could be caused. First, has the study been completed and are its results known? Secondly, are any provisions made in this year's budget for expected costs resulting from that report?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I ask the Engineer-in-Chief to comment, as he is in a better position to give details.

**Mr Lewis:** From time to time we have evaluated the water supply system servicing Yorke Peninsula. Certain areas of that system still have capacity, other areas are up to full capacity and some coastal settlements have no water supply at all. There is no provision to do any major augmentation of that system in the coming financial year.

**Mr MEIER:** I desire to ask a supplementary question. Have the findings of that committee been released? Would the findings come to your department?

**Mr Lewis:** We would not be producing the final Coastal Management Study Report to which you refer. We would certainly be making input to that study.

**Mr MEIER:** I refer to page 173 of the estimates and the statement in the left-hand column, two paragraphs from the bottom:

Many country water supply systems have reached the end of their economic life and are operating at lower standards. Asset replacement has had to be deferred due to higher priority capital projects.

What are these higher priority capital projects?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The major ones that we see as high priorities are those ongoing commitments from previous years and they relate to the overall water filtration program, both metropolitan and northern towns. Also, we have the ongoing subdivisional activity, particularly in metropolitan Adelaide. There is a responsibility that we have to ensure that that proceeds, and we have certain responsibilities there. Not all that is a charge against the subdividers. Again, there is a good deal of detailed information that we could make available now, although I imagine that simply reading all this out would not be of any great benefit to the Committee, but we certainly can make the information available. The water filtration program and the support work necessary for the continuing subdivisional activity are virtual necessities which we have inherited and which we have to continue. Of course, there is the Commonwealth funded COWSIP, but I do not know whether the honourable member wants me to proceed in that direction.

**Mr MEIER:** If the details are specifically relevant to the question, is it possible to have that information incorporated in *Hansard*?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We can undertake to do that.

**Mr MEIER:** My third question relates to page 167 and the first paragraph, which states:

Under a Department for Community Welfare initiative rate remissions are provided to pensioners.

I was aware of that. Are rate remissions provided to war widows?

**Mr Killmier:** Where the war widows pass the necessary tests for eligibility; in other words, they are in the same position as ordinary pensioners.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I want to refer the Committee to page 175 of the Program Estimates under 'Issues/Trends', where it states:

In November 1985, the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council was formed to address a broad management overview of all aspects of the water supplies in the Murray-Darling Basin. This council is expected to consider the salinity problem as the issue of highest priority.

Can the Minister outline briefly what progress has been made since that historic day in November 1985 in regard to the establishment of that Ministerial Council? How many meetings have taken place? What progress has been made in tackling the general problems of land water environment problems in the Murray-Darling Basin?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will be reasonably brief because other members will probably want to ask questions on this topic. What the honourable member is inviting me to do is give a general overview into which more details can be put. There has been considerable progress made in this whole matter. At the initial meeting in Adelaide there were about six key areas of concern that were identified for a lot more detailed work. One was the inappropriate land management which, it is alleged, has adversely affected the land water and ecological resources of the basin. The second was concern for poor water quality, especially salinity. The third was general concern for degradation of the natural environment.

Another was the need for new institutional structures to more effectively coordinate intergovernment action over the whole of the basin. A further was the need for a coordinated and upgraded research program to assist in the development of management strategies, and another was the need for effective community participation in the resolution of the water, land and environmental problems of the basin, given that we knew in advance that this would not simply be something which Governments could impose on the people either in our Riverland or throughout the Murray-Darling Basin, but rather was something in which we would seek their active cooperation in all that we were trying to do.

So, a series of working groups were established in furtherance of these aims. One was a general review of the environmental resources of the Murray-Darling Basin. At the recent Sydney meeting, that matter was considered, and there has been good progress on that. Dr Jensen, who is in my other Department of Environment and Planning, has been very much involved with that whole issue, and we believe that we have made some real progress there. The next aim was to review appropriate structures and places of community participation in the work of the council. Mrs Kirner, one of the New South Wales Ministers, was very keen on this initiative and promoted herself to chair the working group looking at that, and there is now a high level of acceptance as to the model that should be used for community participation.

Next was to review the potential to improve on-farm water use and irrigation areas of the basin. Here, of course, the Departments of Agriculture and Primary Industry—call them what you will—have had a prime input on that matter. Further, to assist the capacity of the existing water supply systems to deliver water to farms and assess the cost of any

improvements needed—and I might have to call on the Director-General for some advice as to exactly how we have progressed with that one. Next, to examine proposals for salt interception works in relation to alternative options for salinity reduction. We have a report about which the member for Chaffey made reference a little while ago, and we know pretty well where we are going there.

We are particularly concerned about the unacceptably high river salinities within South Australia, despite the excellent level of salinity we currently have which is due to seasonal factors. Finally, there is the need for new institutional structures to more effectively coordinate intergovernmental action. I think there is a very high level of agreement about all these matters, although we are a little short about having a complete resolution of the institutional arrangements. There is what is very close to complete unanimity between Victoria and South Australia and the Commonwealth Department of Resources on this matter. I think the New South Wales people are being perfectly cooperative in relation to the studies which are proceeding and what might result out of them. They are, understandably, nervous given that two-thirds of the State of New South Wales is represented in the Murray-Darling Basin, and anything that could be seen as a surrender of sovereignty is something that their local electorates might see as a sell-out on the part of that Government.

However, we have continued to press an arrangement on our colleagues in the Eastern States which would be of a commission-type structure. The New South Wales people are considering their position, and I would hope that we would have that matter resolved at the next meeting of the council. I think I can assure the honourable member that since that initial meeting in which he played a prominent part there has been quite encouraging progress, and I believe that we are close to a resolution of what perhaps is the most vexed issue, the institutional arrangements. As to the technical matters, there is a very high level of agreement as to the approach and, indeed, some of the results that are coming out of the approaches that have already been adopted.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** To what extent is the Woolpunda ground interception scheme proceeding, having been in operation now for two or three years, and what reference was made to it by the Ministerial Council which set up a working group to provide the study referred to by both the Minister and, previously, the member for Chaffey?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There is a fairly long history on this. What we intend here lies very much within the recommendations of the River Murray Commission in relation to salinity interception. This is seen as having a very high priority. The report of the River Murray Commission in fact put a price tag of something like \$44 million on the work that should proceed and, therefore, Woolpunda has to be seen as a fairly modest subset of that whole matter. During the 1985-86 financial year, investigations which had already been entered into confirmed the feasibility of an interception scheme. This would involve 58 high yielding pumping bores along a 39 kilometre stretch of the river and three possible alternative evaporation basin sites were identified for the final disposal of the effluent. Preliminary designs have been completed for the purpose of carrying out an environmental impact assessment which will commence in the near future.

In fact, on Monday of this week, Cabinet approved the additional expenditure which was required, given that the cost of the investigation is now \$2.4 million. This capital works budget includes a provision of \$693 000 for the project, of which \$175 000 will be funded under the Federal Water Resources Assistance Program, and the preliminary

estimate of the overall cost of the scheme of \$23.6 million includes expenditure of \$1.55 million to June 1986. The anticipated salinity reduction on completion of the scheme is about 90 EC units, which is quite a significant contribution to overall salinity reduction. The target that has been agreed by Governments is less than 80 EC past Morgan for 95 per cent of the time.

**Mr GUNN:** The question that I raise could be considered a hardy annual. I note that approximately \$30.5 million has been allocated under country public water services; that is a considerable amount of money. Can the Minister indicate whether there is hope that any of the proposals included in that large list of uneconomic proposals that the department currently has before it will see the light of day? Can the Minister also indicate whether there is any funding available from State or Commonwealth sources, or a combination of both, for any of the following three matters which are very familiar to me: first, the extension of the water supply to Nile Bay west of Ceduna; secondly, the replacement of the badly deteriorated main to Smoky Bay; and thirdly, the improvement in the arrangement to reticulate water to the township of Terowie? It is important on occasions like this that we are brought up to date, because my constituents find it difficult to understand why they appear to be on the end of the line all the time and then drop off. I share their concern and could go on with it tonight and give a list of projects which I think should have a lower priority, but it would serve no purpose.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I have to sadly report to the honourable member that none of the schemes that he puts before me right now are represented in the estimates that we have before us. I would very much like to see some of these schemes proceed. Again, the problem is the resources available to us. The honourable member might like to discuss with his constituents the possibility of funding under the COWSIP scheme (the country towns water supply improvement program), under which scheme the Commonwealth meets one-third of the cost of a project.

There is a water supply augmentation scheme currently going into Mount Compass under a joint funding arrangement between the Commonwealth, the State and local government: the South Australian allocation is \$388 000 for the 1986-87 financial year. We have some funds available for the coming year, although at this stage the six schemes that are being examined for priority do not involve any of the areas that the honourable member has indicated. I can only suggest that local people continue to keep the matter before us and we will try to get priority. Many others are looking for similar consideration.

**Mr GUNN:** Will the Minister list the schemes that are currently being considered, and will he have his officers provide to me later the full details of the scheme that he outlined briefly so that I am in a better position to make the information available to my constituents? No doubt they will be interested in that scheme. Some of these projects involve very large sums. I wonder what will happen when the pipeline into Smoky Bay gives up the ghost. There is a real problem, particularly at places like Denial Bay, which has the potential for considerable growth being in a large growth area. I understand that we should not develop an area where there is no reticulated water. It is a vicious circle. In most years the Minister has inserted in *Hansard* a list of uneconomic projects, and I ask him to provide that information.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** First, in relation to council schemes, my officers can make available to the honourable member details of the schemes that are currently before us for consideration. Not all of these schemes will get the nod

in the coming financial year, because of the limited resources available. There are the following schemes: Meadows, with a June 1986 capital cost of \$700 000; Echunga, \$700 000; South End, \$800 000; Mundulla, \$500 000; Macclesfield, \$1.05 million; and Blanchetown, \$600 000. I understand that a list of uneconomic schemes was made available previously and we can certainly update it and make it available. We will look very closely at existing water supply provision to try to ensure that such a catastrophe as outlined by the honourable member in relation to Smoky Bay does not eventuate. That is the information we must keep before us.

**Mr GUNN:** The projects that are currently being considered, with one exception (if my memory serves me correctly), all involve particularly high rainfall areas, thus there are alternative sources of supply. Some of the schemes I have mentioned and those referred to by my colleagues in the northern areas, for example at Ceduna, involve areas where there are no alternative sources of supply. Underground water and soil structure are not suitable for dams, so there is a real problem. I understand that at Terowie water is carted to certain areas, and only half of the town has access to a reticulation system. When priorities are being considered, will those points be borne in mind? It is bad enough having to put down a bore or well to supply one's household (and I have had a lot of experience with that) but, where there is no underground water in a relatively low rainfall area, solution of the problem is difficult. Will the Minister take that into account?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I am happy to do that, and the honourable member is perfectly right: of the six schemes I mentioned, only the Blanchetown scheme could be regarded as being in an area of reasonably low rainfall. The criteria for COWSIP funding are fourfold: the economics—the viability of the scheme once it is installed; the concept of public health; the possibility of bushfire risk; and the general category of need. Part of the problem may well be that the COWSIP scheme relies on local initiative: schemes must be put before us. For example, the Mount Compass local government authority was prepared to make a subvention and assist us. In dealing with the Commonwealth Government we can indicate only what bodies made a submission and what are the priorities between those various bids for assistance. If people from dry areas are prepared to come forward with bids, we will try to accommodate them within the limited resources that flow from the scheme.

**Mr GUNN:** What percentage of the money does the State put up for these schemes?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Mr Killmier will answer that question.

**Mr Killmier:** In the case of the Mount Compass scheme, the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa made available \$194 000, and the Commonwealth made available a similar amount—those bodies provided about one-third each.

**Mr GUNN:** So, the Commonwealth, the State and local government provide one-third each.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** In relation to this project.

**Mr Killmier:** If the final cost of the scheme was slightly more, it is possible that the State would put in the balance: I would not imagine that the Government would want to quibble about that. Under COWSIP there is an attempt, first, to provide water to smaller country towns that are what we might call community centres. At Mount Compass, for example, there is an area school, shopping centres and a community centre—quite a range of activities.

The criteria that we used to choose the six townships to which the Minister referred earlier included their being significant community centres, and, further, several of those towns have common effluent schemes. The local govern-

ment people clearly were interested in a mains water supply, given the fact that they had contributed towards common effluent schemes. While I cannot pre-empt a decision that might be taken for this year, I point out that we have already received an indication that the District Council of Truro is well down the track in providing its own water supply scheme and, when presented with the opportunity, the council realised that it would much prefer to be involved in a Government scheme. The council indicated that it would be prepared to put a sizable sum into the provision of a water supply from Blanchetown. Under COWSIP, those local government authorities that have the support of the local community and are prepared to provide some funding will assist in making reasonably viable what will otherwise be an uneconomic scheme.

**Mr GUNN:** Who does the work?

**Mr Killmier:** It is a South Australian Government scheme in the normal sense, designed, built and maintained by the E&WS Department. The only departure from normal works is that the local government authority contributes preferably one-third or thereabouts and the Commonwealth Government also contributes under the COWSIP arrangements.

**Mr GUNN:** Are private contractors involved?

**Mr Killmier:** No, the work is undertaken by the E&WS Department.

**Mr Lewis:** One other constraint was not mentioned, that is, that the Commonwealth is putting up about \$2 million a year spread across Australia, and South Australia's normal allowance will not be sufficient to embark on schemes that will cost, in my view, more than about \$800 000 as a total scheme. It would be unwise to start on a scheme which would be \$2.4 million when you are only receiving from the Commonwealth something like \$194 000 for any particular scheme.

**Mr KLUNDER:** When I was in London recently I was introduced to a submarine mole (a small machine with a battery, radio controls, a light and television camera) which was sent through larger water and sewerage pipes to take internal pictures of the amount of decay and was also used in new subdivision pipes to check the quality of the laying of those pipes. In fact, it took a library of tapes which could be added to during the lifetime of the pipes to see what their wear history was going to be. Is the department aware of that and of the cost effectiveness of such a system?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I have seen photographs of what look like stalactites and stalagmites growing in old pipes. I will leave it to my officers to explain how these interesting photographs are taken.

**Mr Lewis:** We have been using television for looking at the condition of all our smaller sewers for many years. I think we have had television monitoring systems for 10 to 12 years, maybe 15 years. We would be very happy to show any member of the House their operation. We use them in a number of ways: to look at collapsed sewers; to look at the condition of particular sewers; to look at the infiltration problems in some areas where saline water gets into sewers; and to look at the efficacy of repair work which is sometimes done in place in the sewers. Those systems are used in smaller sewers for chokes, tree roots and that type of thing.

We have to enter the very big sewers, and the Adelaide trunk sewer is a case in point. We inspected it recently and found that after 20 years of operation it is in absolutely perfect condition, which is very rewarding considering the trouble we went to to give it a plastic lining to prevent future corrosion. We have been using television cameras for a long time, and they are very sophisticated. They are

an important tool in the management of the maintenance of our sewerage system.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Coming back to the report of the working group in relation to the Murray-Darling Basin, page 7 of the summary states:

6. River Murray Commission Salinity Objective:

The salt interception and river management options identified in this report have the potential to reduce Murray River salinity at Morgan to less than 800 EC for 95 per cent of the time . . .

Page 33, which is the major section—and this is extremely important—states:

The River Murray Commission salinity objective is achievable within 10 years if the salt interception schemes together with the changed river regulation strategies are adopted even after an allowance is made for increased salt inflows.

How confident is the Minister that the recommendations put forward (with an estimated total cost of \$44 million) and the proposed works as identified in the document will be implemented within the 10-year time frame? What negotiations have gone on between South Australia, the other two States and the Commonwealth in relation to the manner in which it will be funded? Is it intended to proceed with these works on the basis that no matter in which State the work has to be undertaken the financial load will be borne equally by the States? In other words, if two-thirds of the work had to be undertaken in New South Wales, then my view is that Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales should equally share the costs in relation to the State's input.

I still hold the philosophy, and I have yet to be otherwise convinced, that until such time that it is funded on the basis of the major part being contributed by the Commonwealth (in other words, say, 70 per cent by the Commonwealth and 10 per cent by each of the three States, in line with the practice that has proved to be the only way to come to grips with this problem in other parts of the world) it will be hard to convince Victoria and New South Wales to contribute a quarter each of the total \$44 million. Overseas experience clearly shows that until the Federal Government is prepared to come in with the lion's share most of these projects, with the best will in the world, flounder.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Certainly considerable Commonwealth resource input in this area would be very welcome. However, whether or not that happens, I am reasonably confident of there being an equitable share of work and resources for work as between the three Murray River States. For example, in relation to salinity interception, our aim, as I have indicated previously, is no more than 800 EC average salinity past Morgan for 95 per cent of the time. It does not really matter too much where the salt comes from provided we are able to keep below that figure. There are considerable gains, as the Woolpunda scheme, modest as it is, indicates, with salinity interception.

At the other end of the river the Victorians have a real problem in that they have nowhere to put their saline run-offs from irrigation schemes that have been running for a very long time. As the honourable member may well know there is a group going around the country (they have seen me and may have seen the honourable member) touting the possibility of pipelines to Bass Strait in order to get rid of these saline outflows. There has been litigation in relation to schemes for evaporation basins in Victoria which are not dissimilar to what we have had in South Australia, through the Noora scheme, for quite some time. A reasonable level of expenditure on salinity interception in South Australia would allow the Victorians to put more salt into the river with a clear conscience. In fact, that could occur without our exceeding that ceiling figure, which all Governments see as desirable.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I do not have any problem with that so long as we get the average figure below 800 for 95 per cent of the time.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** That is the point I am making. It is in the Victorians' interest to spend money in South Australia on saline groundwater interception because that will be cheaper than either piping it to Bass Strait or taking areas out of production because of increased salinisation that occurs. To a lesser extent, because irrigation has been going on for a short time, the same sort of thing is showing up around, say, Deniliquin, in New South Wales. That is one example where expenditure in South Australia can be seen by the Eastern States as having a real financial return. I would expect that that would be a reasonably positive outcome. I also agree with what the honourable member says, that the more resources can be put by the Commonwealth the quicker we will be able to meet these objectives.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The reason why that is a realistic approach, for the Federal Government to put in money, is that even the Federal Government acknowledges that the total resource is worth something like \$10 000 million annually to the national economy (a figure they have come up with on numerous occasions), and while we might consider that \$44 million a significant sum of money it is minute in terms of the total context of what the resource is worth.

The underlying responsibility is that we have a moral obligation to protect the resource not only for our use but also for that of future generations. It is of the utmost importance as to what progress has been made on reaching agreement in relation to funding. In the recommendations of the half dozen engineering proposals one is listed as the Chowilla groundwater interception scheme of 17 EC units net value. I take it that concerns the Chowilla Creek and also takes in Punka Creek. What would be the implications of that project on the environment? What impact will it have, if it blocks off the creeks for the purpose of damming them up or diverting them, on the red gum and other native species?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I want to be fair to the Commonwealth about what we were saying earlier. Investigations for all these works are funded 50 per cent by the Commonwealth, with the three States finding 16⅓ per cent. We have that level of commitment, which we hope might flow over into active works and not simply investigations for works. I have not looked at the Chowilla interception case in detail, and I wonder whether the Director-General, who is a Commissioner on the River Murray Commission, can give specific details.

**Mr Lewis:** I cannot add a great deal except to say that there are a number of ways in which they are looking at the salinity interception works there, and the environment studies have not started, but they will be significant in seeing how we shall dispose of salt at that site. I understand, without having the details, that there are opportunities for good sites which will hold water much better than some of the sites at which we were looking in the area downstream, in the Loch 2, Loch 3 or Woolpunda schemes.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I am not sure whether the Chowilla/Punka Creek proposal is just for damming them off, and containing the natural salt inflows or whether the salt is originating in the ground water of pressure from Lake Victoria or where. If it is just damming them up to contain them, obviously there will be a fair bit of devastation of the natural environment and ecology. I am concerned that, whatever scheme is implemented to get rid of the 17 EC units, we must not at the same time unduly damage the environment.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** We do not want to solve one environmental problem and create another. That is accepted.

**Mr Lewis:** There is a natural saline inflow but it is not man induced, nor associated with Lake Victoria. We certainly would not contemplate any scheme that would wipe out some of the natural environment in that area.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I understand that the water filtration plant will be commissioned shortly and that it will be officially opened next Friday week. I am anxious to know whether the project has been completed in accordance with the original time schedule.

My second question is about the Happy Valley filtration plant. What progress has been made on the Happy Valley plant and what amounts of money have been allocated to it in the budget for the forthcoming year?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Morgan filtration plant will be commissioned on 10 October, as the honourable member said. I have information on the cost which may be known to the honourable member, anyway. I do not know the extent to which this meets the target for construction that was set at the beginning.

**Mr Lewis:** I do not have the figures with me, but the current figure to complete the scheme is about \$30.9 million. That would be higher than the original estimates, but there has been an escalation since then to take into account. There is no evidence that we have overrun on the cost. I can follow that up if you wish.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** On the Happy Valley scheme, we have allocated \$11.018 million in these budget estimates, which represents an increase of about \$2 million over the allocation for 1985-86. The commitments beyond 1985-86 have been for completion dates of October 1989 for stage 1 and April 1991 for stage 2. We will be seeking increased subventions in the next couple of years if we are to maintain those dates.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** What is the Commonwealth allocation in that \$11 million?

**Mr Lewis:** I cannot give the actual amounts, but when the construction of the plant was started several years ago, the Commonwealth was making annual grants of 30 per cent of the cost of the works. However, last year the Commonwealth decided to change the basis of its financial assistance under the Federal Water Resources Assistance Program for this project. We now receive 30 per cent of the 30 per cent as a grant and the balance of the 30 per cent as a loan. So, strictly speaking, the Commonwealth is providing only 9 per cent of the capital cost of the Happy Valley water filtration plant as a grant. Therefore, it is also providing 21 per cent as a loan, and the balance is State loan funds.

**Mr MEIER:** I was interested to hear some of the comments from Ministers and officers on the country water supply improvement program. I wanted to extend a little further on that. Are the schemes, such as the Moorowie and Hardwicke Bay scheme, which were mentioned by the Minister in the list of six or so, considered to be uneconomic schemes?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** They are all uneconomic schemes. There is a viability criterion that has to be met for COWSIP funding.

**Mr MEIER:** I think that answer is sufficient. Going on from that, page 173 of the yellow book states that the 1985-86 specific targets (which have just been completed, I assume) include the employment of resources under the Community Employment Program to provide water supplies to the highest priority deferred water supply schemes. I am aware that that occurred on the West Coast in particular. Are any CEP schemes envisaged for 1986-87?



**Mr Lewis:** Yes, the country water supply improvement program began as a Community Employment Program. There seemed to be some confusion at Commonwealth level as to where the program would be best placed. Subsequently, it has come under the Federal water resources financial assistance program. As a result, there are no further schemes under the Community Employment Program for water supply.

**Mr MEIER:** So, in future, we will have COWSIP schemes.

**Mr Lewis:** Yes.

**Mr MEIER:** I refer to page 173 and the specific targets for 1986-87, one of which is:

To commission the Morgan water filtration plant and to undertake detailed design work for the Stockwell water filtration plant.

Stockwell used to be in my electorate, but it is no longer. However, I remember the telephone calls I received from that area and the unbelievable problems that certain people had in washing their clothes, let alone trying to bath their children, who came out dirtier than when they went in. Can the Minister supply a time chart as to when the Stockwell filtration plant will be nearer completion?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I am glad to hear that although it is no longer part of the member's electorate it still induces a warm inner glow in him. At this stage we have set aside \$627 000 for design work this financial year. Expenditure to date has been \$655 000, and the estimated overall cost of the scheme is \$20.67 million. The \$627 000, I guess, relates to further detailed design work that must proceed before we are in a position to obtain Public Works Committee approval to proceed further with the scheme.

**Mr MEIER:** My third question relates to page 174 of the yellow book and the policy area of natural resources and 'issues/trends', as follows:

The demand for water is near the limit of available supply from the River Murray, and greater than the availability in the ground water basins in the Northern Adelaide Plains . . .

Is the effluent water from the Virginia area to be further developed? I brought up this subject earlier in the session in my Address in Reply speech and put forward in reasonable detail the history of the Virginia effluent scheme, the various things that have occurred and perhaps the lack of suitable progress that has been made with effluent water. I still strongly believe that it has great potential to be an important water source for that area in the future, yet it continues to be left to lie and is used very minimally, even though the yellow book acknowledges that the water supply for the Northern Adelaide Plains is close to the limit. In other words, we have reached the limit but nothing seems to be occurring in relation to the use of effluent.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I am aware that the member has raised this matter. In fact, it has been a hardy annual practically all the time that I have been in this place. Mr Lewis has been living with the matter all that time, so I invite him to enlighten the Committee as to where we are.

**Mr Lewis:** The situation with the Bolivar effluent certainly has been with the department ever since Bolivar came into being, and I think it was in 1966 that I had to write the report for the first committee of inquiry into the use of Bolivar effluent. There have been numerous committees of inquiry into the further use of that effluent for some time. The basic disability with Bolivar effluent is that it is too expensive to use anywhere else but very close to the channel itself. As a result, the Government has proclaimed the Bolivar effluent channel as a watercourse and has issued licences for extraction of water from that channel; people may, as with any other stream in South Australia now, take water from the channel and use it for irrigation and other purposes.

The fact that we have now licensed people to utilise as much water as there is in the channel equal to the summer flow means that not a great deal is left to be used up. However, we know that many people who hold licences at the present time have not utilised all the water to which they are entitled. However, some sizeable irrigation schemes have occurred using that channel. As to the future, I think it is indicative that irrigation in Australia, particularly in South Australia, is not enjoying a particularly financially enjoyable time. At the moment I do not see any opportunities for people going in for large scale irrigation from the Bolivar irrigation channel.

**Mr GUNN:** My question deals with the E&WS Department's plan to carry out a program of capping free flowing artesian bores in the Great Artesian Basin systematically over the next few years. I was concerned that discussion take place with pastoral lessees before this program is implemented so that they can have input concerning their problems and have them taken into account. Also, is the department monitoring levels in the basin and, if it is, for how long has it been monitoring levels?

**Mr Lewis:** The question of rehabilitation of free flowing bores in the Great Artesian Basin is a program carried out by the Department of Mines and Energy, and I understand that expenditure is at present about \$300 000 a year. As to the wells that are free flowing, the whole program is not necessarily designed to cap them as such, in other words, to shut them down, but to try to bring them under control. Some are out of control and are running to waste. When they are brought under control there is diminished flow, because that is the program's intention.

There are discussions with all of the pastoralists in the area about their requirements and how they can be satisfied, and there is a program after a well has been brought under control to allow pastoralists five years to get their requirements in place in respect of supplying their stock needs, and so on. There have been few complaints about the program but one or two problems have recently come to light. At a meeting of the South Australian Water Resources Council last Friday this matter was discussed, and it was agreed that we should get together with all the pastoralists who are still in the program or who have the program involving their properties. We will ensure that their needs are met. That industry is also suffering some financial difficulty following the destocking program that has taken place and it is believed that the five years in which they are given to get their own water supplies in place for stock watering may not be sufficient.

Monitoring of the Great Artesian Basin does take place, the main monitoring, however, at this time being done by the Department of Mines and Energy, although the E&WS Department has been doing a great deal of computer modelling of the basin because of the increase in use of water from that basin and the consequent need to bring it under control. Most of the water will be pumped out in association with the Olympic Dam project.

**Mr GUNN:** My next question deals with the desalination of water at Coober Pedy and the program to reticulate this water in the town. The program has been successful and has assisted the community. Has the department looked at that program to see whether similar future programs can be implemented elsewhere where communities have a serious problem? The Minister will be aware that the people of Hawker, and especially the council, have expressed a concern not only about the availability of water but about the quality of water at Hawker. I understand that the standard is close to that set down by the World Health Organisation. Is the department looking at programs of this kind to solve

the sorts of problems facing the people of Hawker? I know what they are talking about, because I have had to shower there.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I have not been given any specific material about an evaluation of the Coober Pedy program, but Mr Lewis may have information that would apply to the problem at Hawker.

**Mr Lewis:** I visited Coober Pedy recently. I try to go into the north of the State and look at water resources every three years. I recently visited Coober Pedy and inspected its scheme, which I think is excellent. It has been well done by consultants, with funding coming from what was the Community Employment Program referred to earlier. There was a considerable investment by the Commonwealth and the State in that scheme, which brings water in about 16 kilometres from a bore of reasonable quality to a desalination plant from where it is reticulated throughout the town.

At present it is only marginal in terms of viability, even though a great deal of capital for the construction of the scheme was provided by the State and Federal Governments. It would require a large investment by the South Australian Government to provide capital to build a scheme and a desalination plant for Hawker. As the member says, the water quality is poor at Hawker but in the present circumstances our program does not provide for improving the supply there.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before I call for further questions, I advise the Committee that there are still four lines of expenditure to be dealt with before 10 p.m.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** What is the Minister's program for the establishment of the Finger Point sewage treatment works near Mount Gambier? I refer to a letter dated 30 May 1986 from the Premier to the member for Mount Gambier when, among other things, the Premier stated:

Design and estimate preparation is continuing uninterrupted so that a submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works can be expected during July 1986.

On 31 July, in a further letter to the member for Mount Gambier from the Premier, he stated:

Although delayed somewhat, a submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the project is in the final stages of preparation with a view to submitting it in August this year.

Has that submission finally been presented to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—it is now October—and when does the Minister expect that actual real work will commence, and when will it be completed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The submission to the Public Works Standing Committee should be within a couple of weeks. I understand that we are ready to move on a reference. As for how long it takes the committee is a matter for the committee. At the end of that time hopefully it would be possible, given an appropriate recommendation by the committee, to resolve the question of the acquisition of land for the project to proceed. The honourable member would be aware that at this stage we can but negotiate with the owners of the land as to what is a fair and reasonable price for acquisition, and then work can proceed. I do not have in front of me the details for more than this financial year: these are in the documents that the honourable member has, and these figures allow the detailed design to proceed. The rate at which it would proceed would depend entirely on the resources made available to me in next year's budget for the obvious work to commence. However, the Government is concerned to proceed with this project to which it has a firm commitment.

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There is an absolute commitment from the Government made in an election context, and we will proceed with that project. Given that we are aware that a reference to the PWSC could not be before this time and given that there is still the continuing controversy with the owner of the land as to what is a fair and reasonable acquisition, it is felt that at this stage the most we could ask from Treasury is what would be necessary for the detailed design work.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** My next question comes back to a matter of policy, and I will have to read a letter that I have received from a constituent so that the Minister will understand what I am getting at. The letter from Kevin Bird, of Paringa, states:

Following our recent discussion regarding the Engineering and Water Supply Department water rating of our property at Paringa, I would like to inform you that the person with whom I discussed the possible Engineering and Water Supply Department water supply to our land at Paringa in 1973 was Mr Ray Harvey, who was then in charge of the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Berri. I also seek your assistance regarding the Engineering and Water Supply Department's statement that it would cancel our existing licence to pump water direct from the Murray River should we sell this property.

As we have outlaid a large amount of money to install our own water supply we certainly do not wish to lose this system, even if we should give or leave the property to our sons, which would constitute a change of ownership.

I sincerely hope you will be able to help us in this matter as it seems I have been remiss in not obtaining in writing, from Mr Harvey and the E. & W.S. Department, the statements which I have made in my letter to the Department. I also firmly believe that there would not have been a water supply to our house or any others in this vicinity if Paringa Pastoral Company (of which I am a director) and A.S. and M.R. Shepherd had not funded the majority of the existing water supply.

What he is referring to in relation to the existing water supply is the new main that has gone up to the Shepherd subdivision, for want of a better word, in respect of which both Mr Bird and Mr Shepherd contributed something like \$42 000 each. They have largely funded the main to the subdivision but, because their existing houses in that area were near a pump when those places were established, they had to put in their own system. In a letter dated 21 March 1972 from the Engineering and Water Supply Department to the Director of Planning, when the application for subdivision was referred to the Director of Planning it indicated that the Department had no objection. However, it also stated:

... in addition, the level of the land is such that it cannot be supplied from the water supply reticulation system for the township of Paringa ...

That was a letter where inquiries had been referred to Mr Lewis back in those days. At that time the department indicated there would be no extension of the main into that area, so they put in their own domestic water supply. They have now subdivided a significant amount of land in more recent time which they largely funded, and the department put in the extension to the main up to this so-called Shepherd subdivision. Because the main that they had funded goes past their existing houses, they now become liable to a rating off a main from which they require no water. They have also been told that, in the event of selling their property or handing it over to their family, their private water supply would be cancelled.

I think you can appreciate that they have put in close on \$100 000 to a Government scheme and as a result have created an extension of the main from which they themselves do not want any water but for which they are now being rated, on top of their contribution of some \$84 000. I believe that the matter should be looked at and that there should be some flexibility considering their enormous contribution to the development of that area.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It sounds like one of those conundrums upon which Ministers are only too happy to take advice. Does Mr Lewis want to assist the Committee at this point? Otherwise, I think I will get a statement prepared for the honourable member. Obviously, there is a long history.

**Mr Lewis:** I hope the Mr Lewis is Mr R. Lewis, who was in our consumer branch at that time, and that it is not Mr K. Lewis, as I do not recall the problem. The complexity of the matter is such that I would like to investigate it. I really cannot contemplate how we will resolve it and what the precise difficulties are. I am sure a satisfactory resolution of the problems can be reached.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** There are probably not many instances where people who have created the development have done so at their own loss.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will follow it up and get a reply.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister and the department may be aware of the Spalding Slate Company Pty Ltd operating in the Spalding area on a mining lease on private property. It obtains its water virtually from a 20 mm service with a neighbouring owner's agreement through his property. The property is actually owned by a Mr W.G. Pryde. For this company to develop to its full potential, it needs significantly more water to lubricate the saws for cutting the marble and slate, and so forth. Evidently, the company has the potential to expand considerably. At the moment, through the 20 mm service, it only has the ability to operate two of its four saws. It has applied to the department for an indirect service. It is one of those strange situations where a mining lease on a property actually abuts the main, so technically the property can have a connection but the mining lease itself, which is on the title, does not actually abut the main.

The suggestion has been made by the department that possibly it could increase Mr Pryde's 20 mm service to 25 mm which might assist in some way, but it is still unsatisfactory. The correspondence is dated 24 September 1986, so it is quite recent. The reference ends '4/86. Inquiries G. Mulholland'. I wonder if that matter could be looked at, because there is a potential there for an industry to expand quite dramatically, but if it is restricted through the actual mining lease not abutting the main, it cannot get the quantity of water it needs to fully develop its potential. Evidently, the company has significant interstate orders and possibilities, but cannot produce because of the amount of water required each day. Will the Minister consider this matter to see whether the problem can be resolved?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will certainly take up this matter and provide a considered reply. Is it economic for the company to consider some sort of storage facility?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I have already suggested that alternative, and the company has considered it. There is considerable pressure in the main at that point and evidently the company needs water under pressure for this process, so the water would have to be stored and then repressurised. I do not know whether that is feasible. It is a distance of only about 600 metres from the main. The company has the potential to employ quite a few more people in that area. A town the size of Spalding does not have many employment possibilities, but opportunities are being restricted by the availability of water to this industry.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will certainly consider that.

**Mr MEIER:** Under 'Natural resources', one of the specific targets/objectives for 1986-87 is to actively promote water conservation in line with Government policy. To what extent is the Government encouraging the greater use

of rainwater tanks? I believe that that is one of the best water conservation measures. I have a rainwater tank which I operate for more than six months of the year: I kept my excess water bill to about \$30 last year.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I think it can still be demonstrated that in the urban situation it is difficult to justify the installation of rainwater tank storage as against normal conservation methods. Certainly, the movement towards a greater component of 'pay for usage', which has continued for some time and which is reflected in the price of water and rating policies for this year, has had its effect on water consumption patterns. We see this in the number of people in the metropolitan area, for example, who are ripping up lawns and putting down bark chips, doing the things that are only sensible in a Mediterranean climate with limited rainfall. We have canvassed a number of times the installation of rainwater tanks; for water quality users, particularly if people like drinking it neat (and I have never been into that to a great extent, preferring Coke or something else), it is desirable, but in terms of the ultimate cost to the consumer the economics are still a bit dicey. I have discussed this matter with the Director-General on a number of occasions and he might like to enlighten us further.

**Mr Lewis:** From time to time we review the costs of various sources of water. One could say that, compared with the State price of water, the true cost of providing rainwater is usually demonstrated to be three or four times the cost of water from the tap. If all the people in Adelaide and I guess in most urban areas used rainwater tanks, and used them efficiently, we could save about 4 per cent of the total demand of water from our natural resources. From time to time concerns have been expressed about water quality, particularly in areas where air pollution is also of concern. One can demonstrate bacteriologically that the water from a rainwater tank is not as good as that which we deliver from the taps. As one person put it, it is polluted by birds, bees and perambulating possums. I suspect that there are other things that might pollute that water. My own view is that, except in certain parts of the State, the quality of rainwater is quite safe and quite palatable for drinking purposes, and we would encourage its use.

**Mr MEIER:** Has this issue been taken up with the Federal Government to ascertain whether a tax incentive could be provided to people who install rainwater tanks, with an increasing benefit of up to 50 per cent of the cost of a 2 000 or 3 000 gallon tank or a smaller percentage for a 500 gallon tank?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am not aware of recent approaches. As I indicated in relation to another portfolio area, there have been approaches to the Federal Government in regard to tax incentives, but that is not a high priority with the Federal Government at present. All sorts of things could be done if we could justify them on a cost benefit basis in terms of water conservation in the home, and if we can satisfy ourselves as to some of the health and environmental problems. It would seem to me that there are circumstances in which bath water could be used on the back lawn. Capital investments must be made when houses are constructed: to hang those developments on a house that already has its own plumbing system 10 or 15 years down the track when people start thinking about these things is pretty costly. We are interested in developing our information services to individuals and the building industry, which may assist people in determining which of these options is feasible, in both health and financial terms. However, we are some way from having a full information service to enable us to do that.

**Mr MEIER:** On the same page we read proposals to develop management plans for the groundwater resources of the northern Adelaide Plains and certain other areas. Does the Minister envisage that the management plans will see a reduction or realignment of quotas for persons who are currently using underground water? What is the basis for undertaking the management plan?

**Mr Lewis:** A number of policies are in place at present with respect to managing the water in the ground, and these are all ground water resources. We know that the northern Adelaide Plains is being over-pumped. The precise number is always quoted as somewhere between 1.6 and now about 2.5 times, but there is some uncertainty about that. Policies are in place which will, over time, reduce that over-pumping which is presently occurring. Similar work is going on in the Angas/Bremer area, because we know very well that the salinity of that ground water is increasing as a result of over-pumping that basin, which is a limited basin. There is an increase in salinity not only from the higher saline waters moving into the basin as one over pumps the basin but also leakage down from the more saline aquifers above the basin.

There have been some dramatic increases in salinity and there would have to be concern among some landholders as to the continuing viability of their irrigation enterprises. We are currently completing our studies which will illustrate more closely how that basin behaves so that we can go to the people in the area who are now represented on the Angas/Bremer Water Resource Advisory Committee, lay out the whole future or prognosis of that basin to them and seek their advice as to what the Government should do in managing that basin in the longer term.

We also know that a similar situation exists in the Upper South-East and the Murray-Mallee. We hope that by the end of this year we will have draft management plans for those which will be canvassed with the local community, mainly through their water resource advisory committees, all of which presently exist, before they are recommended to the Government or considered by the Government and the Government takes its decision as to the strategy that should be adopted for the management of those resources in the future.

**Mr MEIER:** I am aware that chlorine and other substances are put in at specific locations, for example, the Redbanks holding reservoir on the northern Adelaide Plains. To what extent can chlorine and other substances be put in further along the pipeline? Is it possible to do that?

**Mr Lewis:** Yes, we can boost the chlorine into any main as required. In fact, that is what occurs on the Morgan/Whyalla pipeline, because we have the problem with amoebic meningitis caused by an amoeba called *naegleria fowleri*. We find it necessary to maintain the chlorine level in order to protect the population from that organism, so have a number of booster stations along the pipeline.

**Mr MEIER:** Supplementary to that, have any tests been conducted to determine whether there is a correlation between the amount of chlorine put into the water and the incidence of cancer in human beings?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This raises the whole question of so-called trihalomethanes (organochlorides, as they are sometimes called—or they could easily be organobromides or any of the halogens). It is known that high levels of trihalomethanes are carcinogenic to laboratory animals under certain conditions. The World Health Organisation has not been prepared, except in relation to chloroform, to set down levels. Therefore, all that we can do on this is try to keep the levels as low as possible, consistent with the necessity for, in Australian terms, a reasonably high dosage of chlorine in the water.

As I explained once in Question Time, we have proposed to resolve this dilemma between, on the one hand, the necessity for reasonably high chlorine dosage and on the other, the necessity for as low as possible a concentration of trihalomethanes, to go into the chloramination process, which means the addition of ammonia as well as chlorine, which inhibits the production of trihalomethanes. On a pilot basis, that has been introduced, I say that, because some years ago some chloramination was proceeding in the system. I am not aware of the historical reasons for its cessation, but I believe that this is happening at Myponga at present. Perhaps the Director-General could prompt me as to the other aspects of the trial scheme.

**Mr Lewis:** The Minister was quite correct. Chlorination was first introduced in the 1950s in South Australia and chloramination was put in at Millbrook. It was taken out of action purely and simply because it was considered that it gave higher levels of odor and taste, because it is a more persistent disinfectant. That is why it is used in long pipelines such as the Tailem Bend to Keith pipeline, because we want a persistent disinfectant all through the system. It was reintroduced there for the first time, and now it has been reintroduced on Yorke Peninsula at one of the booster stations, and we are about to commission the plant at Myponga for the same reason. It gives a more persistent and a lower intensity disinfectant and, as the Minister said, inhibits the formation of trihalomethanes and keeps them below the level recommended by the WHO.

The WHO guidelines are qualified by saying that they are not sure what the guideline level should be. It could be anywhere between one-tenth of that figure and 10 times that figure. So, the data and its correlation are obviously very poor. The WHO also says that one should not take the chance of not disinfecting the water in order to keep the trihalomethane, and therefore chloroform, levels down. That is certainly the view of the South Australian Health Commission. Its view, rightly, is that disinfection is the primary objective and keeping down the level of trihalomethanes is very much a secondary one.

**Mr MEIER:** Do you know the name of the station on Yorke Peninsula?

**Mr Lewis:** I do not know the station, but I could follow it up. I am almost certain that we have started chloramination there to get a persistent disinfectant level down the main.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The whispering wall is undoubtedly quite a tourist attraction in South Australia, and I have been approached by a Mr Stewart of Para Hills West, who has approached the E&WS Department in Elizabeth and written to the Minister in an endeavour to get approval to enable him to sell icecream and soft drinks to tourist who visit the whispering wall.

Evidently there are no facilities of that nature where refreshments can be obtained by tourists and visitors to the whispering wall. He has been refused on the basis that it would create difficulties for the department. As the wall is quite an attraction, will the Minister re-examine the question and see whether there are terms and conditions under which Mr Stewart can operate a suitably environmentally acceptable facility at the site to provide this service that he would like to provide.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Certainly, I am willing to have a further examination of the matter, as the honourable member has raised it. Our concern in the past has been for any form of other than purely casual access to any of the reservoir areas by the general public. We are aware of the tourist attraction of the reservoir areas. Any number of times I have walked across the swing bridge below the spillway at Mount Bold Reservoir. I am aware of the num-

ber of people who come there to look at the reservoir. It is a scenic attraction, and I am sure that the same can be said for South Para and the particular attraction of Barossa.

We have always been very reluctant about there being any permanent or semi-permanent installation of a commercial or whatever category in the very sensitive areas adjacent to reservoirs. As the honourable member would be aware, requests by fishing organisation to fish reservoirs, for people to have sailing facilities or for joggers to use the forested areas immediately adjacent to those reservoirs have been rejected consistently with the exception of Thorndon Park, which is now out of the system. However, as the honourable member has further raised the matter I am willing to ask for a further report from my officers, not necessarily to reverse that decision but simply to ensure that we have a proper balance of public interests flowing into such a decision.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Times change, and this is an industry which we can promote and develop and which has a potential to expand when many other industries unfortunately seem to be going backwards at present. That is a tragedy for the State. Tourism is held up as an example of where possibly our future lies.

I now refer the Minister to another interesting letter that I have received. The Minister will well remember the publicity a few weeks ago about the toilet cistern being replaced at Parliament House. I have an interesting letter from a professional public relations firm acting, I imagine, on behalf of Caroma, drawing attention to the launching of the Caroma dual flush toilet system in 1980 or 1981. When cisterns were replaced in Parliament House the dual flush water saving devices were not installed in the building.

The firm reminds us that the dual flush system today is mandatory in new houses in Victoria and on Queensland's Gold Coast, and legislation is under consideration in Western Australia. We run water saving campaigns every summer in this State, and it seems ironic that we are not further promoting water saving when the firm suggests that single button flush systems waste about 32 000 litres of water a year in the home of a family of four. It seems to be a slip on our part. Has the Minister any intention of following suit with the legislation that exists in Victoria? It would support and enhance our annual water saving campaign.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Certainly, I am attracted to the Victorian and Queensland proposition. I was not aware that it was in force in Queensland. Certainly, I was aware that it was in force in Victoria. I have had some discussions with manufacturers in this State about the possibility. That is all I can say at this stage. I have not yet asked my colleagues to ratify anything. I see what happened here as regrettable. In any event, at officer level the Department of Housing and Construction would be aware of our preference for the installation of dual flush toilets in public buildings. I certainly regret that that was not carried out in relation to expenditure in this place.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** It was an unfortunate oversight.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Yes. Perhaps Mr Lewis can put forward further information.

**Mr Lewis:** I am not trying to defend the decisions taken by other departments, but it is important when you replace a cistern in a water closet, for example, that you ensure that it is compatible with the pan installed some years ago.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The whole unit was replaced.

**Mr Lewis:** I think it is also fair to say that in Victoria the legislation to make all new installations mandatory occurred during the severe drought of 1982-83. In any other year it would have been vigorously opposed by most man-

ufacturers. In Queensland, notably on the Gold Coast, restrictions occur very frequently, so that would be another incentive to install a dual flush cistern there.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I refer to a letter that I recently received from the Minister in relation to a number of questions that I have raised with him over a period of time relating to the transfer of irrigation water allotments in Government irrigation areas, domestic water supplies from irrigation systems, indirect services from irrigation, drainage systems, special irrigators, allocation for non-rated land, and so on. All of these things are important, and they are issues we have been chasing for quite some time. I have received numerous representations from constituents within the areas that I have described. How far off are we from a final decision?

The Minister indicated that progress has been made, and so on, but some of these things have been discussed by the department and advisory boards for two or three years. In relation to additional water connections for domestic supplies, in one area there were six dry land blocks, and five of them qualified for water connection; the sixth block had houses on it but because of the limit of half a kilometre from the main (which was an extension abutting the main back in about 1979) that sixth block was exempt from the water supply. If the policy and philosophy are based on the capacity of the main, and if the irrigation main has the capacity to supply the domestic connection without adversely affecting the supply to the irrigators, then the sooner that policy is changed the better. The same thing applies to the others that I have referred to in relation to transferring water within the Government irrigation area.

I think that is logical because we have seen instances where irrigators have not been able to continue to afford to irrigate and have actually excised their land. The argument has been put forward by one or two people that you will get dry land blocks appearing within Government irrigation areas if you allow transfer of water within the Government system. That does not stand up, because these dry land blocks are starting to appear, anyhow, as the people have excised them to get out of paying the rates. I believe that the matters raised by the Minister in his letter to me are important, and the progress is encouraging. How long will it be before we receive final answers?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I am not sure whether the honourable member gave us an exhaustive list of the contents of that letter. Although it is fairly recent, I do not recall all the details. However, I think I can give a commitment to him that we are fairly close to a resolution of most of those matters. Perhaps if we take it on notice, in the time that you, Sir, set out at the beginning of the day's session for the delivery of responses, I will commit myself to the next chapter of the letter which will contain a good deal of resolution. I think I can probably adhere to that program.

**Mr MEIER:** On page 169, reference is made to the 1986-87 specific target 'to maintain readiness by updating counter disaster plans and by undertaking simulation exercises'. That is in relation to the State disaster planning control and relief. What sort of simulation exercises are planned to be undertaken?

**Mr Lewis:** For the record, the Engineering and Water Supply Department really becomes responsible more as the State control of engineering, which coordinates all the efforts of other departments and statutory bodies like the Electricity Trust and the Highways Department to carry out necessary works following a disaster. The whole disaster program, of course, is operated by the Commissioner of Police, but I think the simulated ones which have already

occurred have been earthquake disasters and the failure of the Kangaroo Creek reservoir. They are the two main ones which have occurred as simulations for disasters, and that is run through to test out the procedures that have been put in place.

**Mr MEIER:** Relating to page 172 under 'Issues-Trends', it says:

Water filtration will have a significant impact on the standard of supply and the cost of water in metropolitan Adelaide.

I assume that the cost will increase and, if so, to what extent is it envisaged that that will happen.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We might have to take that one on notice. Obviously, we are here talking about a program which includes not only the end of the Happy Valley project but also the Myponga project which is to follow. If we look at the country services, we include also the matters in relation to which I have been cross-examined earlier in the Committee, such as that Stockwell scheme. The metropolitan scheme would have to include some sort of indication of the cost of the Myponga scheme. At this stage, I will say that we will get the information.

**Mr MEIER:** We have so many cost increases (water included) based on CPI increases, yet this indicates that we will see a greater increase than just the CPI increase. I will be interested to see the information.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is a possibility.

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

---

Works and Services—Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$65 148 000—Examination declared completed.

---

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous, \$11 000—Examination declared completed.

---

Works and Services—South-Eastern Drainage Board, \$208 000—Examination declared completed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.55 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 1 October at 11 a.m.