

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Wednesday 16 September 1987

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A****Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold  
 Mr D.S. Baker  
 Mr M.R. De Laine  
 Mr E.J. Meier  
 Mr M.D. Rann  
 Mr D.J. Robertson

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** The procedures for the Committee will be the same as those established yesterday.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I ask the Committee for some assistance about how we will organise witnesses later in the day.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am in the hands of Opposition members. Is there a prospective timetable?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** There could be one slight hitch because Mr Don Macarthur, Chairman of the CFS, is returning from Sydney this evening. Provided his plane is on time, there will be no problem. I wonder whether the Committee, out of an excess of caution, might want to change the order so that the CFS is listed last to ensure that Mr Macarthur will be here, irrespective of aeroplane schedules. Perhaps Opposition members can take up that matter with their colleagues and let me know later.

---

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous, \$162 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood, Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D.J. Alexander, Chief Executive Officer, E&amp;WS Department.

Mr A.N. Killmier, Chief Operating Officer, E&amp;WS Department.

Mr R.J. Greatrex, Acting Director, Administration and Finance, E&amp;WS Department.

Mr K.D. Gamble, Acting Manager, Financial Services, E&amp;WS Department.

Mr R.E. Mander, Senior Finance Officer, E&amp;WS Department.

Mr J.W. Bennett, Financial Analyst, E&amp;WS Department.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Normally, the lead Opposition member is given an opportunity to make an opening statement, if he so decides. He has indicated to me that he has no wish to do that and wishes to go straight into questions.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Both the Auditor-General's Report and the Estimates of Payments refer to a figure that has been included right through the various lines. I refer to the depreciation of fixed assets. Over the years comment has been made in Estimates Committees and at other times during the sittings of the House about the problem of dete-

rioration of fixed assets principally in water supply, mains, sewers, etc. We now have appearing in the Estimates of Payments for the first time a figure for depreciation of fixed assets. The Auditor-General also comments about it. Does that indicate that funds to the extent indicated in the various lines are now being set aside and that there will be a fund within Treasury, or is it purely a book entry indicating what should be set aside? Does it mean that money will be available for replacement of fixed assets (which it certainly indicates)? The reality of whether or not it will occur is critical to South Australia.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I am happy to speak about the philosophy and what we are trying to do but, to get to the basis of the figures we are talking about, I will ask Mr Greatrex to explain exactly how it is accounted for.

**Mr Greatrex:** The 1987-88 figure provided for depreciation of some \$17.5 million, which is based on an historic cost of depreciation for our total asset register. The asset register was put together for the first time in 1986-87 and Treasury agreed to an amount of depreciation that was credited to the department's debt in that year. The provision for depreciation is something new for the department and the exact accounting arrangements for 1987-88 still have to be finalised with Treasury. At this point there is a proposal that it will be credited to our debt. However, we will be negotiating with Treasury on setting up a formal provision account so that asset replacement can take place from that account in future.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** So no money has been provided: it is just a figure (which may be appropriate) on paper that has been added to the debt. Really we are no closer to finding the resources to come to grips with this problem of replacement of mains, sewers and so on than we were last year or the year before.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I think that perhaps there has been a slight misunderstanding of the honourable member's question. From the figures before me there is an amount of \$1.5 million on the recurrent lines for asset rehabilitation. That is separate from accounting for depreciation, which will in turn give a better idea in future what budgeting should take place. The honourable member quizzed me on this matter last year. I indicated that it is a general problem. I will be perfectly honest and say that I do not think that the amount set aside, which I have just indicated, is adequate, and in future we will have to do better if we are to keep a grip on the problem. It is not true to say that money has been set aside in the recurrent account, as it is something like \$1.5 million.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Auditor-General's Report at page 79 indicates that \$16 867 million was set aside in 1987 for depreciation. If we were talking about \$1.3 million, I think what is set aside for depreciation in the Estimates of Payments, as indicated by the Auditor-General, is probably fair and reasonable, and truly reflects what we ought to be setting aside if we are to come to grips with this problem. I know that this has been an ongoing problem for many years. It was brought to my attention on numerous occasions by the Director of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. That department faced that dilemma from 1979 to 1982. It appears that we have not gone anywhere down the track towards solving this problem. This is highlighted by the Auditor-General and is recognised in the estimates, that we are only providing \$1 million in an attempt to come to grips with a massive debt problem.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I will ask Mr Killmier to give some information.

**Mr Killmier:** In the past, prior to last year, the method of providing for depreciation was through a sinking fund

arrangement with Treasury. Several years ago the amount was about \$8 million, which was included in the rate setting process. That enabled us to write our debt down at the end of the year by the amount of provision made for the sinking fund. We have now changed our arrangement in line with proper accounting practices and have a proper asset register. We are depreciating assets based on their estimated life and their cost. That figure worked out in 1986-87 at \$16.9 million, which Mr Arnold mentioned. Provision has been made for \$17.5 million this year. That figure is the amount which, in proper accounting arrangements, should be set aside for depreciation. In our negotiations with Treasury we will be endeavouring to ensure that our debt is written down by that amount. We have provided for that amount in setting the rates and in declaring prices and base rates for the year.

So far as using that money, under the system of appropriation that the Westminster system uses, you cannot directly translate money from where you provided it and go on and spend it, so what happens is that money appropriated for actual expenditure; that is what estimates are about. Provision is made in the recurrent estimates for \$1.5 million for asset rehabilitation.

Money is also being provided under the capital works program, and in the estimates there is a total capital works program of \$63.8 million, of which \$9.3 million is set aside for asset replacement. There are also other items making up the capital works program. The two are not directly related: we are not in a position to directly use the depreciation that we set aside and translate it straight across into replacement works, because a provision for depreciation, of its very nature, does not mean that one necessarily spends it instantly; rather, that it is set aside for work down the track. That is what the estimate has been.

One would find, for example, that if one had a provision for superannuation or long service leave the amount being set aside would be much greater than the amount actually being spent on superannuation or long service leave at the present time, because one is providing for something that one needs to expend in years to come, but one has to do the proper accounting. I think that the Auditor-General has endorsed the accounting arrangements as being appropriate and, over time, the proper expenditure will be undertaken when it is needed.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** You indicated that \$9.3 million is being expended on replacement of existing assets, plus the approximate \$1 million that is provided, so we have between \$10 million and \$11 million going back into the area of depreciation, which is between \$16 million and \$17 million. I might be looking at this in over-simplistic terms, but are we not still going downhill? Whether it is now, in 10 years time, or the next generation, someone will have to front up to the fact of the age of the distribution mains, and there is an indication in the report that certain assets have a life of 80 years, although some vary in that area.

Sooner or later the vast percentage of the State's assets tied up with the E&WS Department will suddenly reach the end of their effective life. Whether it is this generation or the next, someone will have to suddenly pick up a massive bill. If we are not able to put back into rehabilitation or replacement the sort of figure indicated in the estimates or in the Auditor-General's Report, surely year by year we must be further running down our assets.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood:** The honourable member is quite possibly right, provided that a series of assumptions are accepted—and I would challenge one or two of those assumptions. For example, as time goes on the department keeps abreast of modern technology and the cost of various

technologies of rehabilitation. There is little doubt that, with the use of different materials and so on, some of the unit costs are declining. There is little doubt that the department is a more efficient unit than it was 10 years ago, so some of those historic costs will not necessarily be replicated in the future.

Also, we have to keep in mind that our accounting has to assume that the overall servicing requirements from the E&WS in the future will be much as they have been in the past, as dictated by the growth of Adelaide. Some of the things that I have said and announced in the last couple of weeks while wearing a different ministerial hat have been to try to head off some of those costs, to try to ensure that in the year of grace 2 000 where the department is spending money it is in replacement of worn out stock at Bowden, Brompton or Norwood or the like rather than having to put new stock in the ground in Sandy Creek, or wherever else it may be.

This year we are doing the sort of thing which buys us time to ensure that, if an upgraded effort is needed, it can take place without our having an unacceptable level of water main bursts and the like, which is one way of monitoring how rapidly the whole system is ageing. If we had time, I am sure that my officers could give information about the sorts of new technology that we are looking at—relining of pipes without their having to come out of the ground, and that sort of thing, which may considerably reduce the cost that the community has to bear in the future on asset replacement.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I draw the Committee's attention to page 131 of the Program Estimates. The general health argument for fluoridation of water supplies has a good deal of credibility at present, as it has in the past. However, in the community there is still a minority view that fluoridation has a negative effect on public health and that fluoridation of water supplies is unnecessary. For the benefit of the Committee, I would be interested to know whether the Minister believes that argument has any credence and whether there is any scientific evidence to back the minority view that fluoridation is a bad thing.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood:** I guess the question could be better directed to the Minister of Health because there is a sense in which we are not only the servants of the community in this but also the servants of the Health Commission. Obviously, fluorine in inappropriate doses can have an adverse effect on health. In too high a dose I guess it is toxic. In the sorts of doses that occur naturally (and of course there is fluorine in natural water supplies) we know that mottling of teeth can occur where the dose is higher than what is required for maintaining enamel hardeners. All I can say is that, on all the best advice we have available, the level of fluoridation which has now occurred since about 1969-70 in this State that clearly reduces radically the incidence of dental caries. There is no evidence that it has no adverse impact upon human health.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** On the following page is a reference in the 1987-88 specific targets and objectives relating to the recovery of the cost of services to recipients relating, I presume, both to water and sewers and the installation thereof. It is pretty much a parish pump issue for me in a sense because there are areas in the southern hills face zone and suburban areas such as the old subdivision of Hallett Cove Estate that still do not have an E&WS water supply.

I wonder whether the new funding arrangements that displace part of the cost of the new service onto the people whose supply comes on-stream later would lead to a commensurate lessening of the burden on the first person to take on the new service, and what effect that has had on

the installation of services in areas such as the old Hallett Cove Estate and the upper parts of Marino and, finally, whether there has been a rush for consumers in those areas to come on-line. Does the Minister think there is hope that we will be able to have all those areas sewered and connected to E&WS reticulated supplies within the next few years?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** It is a little early to say. I will ask Mr Killmier to comment on that, but as it is a fairly recent initiative there probably has not been much time for the new system to sink in.

**Mr Killmier:** The new policies have come, ironically, at a time when demand from the public has turned down quite dramatically because house building and subdivisions are down. It is difficult to say whether the downturn in applications is as a result of the new policies or whether it is caused by natural events. We suspect that it is natural events because before 30 June there were many fewer applications. I believe that it will take some time for the new processes to be fully understood and for the success or benefits of the system to be able to be measured.

It certainly was a significant change in policy. We had lived with the previous policies for a very long time. The basic constraint that both the public and the Government face is the availability of funding. People do not have the money to buy houses, the Housing Trust does not have the money to do the sorts of things it wants to do, and the State does not have the money that it might like to extend mains in uneconomic circumstances. Generally speaking, where the economics are satisfactory, mains have been extended. However, the instances where mains have not yet been extended generally arise out of the fact that the costs are much greater than one would normally expect to put them into those areas.

The Minister has numerous areas where he would dearly love to do work. For example, the hills watershed he would like to see sewered; the Aldinga area is also dear to the Minister's heart from a sewerage point of view. I am not so sure about the water supply area. Many people who do not have mains water are really on the fringes and we frequently find that when we receive requests for water from so-called uneconomic water supply schemes and have gone and asked people what they are prepared to do to help themselves and whether they are prepared to contribute towards it, they say that only a proportion or half, and not the majority, want it. Therefore, it founders. If people want these services they have to be unanimous among the group that they do want it, and it has to be economic for somebody to put the money in. If those criteria can be met I am sure that the Government will give it high priority.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** The Murray Valley Development League has been in operation for a considerable number of years, and I note an increase in the allocation of about 10 per cent this year. What occasioned the increase in funding, and to which works of the league will that funding be allocated?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** It is a general grant and it is up to the league to determine exactly how it is expended. However, we must remember that there has been a good deal of public activity in the past two years on the whole question of the Murray-Darling Basin. One of the initiatives that has come from discussions between the three States and the Commonwealth is that one of the committees, which should be virtually a standing committee will examine the whole question of public consultation between government and the community.

The Victorian Minister for Conservation, Forests and Lands, Joan Kirner, is one who has played a leading role

in ensuring that there is a proper consultative process. The Murray Valley Development League has a very important role in that consultative process. Therefore, it is believed that it will be more active this year than perhaps has been the case in the past because of the responsibilities that the league will have. Therefore, despite the tight budget, the provision of additional funds seemed not unreasonable.

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

Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$158 961 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold

Mr D.S. Baker

Mr M.R. De Laine

Mr E.J. Meier

Mr M.D. Rann

Mr D.J. Robertson

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood, Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D.J. Alexander, Chief Executive Officer, E&WS Department.

Mr A.N. Killmier, Chief Operating Officer, E&WS Department.

Mr R.J. Greatrex, Acting Director, Administration and Finance, E&WS Department.

Mr K.D. Gamble, Acting Manager, Financial Services, E&WS Department.

Mr R.E. Mander, Senior Finance Officer, E&WS Department.

Mr J.W. Bennett, Financial Analyst, E&WS Department.

**The CHAIRMAN:** This vote covers the whole area in relation to which some questions were asked under the previous vote.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Last year the depreciation allowance was \$16.5 million and this coming year it will be \$17.5 million. I note that the total indebtedness is \$877 million to Treasury and \$48 million to SAFA. Does that \$17.5 million come off the \$877 million, or has it been transferred to SAFA to come off that debt?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Apparently SAFA carries our Commonwealth debt, so in fact it would come off the \$877 million.

**Mr RANN:** Page 131 of the yellow book states that the Government plans to fluoridate country water supplies with implementation to occur gradually as resources permit. Is there a program of extension of fluoridation to country areas, and are there plans to extend to any new areas this financial year?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** At this stage I believe the only detailed plans are for the Morgan filtration plant. The South Australian Dental Service has sought information from the department about fluoridation, and believes that it is important that there is a publicity campaign before fluoridation takes place at the Morgan filtration plant. The service was advised earlier this year that the plant was ready for fluoridation and it was asked to undertake the necessary publicity campaign. So funds have been promised for the campaign, and we are looking at a commencement date of 1 December this year for fluoridation. I am not aware of any specific

decision to extend beyond that at this stage, although of course such decisions will be taken down the track.

**Mr RANN:** I refer to page 132 of the yellow book which states that due to the ageing sewerage system it is becoming difficult to maintain the present level of service and, as a result, emergency maintenance rather than preventative maintenance is increasing. Is the heavy resource allocation to Golden Grove and other new developments placing a particularly onerous burden on resources and making difficult the upgrading of existing water resources management?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** We have had to make the necessary allocations for Golden Grove. It is new work with a different budget. I suppose one could say that but for Golden Grove those funds would be available to do other works—but Golden Grove is necessary in relation to the growth of the city. It is being done under a planned arrangement—a joint venture between Government and private enterprise, and it is occurring very efficiently indeed. The costs involved are no greater than planned for and, if anything, the unit costs are probably lower than has been the case where these sorts of extensions to the metropolitan area have occurred in the past.

**Mr RANN:** I understand that changes have been made to the proposed design of the Finger Point Treatment Works. Why has it become necessary to upgrade the plant proposed to service Mount Gambier and surrounding areas?

**Mr Killmier:** Finger Point has been discussed with the Public Works Standing Committee. We submitted our proposal to that committee some time ago. Subsequently, it wanted additional information because the Woods and Forests Department had considered installing a scrimber plant at Mount Gambier, and we went back before the committee to give additional evidence. I am aware that the Public Works Committee has now reported to the House in as much as it has given an interim report indicating its support for the proposal.

We now await the committee's full report which should be forthcoming in the next month or so, following which the department will submit the project to Cabinet, through the Minister, for approval. In the meantime we will prepare timber specifications and we should be in a position to call tenders later this year with a view to commencing work by contract in around December or January. However, one wild card in the exercise is that we have allocated about \$39 000 for work to be done by the Aboriginal Heritage Branch of the Department for the Environment because of the need to examine the area thoroughly before construction to ensure that there are no Aboriginal relics within the area.

**Mr MEIER:** My first question relates to the user pays principle and the fact that country residents must now pay \$1 200 for the extension of a water service to a town block, and the fact that they must pay between \$350 and \$450 for a temporary service if it is not possible to provide a service straight away. Concern has been expressed that this is unfair on country residents considering that the value of land in the country is significantly less than land in the city. I refer to one example in my area where the land was valued at \$500 by the council. The owner of the land has been offered \$1 000, but the potential purchasers have been put off completely because, if they purchased it for \$1 000, it would cost them another \$1 200 and perhaps an additional \$350 on top of that, making the cost of the land more than double its actual worth. Could the Minister seek to address that inequity between city and country land in future E&WS charges.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** There have been arguments about the system of charging for water services generally in

this State and other States for a long long time, but I do not know whether anybody has come up with the ideal solution to that problem. There is a component of taxation in the rating system, if you like, because any rating system based on land valuation seeks to come to grips somehow with the concept of capacity to pay. On the other hand, there is also the concept of just charging for what is used, because when a person gets into excess water usage they are paying for the water that they use.

The question is whether some sort of system like that should apply to installations, or whether payment for installation should in some way reflect or indeed cover the actual costs of the installation. I think that everybody understands why it is right and proper that the E&WS should lose money on its country operations, and it is not unreasonable for returns from city ratepayers to somehow make good that loss. If one examines last year's outcome one sees that that is largely how it occurred. The question is what the extent of that cross subsidisation really should be. In adopting the policy that we have adopted we believe that we have probably not been unreasonable in the way we have gone about it. I am prepared to examine further the specifics of the matter that the honourable member has put before me to ascertain how we can take that into account in any further consideration that we give to our taxing and charging system for water.

**Mr MEIER:** I have another question related to the block of land I used as an example. It was discovered when the application was made for the water supply to be connected that the people had actually been charged water rates for that block going back to 1970. When an approach was made to the E&WS they were told, 'You will be entitled to some reimbursement.' On taking the matter further they found that they were entitled to reimbursement back to only 1981. They said, 'Hang on, we have been paying rates on this since 1970.' The E&WS said, 'Your fault, not ours; sorry, we will only reimburse for six years.' Is that departmental policy, or did someone misinform them?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** If the honourable member gives me the full details, I will take the matter up.

**Mr MEIER:** A comment appears on page 133 of the Program Estimates in relation to specific targets for 1987-88 that they will continue working to alleviate flooding of the sewerage system at Millicent. More importantly, on page 138 of the Program Estimates, when referring to amendments to the Water Resources Act, it states the Minister of Water Resources may now prepare or adopt flood plain maps for streams flowing through local council areas. My question is two-pronged; first, does the E&WS Department experience problems with flooding in residential areas, both city and country? The Minister may wish to comment on that. Secondly, what is the E&WS Department doing to ensure that new subdivisions do not proceed in flood plain areas? It seems that they are now allowed to proceed.

I am thinking particularly of a development on the Adelaide Plains in the area west of Gawler through to Two Wells that has been identified. I think that the Minister, as Minister for Environment and Planning, has seen plans relating to the flooding of that area, yet it appears that there is every likelihood that major development will continue in that area although flooding is likely to occur. Does the Minister have a policy in relation to this matter, and has the Government considered future moves to stop indiscriminate development where it might lead to massive problems?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The maps to which the honourable member refers are being produced; indeed, I approved the first half dozen, I think it was, yesterday. Perhaps not surprisingly, in view of publicity about a par-

ticular incident not long ago, those maps relate to the hills and the Mount Barker area. They set out the probable extent of a 25-year, 50-year, and 100-year flood event. How do we use that information? Now that information is available to us (or will be once the whole mapping program is complete) we will use it through the planning system. Where there is a proposition for subdivision, it is necessary for the council, or in most cases the Chairman of the South Australian Planning Commission, to get the view of the chief executive officer of the E&WS Department before giving approval.

In those circumstances, we would simply make the maps available and would recommend in extreme circumstances that a subdivision not proceed. I can imagine circumstances where approval might still be given. In that case, the only other thing that we could do would be simply to say that we would not think it right and proper that we service the subdivision. I have not had that proposition put specifically to me, because the matter has not arisen, but the technology has been available for some time, and maps of the western suburbs were prepared when work was being done by the Public Works Standing Committee on the River Torrens Improvement Scheme. That set out the area that would be inundated by a 100-year, 200-year or 500-year flood, and that was taken into account in relation to the work done on the Torrens River improvement. The maps will be made available to decision makers in any application for subdivision.

**Mr MEIER:** At page 142 of the Program Estimates, and in relation to the 1987-88 specific targets/objectives, there is comment that there will be moves to further develop management plans for ground water resources of the northern Adelaide plains, the Angas-Bremmer Rivers regions, the Murray-Mallee and the Upper South-East. What exactly is that further development of the management plans for those areas? I am reasonably familiar with the Adelaide Plains Underground Water Scheme, and am well aware that there are possibly some inequities that need to be addressed. Does the development mean that there will be another reassessment of allocation of water allowances, or whatever?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I will ask Mr Alexander to answer that question.

**Mr Alexander:** It is part of an ongoing review of underground resources to ensure that the basins remain viable. We do these investigations through our Water Resources Branch, the Water Resources Council, and various advisory committees involving local people as much as possible in self managing their resources. It is an ongoing process and could lead to revision of allocations, but that would be very much discussed with the local advisory committee.

**Mr MEIER:** It does specifically state 'to further develop management plans'. As I was given the impression that there would be some redevelopment there, is that misinformation?

**Mr Alexander:** It is an ongoing process. As we learn more and more about the basins and how they operate we modify the general management scene.

**Mr MEIER:** So we cannot expect any real change to the situation that has applied for the past two or three years?

**Mr Alexander:** I expect not; it is an incremental process.

**Mr De LAINE:** Can the Minister explain what is meant by the statement on page 62 'Contribution to the Australian Welding Research Association'?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I do not know much about this organisation—it is no doubt an excellent one. Of course, we are involved with welding all the time and therefore believe that we should help to pay the costs of research into better technology, so this is our small contribution towards that. From time to time, when problems occur with metal

piping, it is often the weld that has been the problem, so the better the technology available the happier we are.

**Mr De LAINE:** Are there any plans to further upgrade the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works in the near future? You, Sir, would know that \$3.5 million has been spent on the facility in the past eight years. This affects the constituents of Price and, to a greater extent, those of my colleague the member for Albert Park. How many complaints have been reported in the past 12 months in relation to smell, and can general information in relation to what has been done and what will be done to this facility be supplied to the electors of Albert Park and Price?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I am happy to provide that information, not all of which is immediately available to me, nor is the actual incidence of complaints. Basically, we are planning for the establishment of a permanent oxygen injection system into both the Port Adelaide and Ethelton rising mains. This is an effective means of reducing the sulphides in the raw sewage which, in turn, would lead to some of the complaints to which the honourable member refers. Three other rising mains will also be involved in this, and we believe that that will reduce odour emission from the works.

In addition, we will continue to operate the specific odour control facilities which have previously been installed in the works, that is, the one which involves foul air collection and treatment, the waste gas burner and the prechlorination of the raw sewage, in all of the rising mains which discharge to the plant. The actual capital allocation involves minor works replacement of air pressure; the Dortmund tanks desludge; I have already referred to the oxygen injection; a replacement of some return sludge pipework; and a valve replacement program. So, one is looking at a total allocation of about \$1.36 million.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am not sure how much of that material will go into *Hansard* or whether it goes directly to the members, but we have a deadline of 2 October for material for *Hansard*.

**Mr De LAINE:** Are there any long-term plans to relocate Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** No, there are not.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Page 9 of the Auditor-General's Report refers to Commonwealth Government payments for special purposes, and goes on to say that the June 1987 balance included \$17.1 million for Adelaide water treatment, the majority of which will be transferred to Consolidated Account during 1987-88. Perhaps the Minister could explain exactly what that means. Is there a transfer away from the water filtration program of \$17.1 million?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** My understanding is that, with the exception of one or two smaller programs like COWSIP, all the Federal funds we get go into the water filtration program which is, of course, proceeding at Happy Valley. I will ask Mr Greatrex to explain how the money actually flows.

**Mr Greatrex:** Federal funding normally flows through the Federal water resources assistance program to South Australia. However, over two or three years special Federal grants have been made to South Australia for additional assistance. I understand that this particular item is one of those amounts, and the moneys were transferred straight to Consolidated Account in South Australia which, in essence, offset the budget provisions for the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** You are clearly stating that that \$17.1 million has not been transferred to Consolidated Account for other purposes: it is still committed to the water filtration program?

**Mr Greatrex:** That is correct.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister would well recall a deputation with which I was involved some 18 months or two years ago from the Riverland Local Government Association in relation to the association's wanting the Government to look again at the flood zone of the Murray River, as far as the blanket restriction on development was concerned. That was then taken up by all of the councils, and a meeting was held here at Parliament House which the Minister orchestrated with the members concerned and the clerks or administrative officers of the councils involved. I believe that they are about to present a paper to the Government in relation to that project.

From the Government's point of view, has there been any progress as far as the department itself is concerned on the blanket restrictions which have applied virtually since the 1956 flood, where everything from town development to the classification of shacks and so forth has very much revolved around that 1956 flood level, or is the Government just waiting to consider the paper that will be put forward by the councils?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This has been handled in detail by my officers in the Department of Environment and Planning. Obviously, there has been a strong input from the officers who are here today, but what we are looking to is a supplementary development plan and other policies which, typically, flow from the environment and planning area rather than from the E&WS Department, the E&WS Department being used as technical advisers in this matter. I understand that the final decision will relent a little from the strict adherence to the 1956 flood level to the extent of trying to be a little more realistic about what is actually there on the ground and the actual pattern of landholding, and so on.

I think that we are fairly close to going public again as to what is intended, and I am quite happy even at this stage to consider any further submissions that are placed before me. Our feeling is that to go back to a line like, say, the 1974 flood level would perhaps just take the brakes off too much, but it is also conceded that having any particular flood level line as the basis for planning decisions is probably not a sensible way to go.

So, we are looking at cadastral boundaries and that sort of thing as a more realistic way of going, with the 1956 flood line or something near to it still being the general policy objective. Probably, the result will be that some areas which currently cannot be developed could be opened up to a development as a result of the review of policy.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** What percentage of the E&WS accounts for water rates and sewerage rates have to be adjusted as a result of appeals against valuations? I have here an example of a person who had a valuation on her property in 1985 of \$74 000. In 1986 it was \$126 000 and in 1987 it was \$150 000. She claims that there is no way on earth that she can get that sort of figure if she puts it on the market, but she also makes the point that the allocation of water that she now gets in the rate she is forced to pay because of that valuation, instead of actually coming down as has been the policy of the Government for some time, is significantly going up because the escalation in the rate valuation is so dramatic.

So, what percentage of accounts have to be adjusted because of people appealing, and how much of a windfall is the department getting in increased rates due to the fact that a large percentage of people in the community will not get around to appealing against their valuations and, consequently, pay significantly higher rates than they would otherwise pay by right?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It will be necessary to get the specific figure for the honourable member, and I will undertake to do that. In the meantime, Mr Killmier may be able to assist the Committee as to the way in which we handle these things.

**Mr Killmier:** Of course, we use the Valuer-General's assessment, which is varied every year, and the opportunity exists for people to appeal against their assessment. Generally speaking, by the time the water rate accounts are sent out most of the appeals have been dealt with, so the number of accounts that have to be adjusted subsequent to the account first going out is quite minimal. We can get the information. If the Valuer-General on appeal agrees to a change of value, obviously, the accounts that are rendered by the E&WS Department are amended, as is the allocation of water that people are allowed to use. It is not a large problem and property values have now levelled off. I recall reading in the Valuer-General's Report of 1985-86 that the proportion of appeals was quite low. They are dealt with on a regional basis these days and so are dealt with relatively promptly. We will get the figures.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** My concern is that it is one thing for a person in business who is actively involved in paper work every day to make an appeal as a matter of course if they believe that the figure is not appropriate for their property, but a large percentage of people in the community just accept a valuation. In many instances one could have people paying rates 20 per cent and 30 per cent higher than was anticipated. Certainly, they have the right to appeal, but unless the valuations are near the mark many people will just pay the account by default.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The other thing that we must remember, apart from the point Mr Killmier has made about annual revaluations that we can now take into account, is that for the most part the valuations are usually on the conservative side. I cannot say that that is always the case. There may be any number of exceptions that the honourable member can pluck out of the hat but, if one asks most urban dwellers whether they can get more on the open market than the valuation indicates for their property, they would probably say that they could. I cannot deny that perhaps an element of what the honourable member says happens, despite the annual review of the valuation but, for the most part, one is usually operating off a valuation that is on the conservative side anyway.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** They are not an 'on the ground' inspection.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is so.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Returning to program 2, page 132, one of the things arising out of waste disposal, and sewerage in particular, is that methane is a natural concomitant of the processes used to dispose of human effluent. I know that in at least three treatment plants on Adelaide's foreshore reasonably large amounts of methane are generated and fed back into the system per medium of generating electricity to run the pumps and/or are fed back into the ETSA grid if there happens to be surplus methane available. What is the overall effect of that as a method of cost recovery, given that the resource is there anyway? How much money does the department save in the course of a year by generating electricity from methane and offsetting the cost of power generated against the cost of ETSA power?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will have to get that information for the honourable member. It is an important consideration, but we do not have the specific amount with us. We will undertake to get that. Incidentally, the one plant which does not so use the methane but which flares it is the plant in the honourable member's electorate.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** My second question relates to program 2 in connection with waste water disposal. The Minister would be aware of a program running in Alice Springs under which treated effluent water is sold, given or otherwise used by a person who runs a eucalypt plantation to provide primarily for an urban wood lot for Alice Springs. Has the department considered selling treated effluent in that way to people, particularly those surrounding the Bolivar treatment works, where there are considerable open spaces? Would it be worth investigating the economics of selling the water to private individuals who might wish to run wood lots in the way that the Alice Springs operation works?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We can give one instance of the use of effluent for wood lotting, but I will ask the Chief Executive Officer to address himself to the question. It does not directly involve the department at this stage.

**Mr Alexander:** It involves a council on the river using material from the common effluent system. There are a number of propositions for the reuse of effluent water on the Northern Plains, as you are aware. It is on a basis of 'come and get it'. Some growers actually pump the effluent water on. There has been more interest on the Northern Adelaide Plains for wood lotting and I guess it is a matter of the department's attitude, which is, 'Here it is at Bolivar—come and get it.' There is no specific proposition for wood lotting at this stage.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** My third question relates to program 4, at page 134. I refer to the preamble of broad objectives relating to the disposal of toxic waste. I wonder whether technology that has been developed in the United States in recent months using triethylamine as an organic solvent for wastes that appear in oil sludges has been investigated for use in South Australia bearing in mind that some of the wastes handled by the E&WS Department are oil sludges with inorganic toxic wastes dissolved in them. Has consideration been given to the use of triethylamine or similar organic solvents to precipitate out the inorganic pollutants and even recover the oil from the sludge?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I would be very surprised if our people at Bolivar, in the State Water Laboratories, are not aware of what is happening in the United States. I am not aware of any specific proposition for replicating it here. It is something which, perhaps as much as anything, is in the lap of the Waste Management Commission to whom we would act as technical advisers, but I will try to get more specific information for the Committee.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I refer to page 142 of the Program Estimates and the following comment:

Develop policies and management plans for the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed, the South-East . . .

There have been some management initiatives in the South-East that have caused considerable concern recently. One is the joint border agreement with Victoria, which operates within 10 kilometres on each side. The concern arises because it just happens that all the country that is suitable for irrigation is on the south-eastern side, and on the Victorian side the country is not suitable for irrigation. We have entered into an agreement that we share equally the water resources or the amount of water that can be taken out of that resource. I would like to know whether a copy of that agreement can be tabled, who negotiated it, and on what basis they negotiated the agreement.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am sure that we can make that information available. Does the honourable member want any further information?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** If we can have that, because on the basis on which the agreement was made it certainly disadvantages South Australia.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** What is the Government's policy in the administration of penalties applying to people who divert water from a common resource? I am referring to the Murray River and to an irrigator who has land within the Renmark Irrigation Trust area, within the Department of Lands, and a private irrigation diversion licence all from the same source. That person had to pay a penalty of \$10 000 in round figures to the department for exceeding his allocation on two of those metered outlets, yet his total allocation of water from the Murray River (and we are talking about one common resource) was 411 000 kilolitres.

At the time that he was charged and had to pay a penalty of \$10 000 his total consumption for the year from the Murray River was 387 000 kilolitres which left him with better than 23 000 kilolitres of his allocation of water that he was licensed to divert from the river. At the time he was bankrupt, and to have that bankruptcy discharged he had to pay the E&WS Department \$10 000 in penalty for water that he was licensed to take. Although he used some of the allocation in excess through certain meters, it is a common resource pool of water and he is licensed to take considerably more from the river. In the year in question he still had a credit of 23 000 kilolitres but was fined \$10 000 at a time when he was bankrupt.

**Mr Killmier:** You are talking about Mr Belheris?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Yes.

**Mr Killmier:** I put a lot of time into this matter: his daughter and son came to see me and I undertook to research it very thoroughly. The year he used in excess of his entitlement in the private area (and he had not done that previously) for some reason he chose to put in a lot of vegetables, from memory, and he used a great deal of water without consultation as to what that might mean. Of course, he was subject to penalty as a result. The difficulty we face is that while the Murray River is a common resource for both Government irrigation areas and private divertees, the capacity of the systems limits the ability to deliver that water to individual irrigators.

The policies presently in place are such that the allocations are based on the capacity of the systems to provide the water to the various irrigators. If we were to remove all restrictions so that people could use the water where they wanted to year by year, depending on crops and circumstances, in some Government irrigation areas excess demands would quite probably be placed on the system and some people who did not have irrigation in a number of places but only had the one property in one Government area would be severely disadvantaged. Mr Belheris was fully aware, I believe, of the rules, and he knew the entitlement in both the Government and private areas. He chose to go about it the way he did and he has been billed accordingly.

I specifically undertook, when I talked to his family, to go back and personally review all the circumstances irrespective of what may have been said by anybody along the way. Chaffey is an example of a system that is overloaded, where people plant more than the system will handle. If we were to totally deregulate and permit people to use whatever quantity they wanted where they wanted, there would be numerous places with excessive demands and the people who would suffer from that would be those who only have the one block, and they would be disadvantaged by the bigger users who may choose to use their water in one place this year and another place next year.

We have advised the gentleman concerned that we do not believe that there is any redress available to him. He

knew the rules at the time and the rules are not capable of being changed because they are basically dictated by the capacity of the various systems. Therefore, there is no real way of solving his problem.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I am not arguing about the penalties laid down in regulations for using in excess of the allocation of water from the Murray River. People using in excess of what they are licensed to divert are obviously disadvantaging someone else in the river system. I have no argument with that whatsoever. However, we are here talking about rules within the department which suddenly puts a penalty of \$10 000 on a person. To the best of my knowledge no regulation does that. The regulations clearly set out the penalties and the multiplier effect of those penalties depending on by how much one exceeds one's allocation. However, here we have an example of where a person was 23 000 kilolitres within his allocation of water.

If a problem is created and if objections have been lodged by other irrigators within a Government or private irrigation system that there have been disadvantages, that is another issue and it has to be dealt with. However, here we are using the penalties laid down by regulation for another purpose altogether and I do not believe that those regulations are there for that purpose. They were clearly set out in the first place to make sure that people stuck rigidly within the allocation of water that they were allocated. I believe that what has occurred in this instance is an abuse of the regulation or a requirement under the water resources legislation in South Australia to try to control another problem that could get out of hand. However, to turn around and penalise that person \$10 000 is completely out of the question when that person has not used in excess of his allocation. It comes back to Government policy on how one implements these regulations.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I undertake to obtain a specific report for the honourable member on this matter. As I understand Mr Killmier's explanation, he is saying that there are two problems to be addressed: first, the limited amount of water in the river; and, secondly, the limited capacity of the various distribution systems. The second matter had to be addressed in this particular case. As to the application of regulation, I will have that checked out. If necessary, I will ask Crown Law to give me advice on it because I do not want the Government to be put in a situation where it had unfairly or inappropriately used a particular regulation. All I am trying to do is indicate the justification for why things were done the way they were done in this instance. The honourable member is questioning them and I will take that matter further.

**Mr RANN:** In relation to page 134 and the line concerning 'Waste water management', what progress has been made towards a polluter pays objective? Has there been any tightening of the criteria adopted to exempt a significant polluter from a full polluter pays policy?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Can we have further clarification on this? Are there any specific circumstances in mind?

**Mr RANN:** The book states that there was a move towards a polluter pays principle. I wondered whether there was any change in the criteria. I know that there have been exemptions for significant polluters and I wondered whether in that mood there has been a tightening of the process.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The answer is, 'Not at this stage.' However, the honourable member would probably be aware that one of my other departments, the Department of Environment and Planning, is working with the E&WS Department towards a rather more comprehensive piece of legislation on marine pollution. That will almost certainly have to take up the whole question of land-based discharges

into the marine environment. I expect that, once that program is a little closer to fruition, I will have something more interesting to say. Mr Killmier will comment in relation to improper waste water disposal.

**Mr Killmier:** Several recent developments have involved cooperation between the department and the polluter, or the waste disposal company, and one of those companies is G.H. Michell & Sons, which disposes of large quantities through the sewers. It also had to tanker to the Bolivar plant a lot of waste that could not go down the sewer. The company has been able to install equipment within its plant to neutralise the wastes such that it will receive a pay back within three or four years for the costs of having to tanker, and so on. The company can put the resultant wastes down the sewer with no detriment to the sewer.

We are looking at a couple of other similar examples whereby consultation between a private company and a department has resulted in improvement of the profitability of the private company at the same time, enabling the sewerage system to be used as the final means of disposal rather than, as was previously the case, tankering out wastes to Bolivar where there was a resultant disposal problem. That problem was ongoing, and the Waste Management Commission had to decide what to do about it. If pre-treatment arrangements can be properly placed within the company's area so that companies can dispose of waste down the sewer, it is to everyone's good.

**Mr RANN:** How successful was the field trial conducted in 1986-87 to treat waste water from the Barossa Valley wineries?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** We will have to provide that information.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Once again, this is an area of policy. I take it that the base water allocation for people at Marla is supplied at the same rate as everyone else in South Australia. I understand that, according to an agreement that people must sign with the E&WS Department, they receive 135 kilolitres of water at that rate but the excess or additional water is charged at \$1.37. The people at Marla point out that an allocation of 135 kilolitres of water in a place like Marla would last about two months if they endeavoured to grow any sort of garden, even considering the requirements laid down that there must be drip irrigation or hand watering. Why has Marla been singled out for this excessively high cost? I appreciate that water supply in most country areas in South Australia is subsidised to varying degrees, depending on the location and the number of consumers, but a charge of \$1.37 for additional water would make it very expensive for any private individual living in Marla to maintain a reasonable living standard.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I am not too sure that it can be said that Marla has been singled out. I think we could give instances, such as places like Yunta, which are not significantly less arid than Marla where a similar policy applies.

**Mr Killmier:** From my memory of Marla, I believe that a water conservation study was undertaken prior to the town being erected to ensure that there was a fair compromise between availability of water, the cost of providing water and possible usage. A decision was taken to charge what are, on the figures quoted, double rates. I understand there are other instances where we charge four times normal rates. In those cases it is much more expensive to cart water. At Yunta and in some other towns we actually have to pump water to Peterborough, put it on the train and take it up there. There are good reasons for discouraging excess usage. In fact, we have found that, in those northern areas, notwithstanding the charges (and initially they were not metered) and the agreements that people had signed, they



were using water for other than in-house purposes, so much so that the Government subsidy was becoming excessive. The conservation studies showed that at Marla there was a need for a loading to ensure that the Government subsidy was not unnecessarily generous.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Since many of the residents in towns like Marla are Government employees and the Government would pick up the tab for that water consumption, whatever Government facility might be involved, there would be two distinct classes of citizen in any remote area—those who work for the Government and those who are self-employed or who work for someone else and have to pick up the tab. That is my concern. As soon as the area is metered and the charges come through, I would be interested to see the cost to the Government of Government instrumentalities in that area compared with what a private individual would have to pay to achieve a like situation.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** We can supply that information.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Again, I refer to a matter of policy. What is the Government's present position in relation to payment of overdue or outstanding E&WS accounts? I appreciate that for a considerable time the Government has had a policy whereby people must approach their banking facility and arrange finance from that source. I believe there is still an arrangement with some people who have not been able to secure bank finance to meet their account whereby payment is made on an instalment basis. I would like the Government's present policy in relation to payment of overdue accounts clearly set out.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Is the honourable member suggesting that there has been a change?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I understand that the Government enters into agreement with some people regarding payment of overdue accounts but that does not apply to others. Is a clear policy set out and can the Minister put it on the record so that we know exactly what is the Government's present policy?

**Mr Killmier:** We do not have that to hand, but I can explain it. We can write to the honourable member.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I would like a brief explanation now if the Government has a paper on this matter.

**Mr Killmier:** I presume that the honourable member is referring to irrigation.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Not necessarily. I am more involved in irrigation than anything else, but in other areas people find themselves with outstanding accounts.

**Mr Killmier:** In the non-irrigation area under the Waterworks Act, people are supplied under that Act. The policies have not changed for many a long day. Quarterly accounts are rendered, people are given reminder notices and restriction notices and, in due course, if it is over a certain sum, they may be approached with regard to some form of restriction. In fact, some properties are restricted and a fee must be paid before the service is restored, but that is only a last resort and the proportion of instances where that occurs is very small. Persons who believe that they are not in a position to pay an account should make an approach, indicate their problem, and ask for a reasonable arrangement. If they do that, invariably a compromise can be sorted out.

The problem in the irrigation areas relates to the fact that for a number of years the department allowed some irrigators to not pay their accounts, and some very large sums of money built up in arrears—so much so that it reached a point where these people were working on an arrangement where they would only pay for the water that they were using and were not attempting to pay off their large arrears debt. So, people were asked to catch up their arrears built up over a number of years, and in some instances it was

three to five years or even more. Clearly, the opportunity was there for people to come to an arrangement with the department. For about four years I personally dealt with those people and invited them to sort out their affairs rather than ignoring the situation and letting the matter become worse. Eventually we reached a point where most problems have been sorted out.

This responsibility is now being handed back to the regional offices at Berri and Murray Bridge, which can still enter into agreements with individuals if they come forward and indicate that they have a problem and they would like to make an arrangement. Of course there are always those who do not wish to make an arrangement and prefer to let things slide, and in those cases it is necessary from time to time to indicate to them that no more water will be supplied until they come to an arrangement. So at any one time there are several properties where the availability of water has been withdrawn. The policies now in place went before the advisory committees and were endorsed. In fact, the advisory committees in these areas were somewhat more aggressive than the department in that they argued that, if they were paying their accounts on time, they were not happy for some individuals not to pay, and they did not really want to know about their problems. I think the department has been careful to ensure that all people are given an opportunity to state their case.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** So it is open for negotiation?

**Mr Killmier:** It has always been open for negotiation.

**Mr De LAINE:** I refer to program 15 and apprentice training where I note that there will be a reduced intake of apprentices by the E&WS Department for 1987-88. Will it continue to be departmental policy to terminate employment on completion of the apprenticeship training period?

**Mr Alexander:** As our general workload scales down—and the Minister explained earlier that there is a lessening in demand for our new services—we will certainly take on less apprentices. Over the past few years we have not guaranteed positions to graduating apprentices. There will be a gradual decline as the workload declines.

**Mr De LAINE:** The metropolitan water filtration program is continuing with the ongoing work on the Happy Valley plant. What is the location for the next water filtration plant, and when will it commence?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The next water filtration plant will be at Myponga Reservoir, which services the residual of the Adelaide metropolitan area that is not filtered or will be filtered under the Happy Valley system. We are not able with the resources available to begin that prior to the substantial completion of the Happy Valley project. So that project will not begin until 1990-91 or 1991-92. It is much smaller than the Happy Valley scheme which, as the honourable member would probably know, services about 40 per cent of the Adelaide metropolitan area. We are looking at about \$28.1 million for the Myponga plant. Plans and designs are also available for the Stockwell water filtration plant, but at this stage I cannot give a definite date for its commencement.

**Mr De LAINE:** In view of the recent flooding of homes at Mount Barker, what specific measures will be taken to overcome the problem and when will work be completed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I have already in part addressed myself to that question in a previous answer. Flooding maps are now being prepared, and there is an allocation in this budget for that work. Those maps will be available to planning authorities when an application for subdivision comes before them.

**Mr MEIER:** I am aware, having received a notice in my last E&WS account, that the department will take stricter

action in respect of people who allow stormwater to pass down effluent systems in country areas. How will this be policed: will extra staff be put on specifically to police this or will existing staff in E&WS offices be used to detect breaches?

**Mr Killmier:** Are you referring specifically to country areas?

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, I presume that all country residents received a similar notice about a week ago.

**Mr Killmier:** I have not seen that notice. We have had this problem particularly in the Hills area—for example, Coromandel Valley—where the flooding of sewers was particularly bad over the past two winters and arose from people using the sewers as stormwater drains. We redirected some of our sewer inspection people towards the smoke testing of properties to detect this practice. Smoke testing is done because quite often the pipes are underground and paved over. When we locate breaches we issue notices under the Sewerage Act for people to desist so that we do not have bad floodings during high rainfall periods. So there is an ongoing program to identify this practice in the metropolitan area and in the country where there is flooding and it can be assessed based on what one would expect the normal flow to be.

Where there appears to be a problem we do an inspection and issue notices in an attempt to rectify the situation. The blanket issuing of notices with the accounts is an attempt to, first, educate people that they should not do it and, secondly, that they should stop doing it rather than the department having to detect this practice and issue individual notices.

**Mr MEIER:** Is the present fine for running storm water into the effluent system the \$1 000 which is mentioned in the pamphlet?

**Mr Killmier:** If it is mentioned in a pamphlet, that is what it would be.

**Mr MEIER:** On 8 April I drew the Minister's attention to an article by Mr John Laurent in *Habitat Australia* in which he is reported as saying, among other things:

Perhaps the most devastating effect of sewage pollution on marine life in Australia has been that witnessed at Gulf St Vincent in South Australia. Gulf St Vincent received a large quantity of Adelaide's sewage via treatment plants at Glenelg and Bolivar. This has proved disastrous not only to the gulf's once luxuriant seagrass meadows, but also to the fishing, crabbing, and abalone industries.

There is little doubt that the decimation observed has been almost entirely due to sewage.

Then, later:

The South Australian Engineering and Water Supply Department which is responsible for sewage disposal . . . has consistently denied that sewage is responsible for these problems. The department maintained that the harmful effects can be attributed to storm water . . .

In his answer the Minister dealt with the various points made by Mr Laurent about the effect of sewage effluent on fishing, crabbing and abalone, as follows:

There is no evidence that effluent has adversely affected scale fish, crab, or abalone fisheries.

*Patriella brevispina* numbers: there is evidence of localised increases in the numbers of *Patriella* (Purple Seastar) following seagrass degradation.

With respect to *Ulva* growth the Minister said, 'As the effluent contaminated water moves south on the ebb tide, it will be pushed offshore . . .' In other words, the Minister indicated that it will be pushed out to sea. The Minister continued:

. . . the Engineering and Water Supply Department is continuing detailed studies on the influence of sewage effluent on the gulf . . .

I was not a 100 per cent happy with that answer, as there are many questions unanswered. I believe a comparison of aerial photographs of the area where Bolivar discharges into the sea, which were taken over a period of years, indicate that things have changed, and that the effluent must be the reason for that. Obviously, studying the effect on fish life, etc., would seem to be a rational approach. Are there continuing studies in this area? How detailed will they be? Will the Minister be handing down a report on this matter?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The studies are directed toward the preparation of the marine pollution legislation to which I addressed myself a little while ago. There is no single report to which I can point at this stage, but much work is being done by the E&WS Department, the Department of Environment and Planning, and the Department of Fisheries. At this stage we want to stick to our guns along the lines that I indicated to the honourable member. However, I must say that much of the information available to me was obtained from reports collated in the 1970s. There is a good deal more information that we are now collecting which, of course, may lead us to change our conclusions.

The change that has occurred in land-based discharges in the past 100 years is not merely related to the running of treated effluent into the gulf as a result of E&WS facilities, as there is also a good deal of land-based discharge, which involves a lot of water which was once impounded in the western suburbs but now gets into the gulf very quickly: therefore, there is the abrasive action of that discharge of ordinary water. That, in turn, carries with it various forms of metal pollutants, which are collected and which tend to aggregate in places such as the Patawalonga and the West Lakes waterway and which cannot be ignored. Nor can we ignore the almost certain reduction in beach profile that has occurred because of the removal of the dune system from most of the Adelaide foreshore.

Wearing my other ministerial hat, I must say that I am not trying to defend anybody or anything: we have to get to the truth of this matter and we have to take the steps necessary to ensure that there is minimal further degradation of seagrasses and, if possible, that some natural rehabilitation will take place. Studies so far available to us indicate that the alarmist statements that gentleman made are not well founded and, if he has a basis of information from which he drew his conclusion and which is not available to us, I wish that he would make it available to us.

**Mr MEIER:** Are the COWSIP schemes continuing?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Yes. We have appropriated funds under the 1-3 arrangement with the Commonwealth for the Blanchetown COWSIP scheme. I do not know whether the officers have details of anything further down the track.

**Mr Killmier:** We are conducting negotiations with several councils for COWSIP receipts. Offers were made to some and indications have been received from several including the district councils of Dudley, Penneshaw, and Lacedpede at Kingston, and there are possibilities in respect to the Port Vincent council. We are trying to encourage local government to contribute up to one-third, the State a third, and the Commonwealth under COWSIP will contribute a third of the money required. A successful scheme has been completed at Mount Compass, and the scheme at Blanchetown looks like being every bit as successful. We are well down the track as all mains have been laid and we are about to build the tank and pumps. Provided we can reach agreement with other local government bodies along the lines that I have mentioned, there is no reason why COWSIP should not be an ongoing program. It has been well supported by the Commonwealth Government. The problem is not a lack

of Federal funding but the ability of the State and local government to provide their share of ongoing funding.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I will now allow the member for Flinders to ask his questions, as he has been waiting patiently for an hour and a half.

**Mr BLACKER:** My questions relate to uneconomic country water schemes. I appreciate that funds cannot be supplied for uneconomic schemes as they were some years ago. However, I am concerned about the way in which some private schemes are developing. Schemes of 25-50 kilometres in length are being arranged privately. Regrettably, not every landholder has the finance to enter such schemes, so they are bypassed leaving their farm isolated. I believe another scheme is proposed and that the farmers proposing it are making provision for excessive capacity so that farms being bypassed will be able to be connected later. That is common sense, but additional funding is required for that purpose. Is there a means or provision whereby Government departments may use the old uneconomic scheme allocation for funding a scheme such as this? I appreciate that this is a new idea, and whether such a program could be put together, I do not know.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We can examine that matter. However, there is no provision for it in this budget. We have been hoping that some of the uneconomic schemes that have not been possible and have been on the drawing board can be picked up under the COWSIP arrangement.

**Mr BLACKER:** I can see a problem with totally private schemes where farms are isolated, but where a farmer might later be in a financial position to enter into that scheme. Is any provision being made in the planning of the country sewerage program for a treatment works at Port Lincoln? I ask that with some concern because of the tourist development that is occurring and the fact that there is no treatment works at Port Lincoln. Because of the location, the problem will obviously get worse and a scheme ultimately will be necessary.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will look at that. There is no provision in these estimates for that, but we will take it up and get a report for the honourable member.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I refer to program 8, page 138. This overlaps with the planning portfolio, and I apologise for that. I refer to the sort of statement of intent that is now fairly common in supplementary development plans. Marion is one council that has in its supplementary development plan guidelines a sort of motherhood statement about concrete creeks, saying basically that there shall be no more concrete creeks of the type we have developed in Sturt Creek. I note that with approval, and I also note with approval the work done by Campbelltown council and others in the head waters of Fourth Creek and Fifth Creek of the Torrens to restore the banks of those creeks to their semi-original form, at least, and to somehow marry together the dual objectives of conservation and flood mitigation.

I ask as a general question simply as how compatible the Minister regards those two goals of conservation and flood mitigation, and whether the department rates the value of conservation, as enunciated in program 8, as highly as it rates the objective of flood mitigation.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I suppose that the test is the River Torrens, and the effect of what has happened along the Torrens in recent years and the moneys that have been spent have certainly not been conservation in the strictest sense of the term, but what we seem to have been able to achieve there is, nonetheless, the maintenance of a very pleasant environment while at the same time considerably reducing the danger of the impact of a 500 year or 200 year flood on the western suburbs of Adelaide.

Certainly, we have been able to do very much better than a concrete lining of the River Torrens, although it is not, strictly speaking, conservation. It would be nice if, at some stage in the past, that could also have occurred with the Sturt River but, as the honourable member knows, that has been effectively concreted from the Sturt Road bridge through to the sea. Wherever possible, obviously, we should try to retain that pleasant environment. The problem is that from time to time we get blockages in streams and something has to be done to keep the water flowing if this is to be compatible with the general urbanisation of that area.

People generally are far more environmentally conscious now than they once were, and in the landscaping provisions that we have we try to take account of that.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** My second question relates to the work of the former MHR for Hawker, Ralph Jacobi, in raising the public consciousness and establishing the need for the River Murray Commission and for the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council. I believe that the work of Ralph Jacobi has been widely recognised interstate, and I am wondering whether the people of Adelaide in particular, and South Australia in general, realise what a debt they owe him in the fact that they have a reliable supply of potable water for both irrigation and human consumption. Without the work of the former member for Hawker, some of those agreements may well not have been possible.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Mr Jacobi's achievements, of course, have been recognised around Australia, but people do have short memories. There may be an opportunity when the three river States and the Commonwealth introduce their complementary legislation very shortly—legislation which is timed to be proclaimed at the beginning of the bicentennial year—for something a little more tangible to be done. If that is what the honourable member is suggesting, I am quite happy to take it on board, because I certainly share his estimate of the achievements of Mr Jacobi in this area.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I relate my third question to program 12, page 142. I note that the flow rates of bores tapping into underground water supplies in the Northern Adelaide Plains basin are being monitored and flow meters are being introduced. I ask how those flow rates in basins such as the Northern Adelaide Plains basin, the Angas Bremer basin and others compare with the rates of exploitation, and for how many years it is considered that those basins can sustain the present level of withdrawal of underground water before fairly stringent controls need to be applied to them.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There are, of course, already quite stringent controls in the two basins to which the honourable member refers, and I suppose the question is how much more stringent we should get. I understand that the exploitation of the Angas Bremer is in excess of recharge but, perhaps, I should defer to one of my officers on the more technical aspects of this. Do I understand, Sir, that we will be considering these lines further after the luncheon break?

**The CHAIRMAN:** If not, we have to dispose of two lines in three minutes. I understand that the Opposition is happy to finish the E&WS section at 1 o'clock.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** In that case, is the member for Bright happy if my officers simply get a considered response to his question, rather than taking up the time now?

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions on this line?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Further to what I said earlier in response to the member for Chaffey on asset replacement, I omitted to mention that, when we are looking at augmen-

tation, we take the opportunity of doing some asset replacement at the same time. I now have figures which suggest that, once that is taken into account as well, we may be looking at something as high as \$14 million for total asset replacement but, in view of the confusion in my own mind earlier in the day about that, I will try to get even more specific information for the Committee.

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

Works and Services—Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$66 680 000—Examination declared completed.

Works and Services—South-Eastern Drainage Board, \$200 000—Examination declared completed.

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

Environment and Planning \$29 811 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

Mr D.S. Baker  
The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore  
Mr M.R. De Laine  
Mr M.D. Rann  
Mr D.J. Robertson  
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

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

Mr B.J. Hill, Director, Departmental Services.

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

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The Opposition regrets indeed that only 2½ hours can be allocated for questioning on this important section of Government activity. I recall that last year the Minister's responses were precise and concise and that Government members allowed the Opposition the lion's share of the questioning. If that occurs again today, we should be able to accomplish a great deal, and I hope that that will be the case.

Regarding staffing of various programs, the yellow book, at page 70, shows that staffing was reduced last year on many programs. For example, concerning the European heritage, in which the community is placing increasing importance, staffing was reduced last year to only 11.5 from the proposed 16.4 and a staff of only 11 is proposed for this year.

The Auditor-General's Report shows that the national parks, which in the opinion of many are critically understaffed, have had their staff reduced from 269 in 1986 to 257 this year. While the program papers are difficult to interpret, it appears that for park management development and protection only 209.9 staff are proposed. In respect of

environmental policy development, which is another critically important area in the light of the enormous task of guiding and implementing the Government's urban consolidation policy and those policies that are linked to it, the number of staff is reduced from 6.4 to 5.6.

Concerning pollution management, air quality and marine pollution, numbers are down, and in development management, including the formulation of planning policies, numbers are also down. Yet, the Minister's office shows a 25 per cent increase, from 12 to 15, and support services show an increase from 98.4 to 102.7. So, overall, while staffing is down from 723.7 to 705.5, staffing in those two areas has been increased. It seems that the central office is triumphing over service delivery. Will the Minister explain the department's policy and his own staffing policy in terms of inputs, outcomes and priorities?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Regarding my office, fairly recently I have become the Minister for almost everything, which means that there must be some increase in staffing there. Nonetheless, a decision has been taken recently to waste a position from my office irrespective of the general responsibilities of me and my staff, and that is occurring. There may be further wastages that can occur as time goes on. In general terms, the cutback in funds and therefore in staffing in the Department of Environment and Planning is very much in line with what is happening in other Government departments and areas generally. No one is trying to hide that fact. Indeed, if anything, perhaps in the prevailing political climate it is seen as something of a virtue that the Government can operate with fewer staffing resources yet still continue to fulfil its functions.

However, to be specific as to what the honourable member has said and without homing in on each of the areas that she has identified, I must say that we have tried to ensure that field based staff do not suffer and that, if anything, we can increase field based staff even though our total staffing resources available may have shrunk. If this line of questioning proceeds, I may call on my officers, especially Mr Leaver, to say how this operates in their divisions.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I shall develop that question further in relation to the various programs as we proceed, but now I address myself to another general policy question, that of revenue. The resources summary on page 69 of the program book shows that recurrent receipts will increase from \$1.8 million to \$2.05 million. The Auditor-General's Report, at page 93, shows that revenue from the rent of residences fell last year from \$401 000 to \$366 000; admission charges increased from \$332 000 to \$385 000; hire of facilities increased; and bush camping fees increased.

As a matter of policy, can the Minister indicate (a) the anticipated revenue from admission fees to national parks; and (b) the Government's policy concerning revenue application? For instance, does camping fee revenue go to improve camping sites? Will park admission charges go into general departmental revenue or to the National Parks and Wildlife Service by way of improvements or staff increases or specifically to staffing and improvements in the park in which the revenue has been raised? For example, will Belair subsidise the Coorong? How will the policy be applied?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Last financial year, approval was obtained from Treasury for a special fund to be set up to enable the revenue generated from our initiatives to go back into the parks system. The honourable member asked one or two fairly specific questions to which in terms of policy I can address myself but which in terms of outcome and dollars are a little more difficult. Mr Leaver may like to address himself to this question.

**Mr Leaver:** The clear intention is that the revenue raised in the parks be spent back in those parks in a way that primarily will provide visitor facilities for the visiting public as opposed to administrative infrastructure. Belair was the first park where these arrangements were implemented and we expect over 12 months to have a surplus cash flow of abt \$120 000 after paying for the operation of the fee collection arrangements.

Those moneys will be spent on a program to be advanced by the district ranger in charge of the area and will be aimed primarily at providing visitor facilities and at improving the quality of the park that is being used by the public. Concerning the other issues on rental, there is a whole suite of revenue earning possibilities available to a park agency. They range from the use of new camping grounds, the implementation of new concession arrangements on hotel, motel and resort-type developments, and even things such as the sale of publications and guided walks. The provision of wild cave tours is another example of what has been approved recently. These funds can be used, first, to provide services for the public and, secondly, to ensure that any surplus funds are spent on upgrading the facility that is causing the attraction in the first place and, hopefully, implementing some sort of revenue recycling and reinvestment arrangements.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** This is not a supplementary question. Rather, I am restating one aspect of the question that I asked. Will all revenues raised be allocated strictly to the area in which it was raised or is there a possibility that revenue from Belair, for example, would go towards the Coorong, Innes or Black Hill?

**Mr Leaver:** No, the intention in the first instance is to reallocate the revenue to the area in which it is raised. That is considered important, otherwise the district management would have little entrepreneurial enthusiasm to fully explore what opportunities there are. The diversion of funds will occur really in an opportunity cost sense where, hopefully, the level of funding for places like Belair will be less under these arrangements, and in the overall budget places like the Coorong might get a better slice of the cake.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** That raises the question: can the Minister restate his earlier guarantee that the raising of revenue by the department will not prejudice the departmental allocation from Treasury, which is the great fear of everyone who has been involved in this. That is the fear of those who are associated with the raising of money through foundations in order to alleviate what many people regard as a critical situation of impoverishment in the parks and in other parts of the environment portfolio. I do not know what weight can be placed on the Minister's assurance because, ultimately, it depends on the Premier and Cabinet. What is the Government's policy?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am not without influence here. Although the Premier and Cabinet determine my total capital allocation, which of course is the other available funds for providing facilities such as this, nonetheless I have the determination as to what proportion of the total department allocation goes to national parks. Point number one, I can give the member and the Committee an assurance that, in my allocation of priorities, I would not be taking account of the fact that there is this additional source of income now available to national parks.

As to the broader matter of the Premier and Cabinet, I do not know that anyone can give any guarantees, except that there are lots of other factors that seem to be far more germane to the situation than this one, which determines what the allocation for the Environment and Planning Department is in loan funds for any particular year. I think

the particular aspects which have been a very stringent control on the Government's use of loan funds in the budget have been fairly adequately spelt out by the Premier.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** From that I take it that this revenue will only be applied to capital works and not be applied to recurrent funds or staffing, because it is in staffing of national parks as well as capital works that the shortage is critical and the need is great?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will ask officers to comment, but I simply make the point that in picking up capital I did so purely for illustrative purposes. There are many expenditures from time to time from recurrent activities which could be supplemented by these funds.

**Dr McPhail:** It does need to be said that the Treasury Department has been in full support of this development. It has accepted it on the clear understanding that there would be no incentive for the national parks to be involved in active revenue raising activities if the funds were simply used to replace funds already flowing from Treasury. The clear arrangement is that we will maintain what had been an historic flow of funds from Treasury from receipts, but anything in addition that we raise—and this includes admission fees and the whole new range of activities in which we are involved—goes into the new general reserves trust and will be returned to the parks system. That is the entire purpose. It is being promoted on the basis that individual district rangers will want to do this in order to improve parks within their area. Certainly, we believe that we have a very strong arrangement with Treasury in this regard.

On a more general note, the honourable member asked about the increase in receipts from \$2.055 million to \$2.6 million: we need to point out that the Public Finance and Audit Act now requires us to bring all Commonwealth revenues into the statement. The funds we receive from the Commonwealth for national estates, historic shipwrecks, and Aboriginal ranger training programs and the like are all now brought into account in these receipts. To that extent it is money that we have historically received from the Commonwealth but, for the first time, it is brought to account in this form.

**Mr RANN:** My three questions relate to page 78 of the yellow book. First, as to possible world heritage listing, over the last decade or so various areas have been mooted for world heritage listing in South Australia. At one stage there were newspaper reports about the possible listing of the Coorong, and other reports saying that Lake Eyre might be listed. At various times these areas were deemed as not being suitable. I understand that environmentalists believe that at least part of the Nullarbor may be considered suitable for world heritage listing because of its unique character. Does the Minister believe that the Nullarbor could be considered or pursued for possible world heritage listing?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We are very keen on this. Without taking up too much time of the Committee, in view of its request that we be succinct, I will invite Dr McPhail to comment briefly, because he was there only last week.

**Dr McPhail:** In fairness, I should ask Mr Leaver to comment. The reason the area is suitable for world heritage listing is that just about all of the criteria required for listing can be met. We have an area that is of major geological significance. It is the largest arid cast landscape in the world. It sits in the major continental rift zone and it has major arid cast features such as, of course, subterranean caves, and the like, which are of unique character. It is well off the coast. We have now the southern white whale returning to breed at the head of the bight and in this area. So, we have an opportunity, in association with the existing owners and users of the land, to look at the Nullarbor as a uniquely

good world heritage listing possibility. Certainly, we would like to advance that. Mr Leaver, as something of a geological whiz, might like to add to my comments.

**Mr Leaver:** I am not so much a whiz. Yes, it is the largest cast area in the world. Recently, the Australian Heritage Commission completed a report of which I received a copy this morning supporting world heritage listing for the area. I will be preparing detailed information for the Minister. Unquestionably, its geological and geomorphological features make it significant. A large portion of that is in South Australia and a good case can be advanced for seeking Australian Government approval to nominate the area to UNESCO for world heritage listing.

**Mr RANN:** That is great news. My second question relates to what progress has been made in developing a draft South Australian conservation strategy and a state of environment report for this State.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This is something that was announced a little over a year ago. A good deal of work has been done. I have always seen this as something that proceeds at two levels. On the one hand, there is a report which is publicly available and which is accessible to the minds of reasonably well-informed lay people, encompassing generally the area of environmental impact and the state of the environment in this part of the continent. Secondly, and on the other hand, there is a very comprehensive data base which is prepared and which would be accessible by the technical people who might want information as varied as breeding habits of the white whale and what is happening in our marine waters, on the one hand, through to aspects of marine life in the Murray River or whatever else it might be, on the other hand. Work is well advanced on that with a view to the first of these reports (if I can call it that)—because the very first one that came out was more or less an example of what it would be like—being available in 1988.

**Mr RANN:** I experienced being buzzed by off-road vehicles in the middle of the night while camping in the Coorong a couple of years ago and saw some of the environmental damage done by these vehicles in our national parks. I understand that there have been changes to the legislation in other States. Are such changes envisaged in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Such changes have been talked about in this State for about 10 years. As I understand it, the strategy adopted by successive Governments in this State is that it would be very difficult to sustain such legislation without there being developed alternative areas for use by off-road vehicles. With the Department of Recreation and Sport we have been moving into that area. An area at Redbanks in the lower to mid north was opened up last year, from memory, to a good deal of publicity. An area at or near Port Gawler has been looked at very closely and other areas are slowly being identified.

That does not mean that in the meantime work has not been done to try to control off-road vehicles particularly in our park areas. A good deal of work has recently been done on the Sir Richard Peninsula with a view to determining, first, the impact of off-road vehicles and then just what controls can take place. At the same time our rangers are always vigilant with a view to trying to apprehend anyone who deliberately thumbs their nose at the law. I cannot promise early legislation on this matter although we are still interested in the proposition.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** What does the department regard as the key issues facing South Australia's environment?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will be as brief as I possibly can because that question could lead to an hour long dissertation. Probably, the Murray River, because of the variety of environmental impacts involved, is one of the areas on which we have done a great deal of work and will continue to do so. Also, the marine environment, particularly the littoral zone, is another area where we are now moving fairly rapidly along with sister departments like the Department of Fisheries. Eventually there will be marine pollution legislation brought before the Parliament.

If I may venture a little beyond the narrow confines of my portfolio to another area with which I was involved until the change of portfolio not long ago, the whole of the arid zone and the various impacts on the biota of the arid zone would seem to me to be another one of the areas where the Minister of Lands will be bringing down legislation in the near future. That list could be extended quite considerably. I did not mention the native vegetation legislation because that is something that is already in place. Although it has been reviewed on a couple of occasions I still see the whole question of the status of our native vegetation as being very important, but I think the Government has already played its major card in that respect.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I do not think that there is any dispute between us that land use, water quality and air quality are the three principal issues worldwide. If those issues—the Murray River, marine environment and the arid zone—are seen as the principal issues, that is not reflected as far as I can determine in the program descriptions for the department. Taking into account that last year's goals and objectives were set out in a different form, the revised form this year breaks the broad objectives, issues and trends, and program down into smaller and more specific groups. If those are the issues, their importance does not seem to be reflected in the funds or staffing allocations because each of those areas has taken a cut in staffing. Marine, coastal management and the Murray River spread across a variety of programs.

On that basis I will ask questions on conservation policy and program development which has taken a substantial cut in real terms from \$2.6 million to \$2.1 million, as well as a cut in capital and staffing. The environmental policy development program is presumably closely linked with the department's broad objectives including development management and the State development plan (for the whole State not just the department). Why has staffing been reduced? Why is funding down for the environmental policy development program from \$262 000 in 1986-87 to \$258 000 this year (page 70 of the program papers)?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I really cannot let the honourable member get away without responding to her comments on my comments before I ask my officers to address themselves to the specifics of the question. The anomaly that she identifies in what I have to say and what these documents state arises from a couple of things. First, I see the Government's environmental program as being very much wider than that to which I am required to address myself under the various pieces of legislation. For that reason things like the arid zone and marine (which involves other Ministers) must be brought in. Before one draws the conclusion that the honourable member seems to have drawn, one would need to put together the total votes in those various areas.

Then, there are certain areas which I did not identify as being the big issues that are facing us, to paraphrase the honourable member's question, because they are matters that have really been taken up long ago, but they are ongoing responsibilities under statute. The whole of the development

management system, for example, requires a considerable allocation of funds. They are not large issues necessarily because they are matters that are well taken care of by the legislation and by the way in which my officers administer their responsibilities under the legislation. Nonetheless, those resources still have to be expended. There is just not the capacity for me to be able, willy-nilly, to reallocate 45 salaries from those areas of statutory responsibility to some of these newly emerging areas. I think that that will always be the case. The Director-General may care to comment on the conservation programs.

**Dr McPhail:** The apparent drop in funds derives principally from the fact that we received a special allocation last year from Treasury to purchase land from individuals who had suffered from the native vegetation legislation decision: in other words, farms that were rendered non-viable by the effect of a refusal to clear. Cabinet agreed that we could purchase those lands and re-sell them with a heritage agreement attached. We received something in the order of \$400 000 as a one-off allocation from Treasury to pay for the purchase of those lands.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I asked why staffing had been reduced and why funding was down for the environmental policy development program from \$262 000 in 1986-87 to \$258 000 this year (page 70 under 'Conservation policy and program development'). I have a separate question regarding capital and recurrent funds for the native vegetation scheme. Do I understand from Dr McPhail's reply that the environmental policy development program reduction of \$40 000 is related to native vegetation, which comes under a separate line?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** We are having a little trouble, because the figures quoted by the honourable member do not seem to appear on our pages. We have had to look at attrition of about 19 staff, and we have endeavoured to share that attrition around the divisions as fairly as possible.

**Dr McPhail:** This simply involves a rearrangement of resources within that division. A small branch called the Conservation Projects Branch was disbanded, and the resources were put into the Native Vegetation Branch, which is the area of highest priority within the division at present because of the pressures on that branch. The resources have not been lost from the branch; they have been redistributed within the branch.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Why have both capital and recurrent funds to the native vegetation scheme been reduced? At page 94 of the Auditor-General's Report it is stated that in 1986-87, \$1.4 million was paid to 14 land-holders and \$46 000 was paid to two landholders. The Auditor-General's Report also states that, of 299 clearance applications, 158 were refused. The capital in vegetation clearance has been reduced to \$440 000 from \$461 000, and recurrent funds have been reduced from \$1.8 million to \$1.5 million. This seems to be a substantial reduction. Does the Minister feel that most applications have been made, or will there be a fairly steady annual stream? How many of the 158 people whose applications were refused applied for compensation?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** We will have to obtain information about the very specific final part of the question. Regarding the more policy oriented aspect of the question, when we entered the scheme—and there is a statutory obligation on the Government to provide payment when the disappointed applicant requests a heritage agreement—it was agreed with Treasury by the Government that about \$1 million a year for 10 years would probably be the requirement for the scheme. That is the assumption under which we are operating. However, the thing is notoriously lumpy

and 'a steady stream' is really not the best way in which to describe it. It depends on the nature of the properties in relation to which requests are made for heritage agreements.

It is true to say that in the early stages of the scheme, and perhaps even now, there was some disappointment that there had not been more requests for heritage agreements: however, it seems to be picking up steam and, although that means more money must be expended, the whole concept is that all these areas will eventually come under heritage agreement. The lumpiness of the program is also brought about by the fact that there have been circumstances where it seemed to be more appropriate to simply purchase the whole property and resell it with heritage agreements applying to the areas of scrub, and in that regard we may be dealing with an allocation for one property of about \$400 000. We recover that money, but not necessarily in that financial year.

The fact that the \$1.8 million to which the honourable member referred was substantially above what was budgeted for last year indicates that both the Government and Treasury are prepared to be flexible with me in this matter. It may well be that, if we run into the sort of trouble that the honourable member seems to be implying we may run into with the allocation available, it could be possible to obtain further payments, on the understanding that this is really only bringing forward payments that might otherwise take place in the fifth or sixth year, or even later in the scheme. Dr McPhail can cite the statistics that the honourable member has requested.

**Dr McPhail:** It might save the Committee's time if these details were incorporated.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I would be quite happy with that.

**Dr McPhail:** The sum of \$1.3 million was established with Treasury on the basis that it appeared to be the amount required for this financial year. The Native Vegetation Management Act places an obligation on us to enter into a heritage agreement with any landholder who requests an agreement, and \$1.3 million appeared to be the amount required for this year. I might say that following a very successful review of the scheme involving the United Farmers and Stockowners, the rate of application for heritage agreements increased, and we expect that in future years the demand for funds will also increase.

Since the inception of the scheme (and the honourable member cited the number of people who have applied for clearance and been refused) 174 of the applicants who have been refused have asked the department to seek estimates of valuation. In other words, the landholders have initiated a process that might lead to heritage agreements. Many landowners do not go past that point; many are willing to accept that their land will not or cannot be cleared but are not interested in entering into a heritage agreement. It is primarily those who have relatively small proportions of their property uncleared who are involved. Therefore, it is very hard to estimate the numbers in any one year. At present, 174 have asked for valuations and 139 have received valuations from the Valuer-General. That covers about 86 000 hectares of uncleared land. That is the situation at present.

**Mr De LAINE:** Recently I asked a question in the House about an environmental health study on the northern Le Fevre Peninsula to investigate air pollution and its effects on residents of the area. The Minister promised to look at the establishment of an environmental health study covering the whole Port Adelaide area as well as Wingfield and Gillman. Will this study be undertaken in the 1987-88 financial year?

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr G. Stafford, Director, Pollution Management Division.

**Mr Stafford:** The study referred to will be commenced in this financial year, and we believe it will take 12 or 18 months to complete, depending on the content.

**Mr De LAINE:** With the move towards coal firing of boilers and power stations, when will the Torrens Island power station be converted and has research been undertaken on the possible air pollution effects on people living in the immediate area?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** We have no specific information about that. That question would be more correctly put to the Minister of Mines and Energy. We would be responsible for monitoring any impact of change to a coal-fired operation. I do not know that we have any specific information from ETSA as to any timetable for change to coal-fired operation.

**Mr De LAINE:** Following completion of the ICI chlorine spill report, what additional safeguards will be brought in to hopefully prevent future spillages of this type?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** There has been a good deal of discussion about this, and work is still proceeding. My officers were present at a public meeting held on the peninsula only a short time ago, and possibly the honourable member was present. We will come up with recommendations to discuss with the Health Commission in the near future.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I am not sure whether Government members have any questions on the Botanic Garden which could be dealt with now so that the Director does not have to spend the whole afternoon here.

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Dr B.D. Morley, Director, Botanic Garden and State Herbarium.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I believe that most people would have been pleased to see yesterday's announcement that the tropical conservatory has been approved by Cabinet, but some questions must be asked about the amendments and the funding. Two aspects are obviously affecting the costs for the heating arrangements. Criticism has been voiced to me about the choice of heating method by boiler as distinct from soil heating as a cheaper and better alternative: I ask Dr Morley to comment on that. Also, can the Minister say where the \$159 000 will be found (using his words as reported in the *Advertiser*) in terms of the excess over what has been provided by the Commonwealth and the State for construction of the conservatory?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I am sure that Dr Morley can comment on both questions.

**Dr Morley:** In relation to the honourable member's second question about the \$159 000, that will come from the Botanic Garden Board Trust Fund. There is moiety in the trust fund that was donated by a member of the public, and that will be partially used for this purpose. The donation was made by a member of the public on the understanding that it be used to construct a greenhouse, glasshouse or something similar. In that sense the board believed that the use of those funds for this purpose was appropriate. In relation to the first part of the honourable member's question about the choice of heating device for the conservatory, it rests partly with the heating consultants and partly with the Department of Housing and Construction, which has monitored the recommendations of the consultants.

While the conservatory appears to be a radical and unique design, its working elements are very traditional, and one

of the baselines given to the consultants was the experience of the Botanic Garden over the past 100 years or more in maintaining the old tropical house in Adelaide. In fact, the consultants used the operating costs of that house and similar conservatories around the world to devise a heating system for the Bicentennial Conservatory, looking at North America, Europe, and in Sydney. It was their professional opinion that the proposed heating system is the most effective available and will be adequate for our needs. The possibility of using heat pumps and soil heating, as mentioned by the honourable member, was certainly canvassed and considered, but the consultants believed that a traditional and well proven type of heating system would be preferable—something reliable which can serve the community in the long term.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** My next question relates to conservation policy and program development. Does the department place any value on the environmental significance of the wetland area of Le Fevre Peninsula which has been set aside for the submarine base and, if the department regards this area as having ecological value, will the Minister undertake an environmental impact statement prior to commencement of construction of the base and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** This area has been extensively modified over the years. I assume that the honourable member refers to what I once called 'Leg o' Mutton Cove'. The site for the base is somewhat south of that area. Much of the area to which the honourable member refers has been filled and reclaimed and could hardly be regarded as a viable wetland area. We would be concerned about the impact of the project on the area. I am quite happy, now that the matter has been referred to me, to have my department (if it has not already done so) seriously consider what viable wetland is left in that area. Having inspected it from both the water and the land not so long ago, I wonder whether there is much left there worth preserving as opposed to the other side of Lipson Reach where there is a conservation park at the far end of Torrens Island.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In the light of the Minister's undertaking, which I think would reassure conservationists, can he advise what procedures the department has been asked to undertake to ensure that the marine environment around the construction base is kept pollution-free, and what assessment has been made—and this is what I am really referring to in asking for an environmental impact statement—not only on the wetland as such but on the marine environment around the base?

It seems that a project of such magnitude and length, having an impact on an area which admittedly has already been considerably degraded, must not be further degraded. It should be essential that the Government set an example to others of whom such statements are required by undertaking an environmental impact statement—and one can only liken the submarine base proposal to the Jubilee Point proposal and what it has had to undergo. One cannot help but feel that this project has been treated differently if a full EIS has not been undertaken.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I would contest that the two projects are similar: one is clearly designed to be built in a zone of littoral drift and the other is not. To get to the nub of the honourable member's question, what happens in all of these cases is that the matter is referred to my officers in the assessment branch who in turn recommend to me whether an EIS should be undertaken. It is not done as a result of the political process but as a result of their professional judgment. I am now informed that the matter raised by the honourable member was referred to them, and it was



recommended that no EIS be undertaken on the submarine base site.

These are the same people who would have to assess the EIS should one be undertaken. Notwithstanding the fact that it was judged that no EIS was required, the development will have to meet all of the normal standards in relation to the discharge of materials into the terrestrial marine and atmospheric environment as laid down in the Public Health Act and other legislation. Obviously, my people would be involved in the ongoing monitoring to ensure that legislation is respected and adhered to.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I find it interesting that the department advised the Minister that no environmental impact statement was required. When talking about similarities, I was not suggesting any necessary physical or geographical similarities between Jubilee Point and this project, but in terms of the size, nature and impact of the project on the surroundings there will obviously be a considerable impact. On what basis was it decided that an environmental impact statement was not required?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** From memory, the advice was that the only possible adverse environmental impact would be on water quality in that portion of the Lipson Reach adjoining the submarine base, and that that could be adequately taken care of under current legislation controlling input of discharges into a marine environment.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I take it that when the Minister says 'water quality' he is referring to the sea?

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

**Mr ROBERTSON:** One of the issues and trends under program 2 is that importance be given to items of significance to Aboriginal communities. What plans have been undertaken by the Department of Environment and Planning (in particular, the national parks section) to allow Aboriginal communities adjacent to national and conservation parks to use those parks as a resource for tourism, or for traditional hunting and ceremonial practices? I refer particularly to the proximity of the Andjamatana people in the Flinders Ranges to the parks in the northern Flinders Ranges and of the Pitjantjatjara people to the Unnamed Conservation Park on the Western Australian border?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Andjamatana have always been recognised as having a particular interest in the Gammon Ranges. It was from that community that four Aboriginal men were recruited for training as rangers under a Commonwealth funded scheme some years ago. Three of those people are now fully fledged rangers in our system and one is the ranger in charge of the Gammon Ranges National Park. The honourable member would be aware that there are provisions in the National Parks and Wildlife Act whereby certain protected species can be taken by Aborigines for ceremonial purposes, using traditional hunting methods.

There has been further discussion about the way in which that operates and it is not unlikely that the House will be considering that matter further when the long awaited amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act are brought forward during this session of the Parliament. Without wanting to take up too much time, as the Director-General has recently been to the Unnamed Conservation Park and discussed some of these matters with the Aboriginal people in the area, he may wish to add to what I have said.

**Dr McPhail:** We had useful discussions at Oak Valley with the Pitjantjatjara people about the future use and management of what is known as the Unnamed Conservation Park, which has to be one of the most magnificent areas of arid desert vegetation in the world. The Pitjantjatjara

people are particularly interested in an arrangement similar to that at Ayers Rock (or Uluru, as it is now known), and that is whether we should proceed to surrender title to the Pitjantjatjara people, who would then lease the park back to the National Parks and Wildlife Service for management purposes, and as part of that we would look to an Aboriginal management arrangement similar to the one we have successfully in place in the Gammon Ranges. Perhaps Mr Leaver would like to pursue this matter further.

**Mr Leaver:** Topical to this question was the Federal budget released last night when, among other things, the Federal Treasurer announced that certain moneys would become available for Aboriginal employment and training programs. The involvement of Aboriginal people in park management will feature strongly in that. The role of South Australia will feature strongly, because of its previous record in this area and its strong commitment to working closely with Aboriginal people, not only in the Gammon Ranges but, as the Director-General has said, in the West.

We think that there are other areas in the State where joint programs like the one currently under way in the Coorong could be used to involve Aboriginal people not only in ranger work but also in park worker type work, contract type work and hopefully, further down the track, in the provision of tourism facilities. I am hoping to receive word from Canberra that those programs will get the green light in the near future. We will then start them as quickly as possible.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I was going to ask when the Unnamed Conservation Park would be named, but the Director-General's answer covered that matter. He has suggested that one possible option is to give title to the Aboriginal community and have them take control of that area. I have said to the Minister in the past that I thought for many years that it was in fact the Un-na-med park, named after the Afghan camel drivers who released their camels in that area. I found to my chagrin that it was not, that it was the Unnamed Conservation Park.

My second question relates to program 4 on page 79 of the Program Estimates. As we have seen a spate of marina proposals for the South Australian seafront, has the department concrete figures on the amount of south/north sand movement on the metropolitan coastline system from the south, and specifically from the Christies Beach region to the metropolitan system? I understand that the figure of sand drift is of the order of 1 000 cubic metres a year. Has the attention of the various proponents of marinas been drawn to that south/north sand movement? In its assessment of those proposals, will the department bear that fact in mind as an additional cost to be considered in any marina proposal put forward, for example, for the Westcliff area of Marino, or Kingston Park?

#### Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr C. Harris, Director, Conservation Programs Division.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Mr Colin Harris, Director of our Conservation Programs Division, has joined me at the table and I will ask him to direct his attention to the question.

**Mr Harris:** Those figures are certainly available. We do not have them immediately to hand, but we can provide them to the honourable member. In relation to the matter of marina development, it is certainly quite a topical question and one being looked at very closely within the department. The whole sand management issue is clearly one of

the most significant whenever we talk about marinas, and that is being taken into close account in looking at these marina proposals, but we will get the more detailed information the member seeks.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** On the previous program, program 3, I note in the issues and trends some space devoted to the concept of wetland management on private lands. What steps have been taken in the recent past to ensure that wetlands on private lands are in fact preserved in a way that is meaningful in wildlife conservation terms and, in fact, what incentives have been or will be offered to landholders who happen to have areas of wetland on their holdings to ensure that those areas remain as viable conservation breeding areas and wildlife habitats, and so on, and to ensure that they will not be simply drained and turned over to pasture or some alternative land use?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I guess that there are three mechanisms: one is for the land to no longer be private but to become public and to be put under the administration of the appropriate body—which, in most cases, would be the National Parks and Wildlife Service. That has happened from time to time where land has been purchased in my own time: Poocher Swamp and several others in the South-East have been purchased and turned into conservation reserves.

The second is through the heritage agreement program, which is as applicable to wetlands as it is to conventional patches of scrub, if I can use that term. The third is that, when the native vegetation management legislation was brought down, one aspect of that legislation which was not widely commented on but which was clearly there was that those same controls could apply to wetlands and the draining of wetlands as could be applied to scrub and the clearance of scrub. I am not aware of any propositions for heritage agreements which have arisen out of a refusal to drain a wetland but, on the other hand, I am not aware that there have been many, if any, applications for the draining of wetland under that legislation.

**Mr Harris:** Some areas in the South-East, certainly, have been applied for under the terms of the Native Vegetation Management Act—areas which could be described as wetland. By and large, those areas have been refused because of their high value. I do not think that any are under heritage agreement yet but, again, we can check that. Some may be in the process of going through valuation. One exercise which has been pursued with some vigour and is perhaps worth mentioning is that we do know where most of the significant wetlands under private ownership are, and officers of the department have been selectively visiting those important areas and discussing with the owners the possibility of voluntary heritage agreements. There has been some success in that area.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Pursuing the member for Bright's earlier question about marina development, I would like to ask the Minister what plans, if any, the Government has for a long-term policy covering not just metropolitan waters and the Gulf St Vincent but the whole of South Australia's coastline in terms of marina development. I understand that there are about 30 marina plans in the pipeline. Clearly, marina development is essential in this State because of its unique coast—it is the only State with three peninsulas—and safe, good sailing waters. The impact for tourism and for recreational boating is critical and, in fact, the Liberal Party developed a very detailed recreational boating and tourism policy based on a marina policy.

I acknowledge that the full environmental impact of that policy is just not possible to prepare in Opposition. Have

any funds been allocated in this year's budget for the purpose of preparing a marina development plan for the whole State? If not, why not, and, if they have been allocated, what are the Government's proposals in this regard?

**Dr McPhail:** As the honourable member has said, we have something of a marina-led recovery at the moment, with about 33 marina proposals at one stage or another, of which about 15 are on the Murray River and the remainder on coastal waters. As the honourable member has mentioned, we do have gulf waters, but those gulf waters are in fact waters that have to be treated with a great deal of respect from the point of view of recreational boating—and I am saying that as someone who has bashed around most of them over the past decade.

One of the problems that we have for the development of the recreational boating industry in South Australia at the moment is that there are not enough day sailing destinations available for recreational boating. We have had established now with other departments for some little time a marina advisory committee, which committee is at a stage now where it has prepared draft guidelines, which will, in due course, go through the process to the Minister and Cabinet to become a document similar to that which the Queensland Government produces, which establishes the general rules under which marina proposals would need to be identified and brought forward.

We think that it is probably a little unwise to actually identify sites for marinas as such, but we would certainly be talking about those areas where marinas would be more difficult to establish, and it would be a positive document which would be talking in terms of the essential parameters which will have to be canvassed in any marina proposal. So, when anyone comes up with an idea for a marina, that person would then know the particular criteria which would need to be satisfied in putting forward a proposal.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Speaking of marinas is a good lead in to the biggest of the lot—Jubilee Point. What has the department spent so far on its assessment of Jubilee Point? What is the department's attitude to the Jubilee Point project? Does it believe that the project should proceed and, if so, on what grounds?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will have to defer to one of my officers on the exact amount spent on the assessment process. It is also necessary that I point out to the Committee that the Planning Act does not allow the assessment to come down with a specific recommendation one way or another—and that is something that Parliament will have to address itself to if it believes that the original intention of the legislation was that the assessment would not only give a scientific measure of the various impacts but also was designed to give an overall recommendation to Government.

So, the department does not have an attitude because it is precluded by law from having such an attitude, and the law only allows it to look at and measure the range of impacts which is identified in the EIS. As to the amount actually spent in the assessment process, I will defer to the Director-General, who may have that information.

**Dr McPhail:** We have not costed it, but we can if the honourable member wishes us to do so. I would say that the effort put in by the department over a number of its branches, as well as the assessment branch itself, has been very considerable.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I am quite sure that that is the case and, whilst I could put a question on notice, I do not see that the time involved in detailing all of that would be worthwhile, but I understand that the developers themselves have spent in the region of \$2 million

on the environmental impact material that is required, and it would be interesting to have a global figure if the Minister or one of his officers were able to make such an assessment here and now as to what the department might have put in.

Whilst that is perhaps being calculated, I would like to ask the Minister a question. Given that the department cannot make a recommendation in terms of the Act in regard to environmental assessment, and knowing that the Minister and the Deputy Premier have established a committee to look, presumably to make such a recommendation, what are the terms of reference of the committee which the Government established for that purpose? What is the deadline for the committee to report to the Government? In light of any recommendation the committee might make, would it be the intention of the Government to override the Glenelg council in this matter if the committee recommends a go-ahead?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I thank the honourable member for the question, because it enables me to clarify the statement that I have made today. The committee that has been set up (consisting of Mr Brian Hayes QC, Mr Des Ross, former President of the Local Government Association, and Mr Ron Barnes, former Under Treasurer) is not charged with the responsibility of making a recommendation to Government. It is charged with the responsibility of providing a public report on what that committee sees as the agreed facts of the matter in relation to the Jubilee Point project.

This decision arises from the Government's perception that there is a good deal of public disagreement as to the facts of the matter—not simply the desirability of the project, but the facts of the matter. What will be the impact of the project on the coastal processes? What will be its impact on the finances of the Glenelg council and those of the State Government, as well as on the land valuations in the area and the rates that people may have to pay? What will be the impact on the accessibility of the existing boat haven, which is part of the Patawalonga, or on water quality in the Patawalonga?

Despite the money that has been spent by the developers, to which the honourable member has referred, and despite the assessment of their report by my department (and the closest that we could get to it, reverting to the honourable member's earlier question, was about \$250 000 in time spent by my officers and those in other departments), there is still much public debate and dispute as to those matters, which are matters of fact.

So, we believe that by appointing three people who have absolutely no public axe to grind in this matter and asking them to provide a public document, although they will be reporting to me, we can perhaps have a more mature debate on the whole project than has so far taken place. However, I do not know where that leaves us. Up to the present, the Government has indicated to the developers that they must satisfy the Government on a series of points. Some of those were matters of measurement dealing with scientific principles, such as the impact of the project on the treated effluent outfall from the Glenelg sewage treatment works. Other points concerned the approval of or support for the project by the Glenelg corporation.

The developers have come back and said that they can satisfy us on all the further conditions that we have laid down except one—the attitude of the Glenelg corporation. We should not prejudge the continuing attitude of the corporation until this document has been prepared, because there are at least three possible outcomes for the Glenelg council. The council may read the document and say, 'We

now see from the document some arguments that we did not previously appreciate and we now support the proposal.' It may say, 'We told you so. Things are worse than we were led to believe and there is no way we can support the proposal.' Thirdly, the council may say, 'The document really doesn't have much bearing at all on our deliberations and on the decisions which we have so far reached.' I was hoping that the press statement on this matter might be available to me so that I could read the specific terms of reference to which the honourable member has referred. Maybe it can be made available so that these things can be read directly into the record.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I can only speak in response to what the Minister has said concerning costs, which does not surprise me. There is something wrong with a system that requires the proponents of a project to spend \$2 million in proving that the project is acceptable and should go ahead, besides requiring the Government to spend \$250 000 in one department and possibly more in other departments to provide the Government with information, yet the Minister at the end of that process is forced to say that the facts are not agreed. I believe that South Australians will find that that is an unacceptable situation. The sum of \$2 250 000 has been spent in getting and presenting the facts, yet the Minister is forced to say that the facts are not agreed and to set up a high powered committee to establish what is agreed. That is best left for the community to judge.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I do not know whether or not the honourable member contests that the facts are not agreed in the general community. In any event, the Government believes that this matter is important enough to proceed. The honourable member is really talking about whether or not we have a credible environmental impact process operating in this State. This matter has put that process to the test, because this is a highly controversial area and it was to be expected that something like this should emerge.

One thing that is being considered is whether it is possible for the fundamentals of a development such as this to be inquired into in a rather shorter time frame than is normally allowed for, which may allow the Government to say to a developer, 'There is little point in doing more work because to this point it seems unlikely that you will satisfy us.'

It may be that I will introduce legislation to allow an option to be availed of, but I make the point that, if a developer is sufficiently optimistic about the ultimate outcome of a project and is prepared to spend some money, he may well reject that option. It seems a little strange that a Government should say at that point, 'We are trying to save you from yourself. We will cut off the project at this point.' To be fair to all concerned, if the developer wants to take it right down to the wire irrespective of the funds expended, it is rather churlish of Government to prevent that from happening.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** What is the estimated cost so far of the preparation of the urban consolidation policy? I imagine that it would be a round sum estimate such as has just been provided concerning Jubilee Point. What funds have been allocated to publicise the policy? I do not mean the reports already produced other than the small brochure, because those reports will presumably have their costs recovered. What arrangements, if any, have been made with local government to ensure that residents effected by the policy (meaning all of us) are aware of its implications and are given the opportunity to comment? As I see it, the November closing date for comment has not been publicised widely and, after the initial burst of publicity, there has been virtually no public comment

that I have seen and not much time in which such comment can be made.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** There are two levels in respect of this matter. The first level concerns the general political agenda. People can comment on that in any way they like at any time through the honourable member, through members generally, or through the media. The other level concerns the securing of the policy through a series of supplementary development plans, all of which must go on public exhibition and be advertised. Indeed, public comment must be solicited in respect of those plans, so it could occur in that way.

The preparation and the work done so far has been done basically by members of the Development Management Division operating through their normal responsibilities. Mr David Ellis may be able to give more detail on what has been done by specific individuals in this regard. I see this as part of the general functions of the division in any event. I will ask my officers for advice on the publicity but at this stage, rather immodestly, I have seen it as being up to me as some sort of media performer to get the message across. However, further down the line additional material will have to be produced and budgetary allocations made for the production of that material. Perhaps Mr Ellis would like to briefly add to what I have had to say.

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr D. Ellis, Manager, Metropolitan Branch, Planning Division.

**Mr Ellis:** As to the amount of money spent on the project so far, I do not have the precise figures, but it would be considerably less than that spent on Jubilee Point, which is how the honourable member entered the discussion.

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**Mr Ellis:** It would be under \$50 000 in terms of the cost to the department. The brochure was deliberately set at a level where it would be a free brochure. In fact, it has been very popular and we are starting to run low on stocks. We intend to reprint it. That may assist the honourable member in terms of the publicity given to the project. The other aspect is that the Urban Consolidation Working Party whose recommendations were picked up in the main report recommended that an education and marketing kit for urban consolidation be produced, and work is under way on that jointly between our department and the Office of Housing.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I believe the Minister was absent last week or the week before when I complimented his officers on the preparation of that material, particularly the excellent presentation in the blue brochure 'Adelaide: Future Development'. I am glad to know that the demand for that brochure is such that it has to be reprinted. I would like to know how many copies have been printed, how many more are to be printed, what is the method of distribution, and specifically I ask the Minister (because it seems to me that, with due respect to him and his capacity for advocacy, local government can provide the best means of advising ratepayers of the components of this policy and the possible effect on Adelaide suburbs) what discussions he has had with the Local Government Association. How does the Government intend to work with local government to ensure that this policy is well understood and supported by metropolitan Adelaide residents?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I think the honourable member realises that I was speaking tongue in cheek: I do not see myself as any sort of media performer at all. We concede that it is absolutely essential that we secure the support of local government in this initiative because, without that

support, the initiative will not be successful. Again, I will ask the Director-General and Mr Ellis to indicate what discussions have already taken place with local government. The honourable member and I were both present at a seminar organised by local government planners some time ago, when some of these matters were canvassed, and there have been further discussions since then.

**Dr McPhail:** The original urban consolidation committee which I chaired had representatives not only from the Local Government Association but also from councils. They were involved in recommendations and the debate. As you are probably aware, because the honourable member attended the meeting of the northern metropolitan region, Mr Ellis, myself and others have been attending every possible local government metropolitan meeting to discuss the issue and open it out. Through our sector manager network we intend to pursue that approach. In particular, we will be pursuing a very close association with the Local Government Association and individual councils because we are not looking towards a blanket imposition of any mandatory changes: we are looking for changes to be made on a council by council basis with the agreement of the individual councils. The only way we can do that is through a high level of communication. In answer to your earlier question, we have already distributed about 5 000 copies of the blue brochure.

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**Dr McPhail:** Incidentally, the full package of documents that you probably received has gone to each council.

**Mr Ellis:** The councils received about 30 copies of the brochure so that they could also hand them out.

**Mr RANN:** Can the Minister now advise the Committee of the terms of reference of the committee established to advise the Government on the viability of Jubilee Point?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I now have the document in front of me, and I will quote directly from it. My summary of what it was about was correct, but there is no substitute for having the words here. First, the document indicates the membership of the committee, which I have already outlined. The report states:

In the preparation of its report, the committee will examine the documents so far prepared on the project and may seek and examine the views of such relevant parties and persons as it sees fit.

It goes on:

The committee's task will be to prepare a document determining the facts as it understands them on the following matters:

- The financial viability for the project;
- the impact of the project on the State's finances;
- the impact of the project on the finances of the City of Glenelg and the rates to be levied on its citizens in future years;
- the engineering viability of the scheme, including the sand management proposals and breakwater design;
- the economic benefits to the State;
- the environmental impacts of the development; and
- the alienation of public lands, and the amenity and accessibility of new public lands created by the proposal . . .

the committee may consider variations to the scheme presented by Jubilee Point Pty Ltd. The committee is not charged with conducting another EIS process. It will have access to all the technical, economic and environmental information prepared to date.

The other point that I am not sure I answered, although I know the honourable member asked, was that the committee shall report to me by 30 November this year.

**Mr RANN:** Turning to another issue raised in Parliament last week, can the Minister report further on the Auditor-General's reference to a land purchase involving TAFE at Mount Barker?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I can. I was asked some questions about this in the House and, of course, the Minister of Technical and Further Education was not present at the time. I really wondered why I was involved in this at all. I

think I should quote briefly from the report I have in front of me, which indicates that I have been an innocent party in this whole matter. In fact, it is very difficult to find other than innocent parties when one looks at it. The land to which the honourable member refers was purchased on a freehold basis by the State Planning Authority for open space purposes in 1975 for \$120 000. The area involved was 15.25 hectares. When the Planning Act of 1982 was brought in, this concept of divestment of SPA reserves was considered.

It was agreed that the most relevant management body for the Mount Barker open space area was the District Council of Mount Barker, and after negotiations council agreed to accept dedication under its control. It was clearly stated in all correspondence that the land would be dedicated as a recreation reserve under the care, control and management of the council and it appeared that council was under the misapprehension that the title was to be transferred to it. Such transfer of title of course had not taken place. The land was formally dedicated under the Crown Lands Act as a recreation reserve on 2 May 1985. In the same year the Principal of the Hills College of TAFE, who at that point could not reasonably have been expected to know the actual status of the title to the land, approached the council about the possible purchase of three hectares of reserve land on which to build the new college facilities.

Council agreed to the proposal, and negotiations took place on the basis that the reserve was freehold land. The valuation took place and, on the basis that a sale would probably occur, council entered into negotiation to purchase replacement land for recreational purposes. At about that point, TAFE officers discovered that the land was dedicated under council's control and not owned by council on a freehold basis. In other words, they had done their work properly and had discovered the nature of the title to the land.

However, as council had proceeded with negotiations to substitute land in anticipation of payment for the Mount Barker land, and as TAFE still wanted the land, a recommendation was made by TAFE officers for an *ex gratia* payment to council for \$50 000 for loss of usage of the land. That matter was referred to various Government officers who considered that the only proper way of handling it was for it to be referred to Cabinet. In fact, Cabinet considered the matter and finally decided that it was appropriate that an *ex gratia* payment be made. Therefore, the outcome of all that is that TAFE will get—

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** No, if anybody got it wrong—and I am a little surprised that the honourable member would want to weigh in at this point—it appears to have been an officer of the Mount Barker council who thought that his employer owned a piece of land which in fact it did not own. Now, the situation is that—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I am coming to that. The situation is that TAFE is getting what it wants and the council is getting what it wants—both are happy. The only outstanding matter is compensation to the Planning and Development Fund which made the original purchase of the land. Negotiations are taking place for a transfer of funds from TAFE to the Planning and Development Fund which properly should be reimbursed for the funds originally outlaid. In the light of that reimbursement, I would imagine that the funds that come across could be made available for an addition to the national park reserve system, possibly the Kenneth Stirling Conservation Park (which I know is dear to the heart of the member for Heysen), and once that takes

place I think that there would be an additional benefit for what has happened.

A I implied in the House at that time, I am not apportioning any blame. The officer of the Mount Barker council who appears to have been involved in negotiations is, I understand, on leave until 24 September so the person who wrote this report for me was not in a position to obtain that individual's part of the story. In any event, I am prepared to accept that that officer, as all others in this matter, was acting in good faith.

**Mr RANN:** What is the visitation rate of the Botanic Gardens? I note that the yellow book states that the Botanic Gardens was receiving an excessive demand for its botanical advisory services.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** We can provide that information. There is a good deal of public interest in the services that the gardens make available. As a result of the arrangement with Black Hill those services specifically provided by the Botanic Gardens have been broadened.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Will the Minister reaffirm the Government's policy on mining in national parks? Does he believe that the term 'national park' is an appropriate designation for an area in which mining or mining exploration is permitted? What is the number and nature of mining permits that have been granted by the Government in areas that are designated 'national parks'?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I am happy to reaffirm the policy. The term 'national park' in this State does not have a great deal of magic associated with it, because in terms of both the legislation and the biological realities on the ground in those areas there really is no distinction between a national park and a conservation park. I believe that anything I say must be directed towards both of those designations under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. We can obtain that information; I doubt whether it is available at the table. I refer to the situation where there are pre-existing mining leases in park areas. Material was prepared for me when I addressed a Nature Conservation Society seminar a little earlier this year, so I know that it is available.

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The honourable member is making it very easy for me. I assumed she was addressing herself to the situation where the Government decides to place part of the State under a national parks designation. There are pre-existing exploration, or indeed exploitation, rights, and the question is how we take account of them. If the honourable member is merely asking what we would do in relation to a national or conservation park which is so dedicated and in regard to which there is a proposition for mining, the answer is very straightforward: it is extremely unlikely that such approval would be given under our present policy. There are none that have been treated in that way.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I am sure that the Minister does not believe for one minute that I was trying to make it easy for him, albeit his tongue was in his cheek. Will he continue outlining the Government's policy in relation to mining in national parks, and the acquisition of land adjacent to national parks or the establishment of new national parks or conservation parks in which the Government, presumably, has permitted and will permit mining?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I guess there are three circumstances that arise. The first is where there is a pre-existing exploration licence or lease in that area but where we believe it is important that the protection of the National Parks and Wildlife Act be applied. In those circumstances, we would use the joint proclamation mechanism that has been

used for a portion of the Gammon Ranges and various other parks. I think we can go right back to the Simpson Desert exercise in 1969 where the reservation under the National Parks and Wildlife Act occurred, notwithstanding that there were pre-existing leases. Indeed, under the terms of that proclamation those leases must be honoured in perpetuity or, I guess, for as long as further leases are approved by the Minister of Mines and Energy. That is the first situation, and that is how we would handle it.

The second circumstance is where there is an area in which there are no current leases or licences applying but which the Government believes is minerally prospective. In those circumstances, we may again go into the joint proclamation exercise. That has occurred in one or two circumstances. The third is where we decide that the area either is not minerally prospective or the biological factors very much outweigh the geological factors, and we proceed to a reservation in the normal way under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. To give a very recent example, I refer to the Dutchman's Stern, as it is so called, in the Flinders Ranges, an area acquired some time ago for national parks purposes. There is an argument that that area may have limited mineral potential. Notwithstanding that argument, Cabinet agreed recently that it should be reserved without any joint proclamation.

Really, it is a matter of judgment—I do not know that there are any hard and fast rules—as to the mineral or hydrocarbon potential of that area. The Government is very keen to continue to set aside appropriate parts of the State for national parks, and I believe that our record has been second to none in that regard over the past five years. But at the same time we are not prepared to lock away forever areas that may be very prospective from either a mineral or a hydrocarbon point of view.

The honourable member would also be aware that the recent announcement about the Innamincka area, which opens up the prospect of a further form of land use being undertaken or allowed to occur for pastoral use, has attracted our attention to the extent that we believe that the Act should be amended to provide for a fifth category—regional reserves—which would take account of the fact that we really have three forms of land use under the one designation.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I appreciate having that on the record. I am asking questions now as shadow Minister of Tourism as well as shadow Minister for Environment and Planning. I am continually approached by people who express concern that our national parks are under-staffed, lacking upkeep and resources, and compare unfavourably in terms of visitor facilities with parks interstate. The continuing complaints and criticisms, which in my case date back to my tourism phone-in in January 1985 with respect to specific parks, are still valid.

Without taking much time of the Committee, I would like to quote briefly from a letter, which I believe is most important, from a constituent who has travelled over the major national parks in Australia and is, therefore, able to compare our parks to those in all other States and Territories. He says that the Minister of Tourism claimed in the *Advertiser* of 24 February this year that we must aim for the indulgent top end and middle income group seeking good budget accommodation with access to a range of facilities. I believe that that was in respect of the proposed Flinders Ranges facilities. My constituent says:

We have met quite a few of these people. A fair section of them are spending holiday dollars enjoying Australia's national parks. From our observations the spectrum of tourists camping at our national parks is not restricted to 'greenies' or people with

low incomes, nor are campers just Australians, as the following examples of people whom we met will indicate to you.

There then follows a list of people of all nationalities, occupations and backgrounds who were met in the various national parks of Australia. My constituent then goes on to say:

From our experiences it is obvious to us that the tourist potential of the South Australian national parks finds little recognition at the present time. The recently announced redevelopment of the Wilpena Pound facilities is a clear indication of the lack of understanding of the national parks tourist requirements. First priority should be given to—

and I do not necessarily agree with this as a priority but in terms of accommodation I believe it could be—

upgrading camping facilities to an equivalent standard to those of interstate national parks.

In the light of that criticism—and I am happy to show the Minister the whole letter, because it is most convincing, balanced and well-informed—and not only in relation to our tourist facilities, does the Government have a medium and long-term plan for the improvement of our parks and, if so, what is it and what are the Government's priorities in terms of park management both generally and in terms of individual parks which the Government believes should receive priority treatment for one reason or another?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will ask Mr Leaver to comment on this, but in general terms the Government's priority is to protect the parks and the natural environment from human impact, and that must remain our top priority. Interpretation can have the effect of both facilitating visitor use of the parks and the general aim of protecting the parks from human impact. So interpretation also becomes very important indeed. Visitor facilities divide themselves into a series of categories: at the higher end we believe that it is for private enterprise to make the investment required for motel and hotel type accommodation and what have you, and I guess it is for us to facilitate those investments where appropriate. In the middle range it is conceded that it is more a Government responsibility to provide for the more modest income earner. We have been looking at a broad range of approaches in this area in various of the parks—the parks of Kangaroo Island, Innes Park at the bottom of Yorke Peninsula, and of course the Flinders Ranges, as the honourable member well knows.

I will invite Mr Leaver to speak briefly on our approach to this, but first I will comment on staffing of the parks as mentioned earlier. We have tried very hard, in periods when all Ministers have had to accept budget constraints, to maximise the proportion of the national parks service which is in the field as opposed to the proportion that remains in administration at the centre. I think that figures can be produced in relation to that.

**Mr Leaver:** I am looking at this very problem and I agree with the honourable member that it is a matter for urgent attention, notwithstanding the difficult fiscal climate. I am looking at it in a two-pronged approach. The first prong is to make maximum use of development opportunities to private enterprise to provide a range of visitor facilities in parks, and that range extends from basic visitor facilities right through to the higher standard of accommodation mentioned by the honourable member. The proposed Flinders Ranges resort which will replace the existing Wilpena Pound facility, for example, will target some 90 per cent of its occupancy at the lower standard accommodation facilities which are more generally available; and by far the smallest proportion of the accommodation beds will be of the so-called high standard type. So the bulk of the resort will be cabin style accommodation, camping areas and dormitory type accommodation.

We are seeking to encourage this type of mix for proposed developments on Kangaroo Island and in the Innes National Park. Shortly we hope to go to press in calling for registration of interest for these types of development at Innes and Kangaroo Island and we will be hoping to provide a spectrum of facilities of different standards to ensure that those who want to visit our parks can do so at a cost acceptable to them.

There are a number of other areas where these types of concession developments can be looked at: for example, today I looked at a proposal from an Alice Springs based group to use the Mount Dare homestead within Witjira National Park as a desert accommodation facility for people to call in and perhaps use as a tour base. I think that is an excellent suggestion that will be put to the Minister once it has been assessed, and I think that type of use of existing park facilities could also apply elsewhere.

The other major prong that I am looking at is the general reserves trust that we alluded to earlier whereby fees are charged for the provision of facilities and the money goes straight into the provision of further facilities, such as interpretation programs, seasonal programs, guided walks and self-guided tours of caves, wetlands, and so on. This opportunity is now being rapidly taken up by the more entrepreneurial rangers in the service and we are receiving a number of proposals. In summary, despite the difficult fiscal climate, many initiatives can be looked at to get the standard and spectrum of facilities so obviously needed in the parks.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** No-one could argue with anything that has been said about what is required. My point is twofold, and I do not think that the Minister took the first point. The point made by my constituent and that I make (and perhaps the Government should undertake a survey in parks to reinforce this) is that park camping facilities are not being used throughout Australia only by low income earners. My constituent has listed the types of people he has met camping in national parks and they include company directors, consulting engineers, senior technical school lecturers, and wealthy retired couples. These people—the high income earners—are looking for the nature experience involved in camping. They are not looking for hotel or motel accommodation.

Therefore, the leasing and concessions referred to by the Minister and the Director are not regarded as a first priority by these people who in other States and in the Northern Territory find what they are looking for in national parks, namely, good camping facilities, decent lavatories and proper interpretive centres. Notwithstanding the fiscal constraints which face every Government in Australia, why is it that the other States can do it and are doing it while we have not been doing it and are looking to private enterprise to do it? I am not querying the merit in that, but we are looking to private enterprise to provide high quality accommodation, but surely it is the responsibility of the Government to establish the camping areas within parks.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First of all, I challenge the honourable member when she says that we are not approaching this issue in the same way as other States. It is certainly true to say that the New South Wales parks system is better provided in this respect than we are, but I contest that it is a general rule that we are less well provided in this respect. I thought the point made by Mr Leaver was that we are not looking to private enterprise to simply provide the top of the range but a range of styles and accommodation, and he mentioned cabin accommodation, which will provide the bulk of accommodation facilities in the Flinders Ranges. People who really want to rough it can do so, irrespective of the facilities that we provide. That is

more the wilderness experience than being in cabins, caravans or whatever else it might be. We really believe that, without diverting an enormous amount of our own resources to these things, we can capture the private enterprise investment dollar.

**Mr De LAINE:** Because of the extremely unsatisfactory mix of highly polluting industry, in respect of both air and noise pollution, and residential buildings in the Wingfield area, is there a short or long-term plan to overcome the many and varied problems associated with this mix by positive Government intervention to actively encourage resident property owners to relocate and allow the area to become highly industrialised?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I do not know of any specific plan, but it may be something that will emerge from our current urban initiative. At this stage we have a responsibility to try to ensure that the letter and spirit of air and noise pollution legislation is adhered to so that the impact of those industries on the residual residential population is minimised. I invite the Director-General to explain briefly the function of a committee which is presently operating and which has some bearing on this subject.

**Dr McPhail:** Because of the significance of the industrial land on Le Fevre Peninsula, in the Wingfield area, and the Elders stock paddock area in Salisbury, the Port Adelaide Industrial Lands Committee has been set up and is looking at both the future planning and management and release of land for industrial purposes in that area of available land. One aspect brought forward in recent discussions is the need to develop a strategy to try to overcome the problem of an unfortunate mix of some residential properties and some fairly noxious industries. The committee is addressing itself to that task and is trying to come up with a proper industrial land strategy. However, it has not got anywhere near the stage of suggesting that there should be an incentive program, such as the one the member obviously have in mind, to help individuals relocate from that area to more appropriate residential surroundings.

**Mr De LAINE:** Is research being undertaken to find a method of extracting nutrients from stormwater prior to its flowing into the sea in order to arrest gulf seagrass dieback?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** You can do practically anything if you have the money with which to do it. I do not know of any commercially viable process currently available to us. In any event, part of what I was saying this morning was that with the change in the water budget between land and sea with stormwater drains which take stormwater very quickly to the ocean, to the gulf, water which was once impounded in the reed beds in the western suburbs, it is often simply the force of the water itself that has an effect on the seagrasses. Also, there can be periods of the year when there is a considerable lowering of salinity in an area which can impact on the life cycle of organisms used to a particular level of salinity.

The only way in which this matter can be addressed, if it is a serious problem, is to prevent the discharge of stormwater into the gulf. That would be a difficult thing to do, because where have we left in the western suburbs somewhere where some impounding could take place? I do not know of any such research. I will try to get that information for the honourable member, but I believe, in any event, that it would have a limited capacity to address the problem that we are facing.

**Mr De LAINE:** On page 79 there is reference to further investigation of offshore sand sources. If an offshore sand source can be established, will the sand be used to replenish sand on Gulf St Vincent metropolitan beaches?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Yes, it will. The problem we face is that it is not as simple as saying that the longshore drift carts the sand north, dumps it on the beaches there and therefore all one has to do is pick it up from those northern beaches and take it back to the southern beaches, because in addition to that process there is some net loss to the beach environment into the gulf as a result of the natural processes, particularly the annual movement of sand inshore and offshore; in other words, not all of it comes back. Some sand never comes back and it is difficult to recover because it is typically distributed in an even way across the bed of the gulf.

The Gulf St Vincent beaches are steadily losing sand in a way that is very difficult to replace. That life cycle, I guess, has been shortened considerably because one of the recharge mechanisms from the dune system has largely been interrupted by the steralisation of that sand resource under asphalt and concrete. The only way out of that, if Adelaide is to retain reasonable beach profiles, is to access additional sources of sand. Some of those sources are far distant; for example there are considerable sand sources at Mount Compass, but does this community want to pay the cost of transport of that sand for that distance?

There are sand sources on Torrens Island, but they are limited. We are very interested in offshore sand sources, which by definition are close to the areas in need of replenishment. The North Haven area is a typical one that we are looking at. There will be a considerable cost in accessing this material; it is one that will have to be borne sooner or later. In the short term, however, there are still reasonable supplies available to us at various points on the coastline at Glenelg, where the breakwater has acted as a groyne; at Henley South, where the Torrens outlet acts as a barrier to the longshore drift; and on the northern beaches.

**Mr De LAINE:** If this source can be set up for additional sand supplies and is in fact used, would some trucking of sand still take place from the northern beaches to avoid an eventual clogging of those beaches?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** That is as I see it. The chances are that perhaps the amount of trucking involved would be considerably less. There are parts of the northern beaches from which we would not want to take sand now because those beach profiles are such that to remove further sand would be unacceptable. It is difficult to say, and will depend on the amount identified in the offshore sources.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** At page 84 there is reference to program development management. I have two questions, the first relating to release of the report on the Metropolitan Open Space System—Second Generation Parkland Study. When in 1984 the Minister first announced this study, a statement attributed to him suggested that the study would determine the boundaries of the proposed parklands and would examine the provisions of links between those areas, and creeks, rivers and the hills face, and that area included private land. The release went on to say that the study would recommend areas for acquisition by the Government or local government. A report released last Tuesday entitled 'A proposal for Metropolitan Open Space System' states under 'Acquisition of land' that it may be desirable to buy some land to form links between existing public land.

Have any funds actually been allocated for the purchase of private land? Is it intended that you will proceed with the purchase or suggest to local government that they should proceed with the purchase of private land as part of the study? I would particularly like to know when people who own property (in the hills face zone, particularly) will know

whether there is any threat of acquisition of some form or another in regard to those properties.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I think I can put that last one to bed immediately. There is no intention on my part to come out with compulsory acquisitions or anything like that at all. Where people want to treat with us, of course, we are quite happy to sit down at the table and work out exactly what it might cost us to purchase their land under a freely negotiated arrangement, but there is certainly no spectre of compulsory acquisition hanging over anyone who has land in this system.

The funds that would be made available in the circumstances I have outlined would be from the Planning and Development Fund. We always try to keep some discretionary funds available there, rather than tying them up completely, because typically land becomes available during a financial year: one is never quite sure when one is, or is not, in a position to purchase. So, I cannot point to any specific allocation of \$50 000 or \$250 000 for a metropolitan open space system. What I can say is that, where purchases seem appropriate and they result from people coming to us and inviting us to treat with them, it is from the Planning and Development Fund that the money would be taken.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The second question relates to the finalisation of the Adelaide Hills bushfire prone area SDP, and I appreciate that that SDP is before local government for comment at present. There is, however, some concern being expressed by councils at this stage, particularly in regard to liability on the part of local government. I have not yet had the opportunity to see the SDP but I understand that it will be mandatory for councils to consult with the CFS when it comes to the approval of a development within that fire prone area. Should the CFS, for example, object to an application but the council approve it under certain conditions—and I understand that that is quite possible—and subsequently the building is destroyed by fire and there is, perhaps, a life lost, where does local government stand as far as liability is concerned?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** As I understand it, they could be joined in any action. I am not too sure that this is very much of a departure from what we have seen occur previously under the Planning Act, although I do not know of cases having been brought forward; perhaps they have been. This morning we talked in this Committee about circumstances in which the E&WS Department or some other statutory authority may give advice about flooding and the potential for a particular area for flooding and, notwithstanding that advice, local government may give approval for subdivision.

There is an argument that in those circumstances where flooding occurred people could have some right of action against the approving authority. My officers may be able to assist me here, and the Attorney may be able to assist us in other circumstances, but I do not know of any cases to which I can point. My understanding of the law is such that what the honourable member has identified could occur—theoretically, anyway.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Supplementary to that, I draw to the Minister's attention the matter of the flooding that has occurred in Mount Barker. There are still some actions to be taken, I understand, in regard to that matter, but the whole matter of liability is of particular concern to local government and I think needs to be addressed as a matter of the highest priority. I hope that the consultation that will take place with local government in regard to this particular SDP will address that subject: it is vitally important that it does.



**Dr McPhail:** Neither the Planning Act, the Building Act nor the Health Act exempt local government from any civil actions against them for negligence or claims of liability against the actions of the council. This particular SDP is no different in character from any of those other matters in which councils can be joined in action. The whole question of local government exemption from liability is one which has been debated, and the courts have tended to be very strict. The courts have generally ruled that local government and Government, of course, cannot be seen to be exempt from actions of negligence or claims of negligence against them.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Obviously, we want to take some account of that but would probably require assistance from the Attorney-General and his people in any negotiations and, in any event, I gather that what the courts are saying is that it would be very difficult for the Legislature automatically to exempt local government from claims such as this—but I am getting beyond myself at that point.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I presume that the next question comes under the heading 'Conservation policy and program development', but I am not quite sure and would seek the Committee's indulgence. In the policy presented by the Minister at the last election he stated that he would initiate a South Australian environmental audit 'measuring and reporting on the effectiveness of the Government as a community and preventing pollution and loss of environmental qualities, including plant and animal species, improving the qualities which make our cities, suburbs and countryside desirable places to live now and for future generations', and so on.

The Minister has indicated that the environmental audit would be undertaken by the revamped and strengthened Environmental Protection Council. I am not quite sure whether the study, referred to on page 78, into the state of the environment in South Australia is in fact that audit, but I would like that clarified. Also, it was suggested that a report would be brought down, with the audit published every two years as a South Australian state of the environment report. I am not conscious of that happening.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It will happen in 1988, I have already mentioned to the Committee, but we have been using the name we have been using for the publication of the report and not the name 'audit'. The Environmental Protection Council is nominally the author of the report. That council is serviced by Mr Colin Harris's conservation program, so he may like to explain the mechanism.

**Mr Harris:** The Environmental Protection Council has a full-time scientific officer looking after it, and that scientific officer is currently being assisted by a biologist working on contract. Between the two of them they are preparing the report which, as has been mentioned, should be ready next year. It is intended to produce it every two years, and this is the follow-on from the first one mentioned earlier which was something of an experiment. It is hoped to bring it out every two years in the format which is being worked on at the moment.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** One of the local councils with which I am fairly familiar (Marion council) has put forward a proposal for a linear park along Sturt Creek. As the Minister has already said, Sturt Creek is encased in concrete from Sturt Road to the sea. That proposal put forward by council has met with a very favourable public response, and it may be that eventually councils such as Marion and others will come to the department seeking advice and funding for the removal of the concrete from those creeks and restitution of the creeks to their relatively natural state. There are reasons for that, of course, like the removal of a substrate

for graffitists and because the area is a general eyesore. It appears that the public view of things like Sturt Creek is changing fairly rapidly. What can local councils do if they choose to reverse the process of putting everything to concrete, and what assistance by way of advice and funding can they expect from the department and from local government on the issue of renaturalising creeks?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There is no automatic allocation of funds for this sort of thing except in respect of those available under the ordinary greening of Adelaide programs. I suppose that an initiative such as that referred to by the honourable member could attract funds. The officers of the Environment and Planning Department and of the Engineering and Water Supply Department would be happy to give technical advice. Certain things, however, would have to be addressed carefully before such a project could be undertaken. I do not oppose the idea: indeed, I applaud it from an environmental point of view.

However, there are problems. For example, I always thought that there was something of an over-kill when the south-western suburbs drainage scheme was introduced, because the creek, which was straight, wide and deep, was concreted on the one hand and on the other hand a flood control dam was built, whereas only one or the other was needed. Now, from my inquiries recently, it appears that that is not the case and that, notwithstanding the flood control dam, the occurrence of a one in 50 years or a one in 100 years flood could well prove difficult for the channel to cope with, despite what is now in place there. Therefore, considerable flooding is possible in parts of the south-western suburbs.

However, if we were starting out *ab initio* we might prevent subdivision so close to the creek, which might allow for that greater flood to occur without much concern to people, but that is not the present situation. People have built right up to the fences that run on either side of the creek and there is a hazard as youngsters get in there. Every year there is at least one case of someone being swept along the flood race and having to be fished out downstream. This indicates the volume of water now carried by the system.

So, I do not say that we should not try to effect some return to nature, but it will be difficult because of the development that has occurred in those areas. If Marion council has the bit between its teeth, good on it! It should approach Government instrumentalities for advice. Regarding funds, the only thing to which I can point at this stage is the fund available for tree planting.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Concerning program 3, which is referred to at page 78 of the yellow book, research has been done on the revegetation of agricultural and pastoral areas of this State. I am aware that trial plots of various kinds of eucalypt and other genre have been established in the Adelaide Hills and elsewhere and that planting and propagation procedures have been employed. What has the success of those trials indicated? In the light of fairly limited life expectancy of many of the large trees, particularly the *eucalyptus camaldulensis* in the agricultural and pastoral areas, and as the trees along the creek lines and the shade trees along the fences must be getting toward the end of their lives, having been retained in the 1850s and the 1860s, what urgency attaches to that research and how long will it be before the results of that research are disseminated among the farming and grazing communities? Further, how relevant has that research been to the whole problem of revegetating the 70 per cent or 80 per cent of the land that has been effectively alienated either for agriculture or for pastoral use?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Briefly, the results of the experiments have been successful. Such results are known and we are starting to disseminate this information, particularly through the farming community who, as the basic owners of the land to which the honourable member refers, can fix the problem for us. I will ask Mr Harris to explain the point that we have reached in the program.

**Mr Harris:** Dr Julianne Venning, a botanist who has worked full time on this problem for the past five or six years, has done well. Her findings have been written up progressively as technical reports and made available to a range of interested individuals and organisations. We can make copies of those reports available to the honourable member. We are moving into a different phase now. The findings of the trial work indicate that we have the technology and know-how to replant and encourage regeneration over wide areas, and the challenge now is to get the information and advice out to the rural community.

We will release a consolidated account of the trials in popular form soon. A book that is being prepared by Dr Venning will be released on the commercial market in the next few months. That book will encapsulate much of the work that has been done. The honourable member has pinpointed an urgent problem. Indeed, there are two problems in this regard. One concerns the decline of the existing shade trees and shelter trees that have been left, and the other concerns the putting back where the land has been over cleared or totally cleared in the past. Dr Venning has addressed both those issues.

We have a variety of techniques for encouraging the regeneration of young trees where there is a seed source in the form of the old tree, and we have reports on that. Where we have bare agricultural land and it is desired to put back native vegetation, the broadacre direct seeding trials that have been carried out are again relevant. We will make the reports available and draw the forthcoming book to the attention of the honourable member.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Concerning development management, if the Minister has read the *Hansard* record of the debate on the Planning Act Amendment Bill, he will be aware of the criticisms referred to me about delays in approving supplementary development plans. In Committee, the Minister in charge of the Bill could not answer questions on the rate of change of sector managers and the impact of that change on delays in approving supplementary development plans, a problem that has cost local government considerable sums. Can the Minister now say what have been the starting arrangements? How many changes in sector managers have there been over the past two years, or over the past 12 months if that is a more reasonable period for the purposes of the question? What are the department's plans to ensure greater stability in that area and the faster processing of supplementary development plans?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Some sector managers have been in place for some time, although there have been changes in personnel. I will ask Dr McPhail to answer the question.

**Dr McPhail:** The general accusation that supplementary development plans are being held up by the department is a matter of great concern. Together with the Local Government Association, we have thoroughly investigated this matter. In part, a contributory cause can be seen in the number of changes of sector managers. However, we would need to take the question on notice to ascertain the number of changes made over a given period. The number of changes made in our department has been more than matched by the number of changes in council staff who handle the supplementary development plans. There has also been an

equal inconsistency on the part of councils in handling the supplementary development plans as there has been in the departments.

We have tried to develop a strategy whereby in fact we will be placing, as councils have demanded, greater responsibility with individual councils for the preparation of the supplementary development plans. Until now, the department has taken great care to ensure that the individual councils' supplementary development plans are correctly worded so that they will sustain legal challenge and be efficient documents. This is an excellent aim, but it takes much departmental time, especially as some councils' plans come to us in what can only be described as an interesting shape.

A great deal of our staff resources go into doing the sort of basic description work that councils should have done. We are now changing our approach and simply passing back to the councils their plans with the comments of the Advisory Committee on Planning, saying, 'These are the comments. If you wish the plan to proceed, you make the changes and bring the changes back.' The onus has been placed back on the councils. In the end, if the individual SDP is not as carefully worded as it might be, the council will simply be making a judgment as to the exposure it is prepared to accept in terms of liability of some sort or another, or the possibilities of an appeal.

I know that what I have been saying sounds rather hard nosed, but what we have been preparing in parallel is a series of what will be ministerial documents setting out clear guidelines for the preparation of SDPs. Incidentally, guidelines have existed for a long time, but many council planning consultants have been prepared to ignore those guidelines. We are going to have them put out at ministerial level so that individual councils will know that, unless those general guidelines are conformed with, their SDP will not be an acceptable document. That will provide certainty for everyone in the system. The final point is that the SDP system is an open-ended system in that the department has to deal with SDPs as they arrive. If there are only a few SDPs in the pipeline, then obviously the ability to deal with them is greater.

If we get a stack of SDPs arriving from councils, until now we have had to determine a priority order as to which are the more important SDPs from the point of view of metropolitan, town, or country developments, and then deal with the more important ones. With the new strategy about which I have been talking, we will be saying, 'Here are our comments on the SDP. You now rework them and think what you want to do with them.' The onus would be placed back on the council to provide not only a more mature system with council accepting responsibility but also making it possible for the process to be speeded up considerably.

Further, some of the well serviced councils such as Salisbury, and so on, have been able to make the adjustment to this new system very readily, and we have been able to advance their documents very quickly. We have to accept local government resources as they are in this State. We believe that metropolitan councils should be able to operate with a much greater level of independence, if you like, in this arena. On the other hand, country councils still demand a great deal of direct assistance from us, simply because they do not have the planning resources to do the task.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It is very helpful to have that policy on record. One of the corporate management objectives listed in last year's program papers was to 'develop, apply and make available the products of environmental data systems for the purpose of environmental management'. That goal appears to have been dropped, or

at least I cannot find it in this year's program papers. Because of the obvious economic ramifications of that, is it still a goal of the department and, if it is, what progress has been made with data systems? What is the cost to the Government of developing and using such systems? Have such systems been put to use yet in 'expressing environmental considerations more explicitly in the State Development Plan'? That is listed as an issue/trend on page 84 of the development management program. The two seem to relate well to each other.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Certainly, I cannot explain why the verbiage has been dropped: clearly, we are still doing it. The obvious thing to which I can point is the fire hazard maps to which reference has already been made earlier, where the data that is required is the sort of thing that we have gradually been able to acquire as a result of the more sophisticated computer software that is available these days. That can be made immediately available to the development control system. We are able to set up a hierarchy of hazards in the various parts of the Adelaide Hills. Those maps have been produced, they are available, and they will act as a guide to local government and the South Australian Planning Commission in determining the appropriateness of various development applications.

As to costs, if that is not immediately available we can attempt some costing, if that has not already happened, as well as may have been the case, and we can make that information available.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I refer now to pollution management staffing, and refer to page 72 of the program book. Staffing and pollution management is down despite the fact that pollution problems are increasing, which the Minister has acknowledged this afternoon, and expenditure is up from \$1.6 million to \$1.7 million. To what extent does inflation account for the increase, and what are the other components of the increase if inflation does not consume it all?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** There appear to have been four items involved in the increase. One is the carryover effect of salary and wage increases, which is costed here at \$14 000. Plant and equipment provision—and here is where I may need some assistance from the Director-General, Mr Stafford—including carryover is \$108 000. The Commonwealth funded Air Pollution Awareness Scheme for \$57 000 and, of course, the provision for the twenty-seventh pay, which is something that bedevils all of the lines of this budget, an extra \$40 000. Perhaps Mr Stafford can give more specific information, particularly about the plant and equipment provision, which seems to be the major additional cost item.

**Mr Stafford:** The bulk of the plant and equipment provision of \$108 000 is made up of carryover from the previous financial year as a result of equipment not being able to be applied within the six-month period roughly that we have available to us following the declaration of the budget for any one financial year. The reason for that is mainly that the equipment we wish to purchase is not available off the shelf. Generally, it is air pollution monitoring equipment which is manufactured after the date on which the order is placed. In many cases the delays are considerable. We are expecting the equipment to arrive in this financial year.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I refer to program 3 at page 78. In the specific target/objectives for 1987-88 is mention of the intention to amend the Native Vegetation Management Act in accordance with the recommendations of the review committee now studying it. Presumably many members are aware that there has been a feeling in the past that, with a limited fund available for acquisition and compensation, there has been a degree of the 'quick and the dead' among

those seeking compensation for bits of scrub that have been alienated and put out of commission for grazing or farming purposes.

I seek an assurance from the Minister that any amendments arising out of the review committee's recommendations will not lead to a use of this acquisition compensation fund by wealthy landowners as a form of compensation that they hardly need, and that smaller landowners who have proportionately as much valuable heritage scrub on their properties will gain equal access to the funding. I also seek an assurance from the Minister that there be some guarantee that the fund is not used as a form of money pump, to use the colloquial, in the way that several larger landowners are alleged to have treated it in the past. I would like an assurance that there be accessibility for smaller landowners and that the fund that is established will not be monopolised by the larger landowners.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Basically, my function is to adhere to the Act which has been passed by the Parliament, and the Act is no respecter of persons. It looks at the biological, soil conservation, and other realities which are out there. However, there is one area of discretion that I think we have used to try to take account of the concerns to which the honourable member refers: that is, in looking at this very difficult question of hardship I have the capacity to set aside the 12.5 per cent requirement which is not subject to the normal payment where a heritage agreement is entered into. I give an assurance to the honourable member that in the past that is something that has only applied in cases of genuine hardship.

I cannot set aside that the whole system is not acting as some sort of money pump in the sense that there may well be those people who are applying for clearance not because they really want it but because they know that there is a payment available if refusal to clear means that they are eligible for a heritage agreement. That is something that this Government has always understood. The honourable member will be aware that we were forced into the legislation by a High Court decision—one which we would have preferred go the other way. However, it did not and the only way of saving the system was to enter into this scheme of legislation which opens up the possibility of something happening along the lines that I have indicated.

As for the respecter of persons aspect, we do have this capacity to set aside the 12.5 per cent where the scrub is being preserved for biological reasons. Where there are soil conservation reasons for permission being withheld, then it is most unlikely that the 12.5 per cent would be set aside. In any event, it is only set aside where there are genuine cases of hardship.

**Mr RANN:** Concerns have been raised in my electorate about pollution from domestic wood stoves. Recently, a constituent demonstrated to me the effect of noxious fumes in her house that were basically caused, I believed, by the incorrect burning of wood that had been treated that should not have been burned in such a way. What action is the State Government taking to police this problem or educate owners of wood stoves about their proper use?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** This matter has also arisen in relation to the so-called pot-belly stove. I recall raising the matter in the House a year or so ago and being laughed at by some members who claimed that I was seeking to over-regulate. The head of steam, without wanting to go too close to a pun, that seems to be now building up in relation to this matter, may have people thinking twice about whether it is really all that funny. The matter was raised following the controls that were brought in over backyard burning. We believe that there are certain things one can do and not

do in relation to this matter, although at this stage there is no definite proposition before me. One can look at education and control, and whichever way one goes one is looking at perhaps three things. First, the nature of the fuel that is burnt, and I would see it as being quite proper that we might regulate to prohibit certain forms and conditions of fuel from being burnt.

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** By the outcome. The second thing is the design and nature of the flue—the chimney—which is very easily policed under the Building Act. The third matter, which I think only admits of education and not control, is the condition in which the furnace or whatever else is kept. Obviously, a good deal of the problem arises from incomplete combustion which in turn is a result of these devices not being properly cleaned out. I understand that material is available, and has been available for some time. We are seeking to prepare new material that can be made available to educate people. There is sufficient concern being built up, judging by the mail I get on this matter, to have the Government seriously consider whether it should not regulate in this area.

**Mr RANN:** What action is the Government taking or considering to combat the increasing and disturbing use of plastic containers?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** This is a rather difficult one and one which perhaps has been kept on the back-burner a little while we are waiting for the outcome of the High Court decision in relation to beverage containers. I announced just before the recent election that we would have a review of the Beverage Container Act because there is an increasing use of non-glass and non-metal containers for beverages and other food products, and I refer not only to plastic but also to waxed cardboard and like substances. We have not proceeded with that inquiry because the whole matter was thrown into the melting pot by Bond Brewing's appeal to the High Court against our legislation. We see no point in proceeding further in that way until we have the result of the High Court decision. It is of concern to us. Certainly we have addressed the plastics in one way in that under the backyard burning controls (to which I referred earlier) it is an offence to incinerate plastic material which I would see as being a highly anti-social act. Beyond that, in relation to using some sort of a deposit system, that matter is up in the air until the High Court has spoken.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Under the National Parks and Wildlife Act there are regulations providing for the imposition of expiation fees for certain offences. How many expiation notices have been issued by departmental officers, and for what offences?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** We will obtain that information.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** How many prosecutions have been initiated through the courts in respect of offences in which expiation notices could have been issued?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** We will obtain that information.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** How many prosecutions have prosecution officers for the National Parks and Wildlife Service personally prosecuted since 3 November 1986, in what courts and for what offences? What were the travelling expenses incurred for those court cases?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** We will obtain that information.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In relation to the pollution management line, what benefits, if any, have accrued from amendments to the Beverage Container Act to increase the deposit on one-trip containers? What figures can the Minister provide to demonstrate that the amendments have reduced the presence of one-trip containers in the litter stream?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I will try to get hold of some figures for the honourable member. One of the effects of the higher deposit has certainly been the abandonment or delay of the introduction of certain brands of beer into this State which almost certainly would have been marketed in the one-trip container.

I make the point very clearly that the Government, through its legislation, does not seek to discriminate against particular companies or brands of beer and that sort of thing; the concern is only with the nature of the container, because that is what is littered. However, there is little doubt that the push was on for the marketing in this State of a product which, typically, would have been marketed in one-trip containers and which, if the product got a considerable toehold on the market, would have impacted considerably on our reuse system for beverage containers. I do not have the specific figures; we will have to try to obtain them.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** What action has the Government taken, or what action does it propose, following criticism by the Environmental Protection Council of the existing pollution legislation and administrative procedures relating to pollution controls in South Australia? What would be the cost or cost saving of design and implementation of a set of common procedures, as recommended by the council? Does the Minister agree with the council's recommendation for the need for a five-year review of standards?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Basically, what the council has identified is something which has been commented on previously and which is behind our thrust to try to get marine pollution legislation in place, because there are gaps in the legislation in this State. The marine area is one of the obvious areas that comes up for comment. As I have already indicated, a good deal of work is being done in that area. I believe that our system for monitoring various forms of air pollution, the oxides of sulphur, for example, the coefficient of haze, and so on, is quite reasonable given the problems we face. Work is carried out from time to time on lead emissions. In any event, of course, the national move to lead free petrol will assist considerably.

I understand that there is also a gap in bringing together emissions from static machinery and vehicles and from moving machinery and vehicles. This relates not only to chemical pollution but also to noise pollution, and a good deal of work is being done in that regard. Finally, there is the whole question of hazardous chemicals. Quite frankly, we have experienced problems in recent times because of the recent Commonwealth decision that this is something that should proceed through the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations at the Commonwealth level rather than through the Federal Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment. I guess we do not mind, as long as the work is done. We have been liaising, basically, through Mr Cohen, the then Federal Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment, and it was assumed that that was how the legislation would proceed. There has been some delay because of the change of ministerial portfolio and responsibility, but we will now try to make up that delay. It is more a matter of gaps in the three areas I have identified, which we are trying to overcome.

**Mr De LAINE:** Under the provisions of the Planning Act, existing use rights are often granted by local government bodies to planning applicants in relation to industrial premises. Problems arise where land use is the same as previously. For example, an industrial building may be used to manufacture a certain product but, because different manufacturing methods and processes are used, a noise pollution problem that did not occur previously becomes

evident. In my experience, there is a large difference in interpretation by local government planning personnel in relation to the Planning Act and zoning regulations. Could the department exert pressure by way of regulation to achieve some sort of uniformity in this area?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The honourable member has referred to a very technical case. First, if I may be permitted to correct him on one matter, I point out that existing use rights are there; they are not granted. The Planning Act applies only at the point of change of land use and does not control land use *per se*. Either there is an existing right, or there is no existing right, and there is nothing that the council can do about it. What the honourable member has identified, in my language, is that from time to time there are arguments about changes in land use and what really constitutes a change in land use. If, in fact, there is still an industrial use but nonetheless there is a significantly higher level of either chemical or noise pollution, does that not of itself become a change of land use that should have been considered at the local government level?

The only thing I can do, without taking a considerable amount of the Committee's time, is to make available one of my officers to discuss the matter with the honourable member and, where there are problems with any of the councils in his area, we would certainly be prepared to discuss those matters with them directly. The Planning Act is not the only legislation that is brought to bear, of course; where there is a significantly higher level of pollution, notwithstanding it was regarded that there was no change of land use, either the air pollution regulations or the noise control legislation could still be brought to bear on the problem.

**Mr De LAINE:** In my experience there is very little knowledge and understanding of the policy on the concept of urban consolidation by decision-making people in local government, hence the potential for a fragmented development pattern, particularly in the western suburbs. Could the department establish a comprehensive education seminar or other means to educate and inform these local government decision-making people accordingly?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I referred to this matter in reply to a question asked by the member for Coles. I indicated that there was a series of ways in which we would be further discussing the matter with local government. I believe that the honourable member's proposition is worth while, and we will consider it.

**Mr De LAINE:** The open concrete drain in Jenkins Street, Rosewater (in my district) is a continuous health problem for local residents. The problems are seasonal: during the spring and early summer, while water lies in sections of the drain, mosquitoes are a major problem; during the dry months, the drain becomes an illegal dumping ground and attracts rats, which in turn attract snakes. The Port Adelaide council does a great job of containing this and other problems, but a permanent solution is required. Is the covering of this drain a priority, and when can we expect the work to be undertaken?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I would have thought that what was needed was a few well publicised prosecutions in this matter. If there is illegal dumping in the drain, local government either under the Local Government Act or the Health Act would probably have powers to apprehend and prosecute. Basically, that seems to be the problem. Otherwise, in relation to a covering for the drain, someone would have to identify a source of available funds for that work. I certainly cannot indicate where, at the Government level at this stage, funds would be available. If the council wants

to talk to us about it, we would be happy to give it further advice.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The Minister, the member for Elizabeth and I have had endless representations about Hexagon Engineering and noise pollution, and I certainly feel extremely sorry for the residents in their predicament. At the same time, from the point of view of Hexagon Engineering, when was an application made by Hexagon Engineering for Government assistance to relocate its activities to a site at Anglevale Crescent, Bolivar, and why was that application rejected?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Dr McPhail tells me that so far as he is aware the problem has been fixed, so perhaps he can explain that.

**Dr McPhail:** Hexagon Engineering went into liquidation and was sold to CP Engineering, which has relocated.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I am aware of that and, although it is past history, I believe that the people are entitled to know about this. Why did the Government reject Hexagon Engineering's application for Government assistance to relocate?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I am trying to remember at what point of government the application occurred. Certainly I do not have the sorts of funds available to me to enable us to relocate all the noisy activities which from time to time mean that there is conflict between industrial and residential use. The honourable member would be aware of a similar problem at Camden Park (and for all I know that may well be a subsequent question). In all of these cases considerable sums of money could be spent on relocation from a very limited allocation of funds available to the Minister of Employment and Further Education for industrial incentives. However, I guess that he would prefer to see new investment rather than relocated investment. So I can only assume that Hexagon Engineering (as it then was) made an application through the normal channels and that it was refused for the reasons that I have indicated; and subsequent events have been described by the Director-General.

**Dr McPhail:** Hexagon Engineering was offered considerable financial assistance to relocate, but it took a commercial decision to use its own funds for some high risk purposes of its own which did not work out, with the result that it did not have its own funds to match the grant available to it for relocation. I make the point that the department came under considerable criticism in relation to the number of extensions of time given to Hexagon Engineering. I think it is fair to say that Hexagon Engineering was given every opportunity through extensions to permits to operate outside the Noise Control Act to enable it to get its house in order.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I know that the Leader of the Opposition has had questions on notice about this for some time so, because it is past history, perhaps the matter can be dealt with in that way. I turn now to page 77 of the yellow book and the Heritage Conservation Program, under 'Issues/Trends', which states:

... increase in community concern that the nation's cultural heritage should be adequately conserved.

From time to time this Government has made undertakings to establish financial incentives for the conservation of heritage items. What is the status of the Government's proposals in relation to financial incentives for conservation?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Over and above what is currently available through the Heritage Fund and the small incentives put in place a short while ago, I am not aware of any Government commitment to do other than try to

persuade the Commonwealth Government that it should use the income taxing mechanism as a means of making incentives available. A number of approaches have been made to the Commonwealth—to the Federal Treasurer and former Minister Cohen—and we will continue this process through the Federal Treasurer and the new Minister, Senator Richardson. I am aware that this matter has been on the agenda of the Premiers Conference from time to time.

We did establish that the valuation on a heritage property would be adjusted so that in fact the full commercial value of the property was not taken into account. All that is in place and is now happening. In addition, loans are available but of course the honourable member knows that that has occurred for many years and that the bucket of funds available is reasonably limited. I am not aware of any further commitment by the Government other than to try to persuade the Federal Government that it should look at the income tax mechanism.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I think I can probably dig up the past commitments made by the Government, but I will not do that now. Under 'Major Resource Variations 1986-87—1987-88' on page 77 of the yellow book mention is made of a one-off allocation for compulsory acquisition of the heritage properties Kingsmead and Bellmont. How much did the Government pay for those properties?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The short answer is \$1.2 million for both properties.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** What does the Government expect to spend on those properties before offering them for sale, and is that expenditure expected to occur in the current financial year?

**Mr Harris:** Colliers is currently preparing material with a view to putting out to public tender the acquisition of those properties by the private sector for redevelopment within certain guidelines which would reflect the heritage value of those properties.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** When will those tenders be let?

**Mr Harris:** Certainly this financial year.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** That is a long time—we are only at the beginning of it.

**Mr Harris:** It is imminent—within the next few months. It is being worked on at the moment.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The advice before me is that the property together with suitable developed packages will be offered for sale by tender before the end of 1987, and that information comes from the Acting Manager of the State Heritage Branch.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I draw the Committee's attention to program 7 on page 82 of the yellow book, where reference is made under 'Issues/Trends' to the increasing use of disposable plastic containers and one-trip glass containers. What steps are contemplated to enhance the recycling rate of one-trip glass containers, given that the packaging industry in Australia presently rates the return of cullet at between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of total annual production, which means that in its production of about 600 000 tonnes per year it is able to include 25 to 30 per cent as recycled glass? Bearing in mind that one German manufacturer at least runs a whole plant on 100 per cent recycled glass, has the department considered working with the Waste Management Authority and the Department of Local Government to encourage councils to make separate garbage collections for clean glass free of pollution by non-ferrous metals? The glass could then be sorted into three component colours and recycled as cullet, which would then save the Australian glass industry about 420 tonnes per year in the production

of new glass that might as well be achieved with 100 per cent recycling of cullet.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Mr Madigan, my Deputy Director-General, who is also Director of the Waste Management Commission, will respond to that since the honourable member brings up the interface between the department and local government.

**Mr Madigan:** Certainly the Waste Management Commission has a program of trying to encourage local government in particular in this area. I refer to a recent initiative by the Western Region of Councils to acquire a marine store dealers licence and persuade its ratepayers to put out glass separately from other household rubbish and to direct the contractor operating the collection system to redirect those bottles to the recycling depot. The commission is seeking to encourage other regional organisations and councils to do the same thing. As a matter of interest, the South Australian Government's biggest initiative in recycling is the Beverage Container Act, with about 95 per cent of deposit bearing containers being returned and recycled.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The potential enemy in this is the 45 litre bin.

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

Deputy Premier and Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous, \$971 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

Mr D.S. Baker  
The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore  
Mr M.R. De Laine  
Mr M.D. Rann  
Mr D.J. Robertson  
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Deputy Premier and Minister for Environment and Planning.

**Departmental Advisers:**

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

Mr B.J. Hill, Director, Departmental Services.

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

Mr C. Harris, Director, Conservation Programs Division.

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

Mr G. Stafford, Director, Pollution Management Division.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I note that the level of funding for the National Trust has increased from \$17 000 or \$18 000 last year to \$25 000 this year. I think that I am right in suggesting that that amount was increased last year to \$27 000 by a topping up process. I support strongly the work that the trust does for South Australia and acknowledge the dedication of its members, who work tirelessly in a voluntary capacity in areas such as heritage conservation and tourism.

It is interesting to note when speaking of tourism that 200 000 people visited National Trust properties in 1985-86. The Auditor-General's Report, and the annual report of the History Trust released a matter of weeks ago, indicate

that, for the year 1985-86, 209 000 visited the three properties under the control of the South Australian History Trust—the Birdwood Mill, what is now Old Parliament House and Schubert's Farm. However, for that period the History Trust received an operating grant of \$807 000. While I support also the work of the History Trust, it makes the \$18 000 or, if it comes to that, the \$25 000 for this year look extremely insignificant in regard to supporting the National Trust. Has the Government any plans to help the excellent work that the trust does by significantly increasing the \$25 000 allocated in these estimates and, if so, what are they and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Yes. By way of background, when this line was transferred to me three years ago, I think from the Premier's lines, the Government's grant to the National Trust was \$5 000, so I have increased it considerably.

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Well, we must have inherited it from somewhere else. We have done reasonably well to reach \$25 000. In addition to the \$25 000 indicated here, a \$2 000 extra grant and a \$40 000 interest free loan will be made available to the trust through the State Heritage Fund. I join with the honourable member in indicating that we know that the money will be extremely well spent.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Under the miscellaneous line there are grants to the Monarto operations of the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia of \$151 000; last year there was a vote of \$97 000. What are the components of that \$151 000, given the Government's announcement that Monarto is on the back burner and will not proceed? Of that sum, what is for maintenance of the *status quo* and what is for any advancement?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I will ask Mr Madigan to answer, as he is the zoo expert.

**Mr Madigan:** The breakdown of Monarto zoo refers to the Adelaide zoo's breeding and agistment area and not to the so-called Monarto open range zoo. As the honourable member has rightly said, that project is on the back burner, so the Monarto zoo reference relates specifically to the Adelaide zoo's agistment area, and the increase refers to a provision for additional paddocks and fencing for agistment and breeding of other species that will be put there from the Adelaide zoo.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** So it is all capital works?

**Mr Madigan:** Yes; the addition is capital. The base refers to the operation of the agistment area at Monarto.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** In light of the fantastic story released recently about the success rate of tourism at the Dubbo open range zoo, and the latest figures recently released which I think the Minister now has, indicating that it is a quite exceptional project so far as tourism is concerned in that State, what real effort is being made to consider the proposal for a joint venture being agreed between the private sector and the Government to try to get an open range zoo off the ground? I ask this question because there is a real need for increased tourism in that area and very strong support on the part of the local council for such a project. I believe that it could be very viable indeed.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I will ask Mr Madigan to comment on that.

**Mr Madigan:** The Minister has received a number of requests to investigate the possibility of private sector involvement in that new project. He has directed the department to investigate that matter and report back to him. The investigation is currently under review. We imagine that we

will be in a position to report to the Minister by the end of this calendar year.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I thank the Minister and his officers for their responses to questions. The Opposition regrets that time has not permitted us to ask questions about all areas we would have liked information about while we had the advantage of the presence of the officers whose time has been made available to us today.

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

Works and Services—Department of Environment and Planning, \$4 487 000—Examination declared completed.

Auditor-General's, \$3 656 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

Mr D.S. Baker

Mr M.R. De Laine

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr M.D. Rann

Mr D.J. Robertson

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood, Deputy Premier.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr T.A. Sheridan, Auditor-General.

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

Mr P.J. Rowe, Administrative Officer.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The yellow book from page 88 onwards refers to the same information, generally, as that to which we will be referring. It is noted that there is a minimal increase in staff and funds for 1987-88. By my assessment there is a 6.84 per cent increase, but there seems to be some disparity between the figures in the two sets of documents. For example, the white pages would suggest that there is \$3.656 million available, whereas the yellow book shows \$3.785 million. Whilst that in itself is not a tremendously large sum, hopefully we will get to some balance in the longer term. I also notice that the relocation from the inter-agency to programs 1 and 2 is fairly marked in the Auditor-General's documents. Having suggested that all other departments do the same, I should imagine that the Auditor-General is showing the way.

It may be possible to get some idea of whether there are likely to be very great movements of the existing inter-agency line into programs in the future. Is there capacity to improve the direct nomination of funds rather than having a large inter-agency line relative to the total figure available?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** In most of these matters I will defer directly to the Auditor-General. He is an officer of the Parliament and, as such, it is important that members have direct access to him, so I will ask Mr Sheridan to address himself to the question.

**Mr Sheridan:** The change this year reflected what we saw as, probably, a mismatch of funds. They were not in the past directly allocated to programs when I believed that they should have been, and they concerned directors of

audit and our ADP area of the department, where most if not all of their time is directed towards the auditing function out in the field, particularly in the case of the directors who are concerned with the management and planning of the audit and dealing with the heads of departments on the more contentious matters. For that reason there has been an adjustment between what has previously been unallocated to programs and what is now directed to the auditing program.

I do not see a great change occurring in that in the future, because what is left there largely consists of overheads—like myself, the Deputy, and the administration group—and I think they are down fine enough to not need any further adjustment. But we will certainly be looking at that area, although I do not see any great change in it from here on in, in terms of the relationship.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has the Auditor-General, as a matter of course or at the invitation of various departments, sought to give advice to other departments and instrumentalities as to how they may better prepare their accounts, in order to reduce the inter-agency lines in the future?

**Mr Sheridan:** Not specifically or totally in that area. We give advice on the presentation of accounts so that they are more meaningful and able to be compared better against other like agencies. I suppose an example of that this year would have been the Cultural Centre Trust where, as a result of a fair bit of work on the part of my officers, we have a better and more meaningful presentation of those accounts, including the introduction of accrual accounting into that area. On the question of allocation of funds to direct programs, the only one I can recall at the moment involves some discussion we had with the Department of Lands. We saw a mismatch there, and my officer spoke to the Director and his Deputy on that matter, and they are looking at the question. You would be aware that I raised it in my report this year (as I did last year) and I think departments are generally looking at that. We will certainly be looking at it in the forthcoming year with some of those departments.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Auditor-General having raised the point of his report, it has been noted that from time to time he has indicated that some departments have not taken note of directives given by the Auditor-General for better performance. Is there a need within the Auditor-General's reference to improve the performance of some departments? Where does that responsibility lie? Ministerially, the Auditor-General is with the Chief Secretary: Government-wise one would say that the thrust is probably more with the Treasurer as the person responsible for the Government's total policy on a directive basis. Has this matter been assessed at all?

**Mr Sheridan:** On the question the honourable member raises—which, if I read it correctly, is whether matters raised by the Auditor-General's Department are attended to promptly, well and satisfactorily—I can answer that in two parts. I have not had any difficulty in this matter during my term of office. I think the majority of matters raised—and there have been a number of them—have been attended to pretty promptly. Other matters have been raised concerning systems, control procedures and things of that nature, which have not been as major as the earlier ones to which I referred, and I do not think that it is a matter of their not being attended to: I think it is a matter of the resources available to attend to such matters.

I think that one must have a reasonably flexible view on this (and I hope that we have); that departments which are apprised of the need to improve a system, or to improve controls within a system, have other demands on their

resources, and it is a matter of their assessing the priorities within their available resources and of our assessing whether those priorities are reasonable and if the necessary attention has been given to the matter we have raised. If they were things we regarded as matters which could get the Government of the day into some real problem area because of the poorness of a system or lack of control, we would certainly push a lot harder through the Premier to have them fixed, but I think one has to have some balance with the other priorities impinging on their resources, and we cannot expect everything to be fixed up as quickly as we would like it to be fixed up. That does not stop me from drawing attention to it each year to make sure that it does not get put aside completely. If I thought that there was a danger of it just not being done, I would certainly say something about it in stronger terms than I have.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I now refer to the report of the Auditor-General directly to Parliament, as opposed to the full report. Page 1 highlights the significant variations from the previous Act which are embodied in the new legislation on the Public Finance and Audit Act. He indicates that it requires a public authority to report to the Auditor-General whenever it carries out all or any part of its functions in partnership or jointly with another person or through the instrumentality of an agent or by means of a trust. Accountability to Parliament is achieved by enabling the Auditor-General to audit the accounts of such ventures.

Is there a move or a need (I suppose that I am putting it in two ways) that the Auditor-General be given opportunity to look at some proposals in advance of action being taken rather than after the horse has left the stable? Without belabouring the point, one would look to the most recent circumstances in respect of the New Zealand timber company and the South Australian Government. Now, that action would have taken place before this new Act was in place. What I am really asking, I suppose, is whether the Auditor-General has been in the past or is still in the position where he cannot be consulted on the likely consequence of an action that a Government intends to take, albeit recognising that Cabinet has a responsibility and may take a responsibility even against advice that has been proffered.

**Mr Sheridan:** I think that there are two parts perhaps that need to be answered on the question. The first one is about the Auditor-General being apprised where a public body forms a company or a joint venture or whatever to conduct part of its operations. The reason why that was put in the Act was purely to allow the Auditor-General to be auditor of that joint venture or of the trust or of the company, from the point of view of getting accountability to the Parliament. The Auditor-General is not the auditor of that operation; then there is no capacity from his point of view for the Parliament to be apprised of the financial state or whatever of that particular organisation, so we saw that as a means of covering that point. That is not to say that in every case the Auditor-General would seek to become the auditor of that joint venture or trust.

From the other point of view, which is whether the Auditor-General should be consulted or whether he should look into some of these matters before the event, there is a very fine line. It was a matter that was discussed at some length at our Australian Area Auditors-General Conference in Darwin a little earlier this year. I believe that the Auditor-General needs to move or should not just confine himself to looking at what happens after the event, because in many cases the gate is open, the horse is gone and there is nothing you can do other than to assume that it will not happen again.



I think that there is room for an Auditor-General to look at things beforehand, at the decision making end. It is not always easy to get on to but, again, one must be very careful about doing that, because I certainly do not believe that it is the Auditor-General's role to influence a Government of whatever kind as to what it should or should not be doing. I think that all that we can do (and I think that this is properly within his role) is to point out to a Government where perhaps it has not the correct evidence to make a decision or needs better evidence to make a decision and things of that nature. It is then clearly up to the Government of the day to make its decision and to do what it believes is correct.

That does not always rest on financial matters: that can rest on other matters which may well not be financial or commercial, in the wider public interest. However, I think that there is a role there for the Auditor-General properly and carefully to advise the Government of the day where he sees some problem emerging rather than waiting and letting it all happen and then afterwards saying 'I could have told you so.' I do not think that that is a very productive operation at all. I do not know whether that satisfactorily answers the member's question.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It does. Unless I have missed it, I do not think that that sort of philosophy (if I can use that term in its broadest sense) is put forward in your report to the Parliament in specific terms, as a result of the discussion which took place in Darwin for example. Maybe it has gone to the Government as an auditor's report as a result of your having attended the conference. I do not know, but it would seem to me in hindsight a fairly important direction as a result of certain events which have taken place, and I do not want to belabour those.

Regarding what I believe is Parliament's desire expressed in the passage of the new Bill and in other actions which have been taken, including a public accounts system (and seeking to enhance that operation over a period of time), it seems that there is an increased accountability and that the situation of having to live with scandals (if I can use the broad term) exists from time to time.

More specifically, if we look at page 93 of the yellow book, under 'Issues and Trends', we see the particular comment there is to respond to requests for assistance in special investigations of other matters connected with public sector management including financial management. In my estimation, financial management before an event is equally a part of financial management as trying to come to grips with it after an event. We might be tending to get into a philosophical sort of discussion here, recognising that this is an expression of a view and not necessarily criticism, seeking to find whether there are changes in contemplation or whether the Parliament (and I stress the Parliament) ought to be looking to necessary changes.

**Mr Sheridan:** I do not know that I would see it at this stage in terms of having any specific legislation to do this. I think that it rests very much with the Auditor-General of the day and how he sees his role. Having said that it was discussed at the Darwin conference, I perhaps should also add that there were one or two Auditors-General who were a little more nervous about the proposal than I was. However, I do not think that it is something that we lay down: I think that it is all part of the auditing. Over the past 10 years, we have seen a move away from the straight financial and compliance audit, where auditors just looked at the accounts, the transactions, the balance sheet, and the profit and loss account and, as long as everything there was okay, then they had fulfilled their task.

They moved from that into efficiency auditing, performance auditing, value for money—whatever we like to call it. That was a gradual movement and in some cases that has now been enshrined in legislation, but some Auditors-General were doing that long before it was enshrined in legislation. I see this as another move in the other direction: we are looking at things before they happen. I think that it rests very much with the individual Auditor-General and with the circumstances as they arise. I do not know that I would feel any more comfortable whether or not it was enshrined in some sort of legislation. I just feel relaxed about doing that thing with the one warning, that an Auditor-General must be very careful that he is not seen to be directing the Government of the day in what it should or should not be doing. He can point out that there might be some traps and it is very much up to the Government of the day to make up its mind whether or not it takes notice of that and acts upon it. That is my view. I do not know whether the Minister would like to add to that.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Obviously, the auditor's role is not to do other than point out the consequences of a range of options that may be open to Government, and the tools that he has available to him are well understood—the particular skills he has and the right to be able to report direct to Parliament. Now, as long as all is done within those parameters, I think that it is proper that we should look at this way of proceeding. I agree, I do not think that at this stage any amendments to current legislation are required.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I acknowledge that the last thing one would want to do is put two tiers of Treasury advice into the system. Undoubtedly, there have been occasions which have been reflected upon where perhaps a greater degree of scrutiny might have been beneficial to all concerned. That was the basis upon which I approached it. As to the actual report on the Auditor-General's Department in the large volume, there is a note at the end that there is long service liability of \$836 000 for persons in that department. That statistical detail is not available in many other reports. I believe that it is critical in some circumstances, particularly in those authorities with potential superannuation liability. Is the fact that this is reported in relation to the Auditor-Generals' Department this year an indication of what we could expect in the future for other departments? Can the Minister indicate whether the Government believes that this information is highly desirable, that is, in knowing what the potential is down the line?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Clearly, it is information that should be available to decision makers, be they at government or parliamentary level. I am not aware whether there is a specific program or whether Mr Sheridan has discussed it with chief executive officers generally. I will ask him to enlighten the Committee.

**Mr Sheridan:** There are two things. First, one will find in regard to most statutory authorities a provision in their accounts for long service leave. It varies. Some of them work it out on the basis of people with more than four years service, seven years service, and so on but, nevertheless, provision is there. With Government departments it is not quite so clear and it gets into the whole question of accrual accounting and the extent to which we take it. I am not sure, but I think that places like the E&WS Department, for example, do acknowledge it in their accounts, but most Government departments at this stage do not do that and we will certainly be having a look at that in the coming year. That should not be read that we believe necessarily that we need to go into a fairly lengthy accounting system to determine the places where it does not have a great deal of effect on their operation.

**Mr Abraham:** It is desirable for organisations charging for their services such as some statutory authorities to put all their known costs into their accounts so that they can recover those costs in their service charges. I would like to think that some Government organisations that are charging for their services, like the E&WS Department, will build these costs into their accounts.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** By way of comment more than anything else, I notice that we have not had any special report from the Auditor-General of late. The last that I can recall raised some difficulties regarding a venture at Port Augusta and various other activities. I take it that the report had a salutary effect.

**Mr Sheridan:** Certainly, some steps taken in amendments to the Public Works Standing Committee Act and administrative arrangements within departments to improve the situation resulted from that report, yes.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I now turn to the point raised earlier on the amount of funds contained within the inter-agency lines. Is there any feature of the inter-agency lines across departments that appears to be hiding or not to be identifying, for the scrutiny of Parliament, funds held by those various departments for contingencies?

**Mr Sheridan:** I do not believe so. Is the honourable member talking about departments outside the Auditor-General's Department?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Yes. I believe there is about \$200 million across all departments held in inter-agency lines. Clearly, \$200 million from the total of \$4 000 million is a small but significant percentage.

**Mr Sheridan:** That is correct. I do not believe there is anything that has been withheld. The point I was making is that in some cases the percentages, if one looks at individual agencies, appear to be high by comparison with their direct costs. There may be good reason for that. I am suggesting that it needs to be looked at by those departments to see what makes it up and to see whether there is room for improvement. I imagine that in some cases there could well be, but I imagine in other cases it is well justified. There is nothing that should be read into that which suggests that money has been hidden away, or anything of that nature. I do not believe that that is the case at all. It all gets back to efficiency and saving, knowing what is in the make-up of those amounts, and then having a good look to see how one can trim them back, if that is the action that should be taken. It could be in some cases that the figures are quite genuine and there is nothing one can do.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It has been a feature of Auditor-General's Reports over a long period to identify losses by way of stealing or misplacement, and so on. With the experience of hindsight, are there any thoughts about what might or might not be done to reduce some of those losses? Having looked at it over a period, it would appear that some of the losses are occurring in the same places where they occurred previously, which either shows a lack of resources to prevent such losses or freedom within an organisation which provides the opportunity for people to show their prowess in taking goods.

**Mr Sheridan:** I got into terrible trouble in the first year when I took it out with Mr Becker. When one looks at the amount of the losses in terms of total Government operations—Government operations being huge—I do not believe there is anything that should cause alarm. I would not want anyone to think I am saying that we should not try to reduce the amount of losses, but it really is not big. When one looks at the operations that we conduct and the sorts of items that tend to be lost or mislaid, and one thinks about gangs out on a water main, water construction or a

highway, where the small items of plant are used, one sees that it is only human nature if a few of them are misplaced from time to time. My people have not seen anything that would cause us grave concern. We have pointed out two matters in recent times.

One involved some fairly large items of equipment that were apparently stolen from one of the colleges. That was reported quickly to the police and appropriate action was taken. On another occasion material went off in a particular organisation and shortly afterwards, without the window or the door being fixed, it happened again. We pointed that out to the department in both cases and both of them were mentioned in the report. Aside from that, one has to look at it in terms of what has been lost or stolen in the total environment in which we are working. To improve adequate controls over all of those things might be more costly than the losses. I hope that that is not taken by all and sundry that they can go for the lick of their life, because that is certainly not meant.

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

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

Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous,  
\$9 927 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

Mr D.S. Baker  
Mr M.R. De Laine  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr M.D. Rann  
Mr D.J. Robertson  
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Minister of Emergency Services.

**Departmental Advisers:**

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

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The yellow book at page 118 gives a clear indication of the cooperation that now exists between the MFS and the CFS in relation to moving towards better communication and compatibility of radios. A coordinating committee is looking to enhance the delivery of services, and at Brooklyn Park shared training facilities are being used by the CFS. Page 120 states that, in conjunction with the CFS, the MFS will continue to upgrade joint resources and coordination and there can be no argument about the upgrading and the benefit of the best use of resources. However, there is a fear still abroad that the two services may become one. I have no indication that that is intended, but I would appreciate information from the Minister or his advisers as to just how far the coordination is intended to go.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The honourable member is probably referring to matters that have been discussed from time to time by the Fire Services Coordination Committee, which is on record as expressing its support for a very much

closer working relationship, if not amalgamation, of the two services. I can say here and now that there is no Government decision in relation to that, nor have I requested of my colleagues that such a decision be taken. A large number of matters would have to be addressed before such a decision could irrevocably be taken. Some of these may be addressed for other reasons as we go along, but there is little doubt that they would have to be addressed.

First, the absolute assurance that the CFS would remain in the field a volunteer organisation would have to be given, and I am prepared to give right now the assurance that, irrespective of what the future might be for the two services, clearly the volunteer principle would remain predominant in the CFS. Not only do I believe that it accords with the social mores of society, clearly the capacity of Government or whatever the funding mechanism might be to sustain fire control and fire prevention effort could not possibly match what would be demanded if a fully professional CFS were to be instituted.

There is also the role of local government in relation to CFS (and I will not go on too long here because in a sense I am straying into an area that we may want to look at more closely when Mr MacArthur and his officers join us), and that would have to be considered very carefully. Finally, since the funding mechanisms for both services are separate though not unrelated in many of the outlines and the way in which they operate, that also would have to be addressed very carefully. I can give the honourable member an assurance that he is seeking, although I can make clear that, where we can find further areas of closer cooperation and sharing of facilities between the services, we can and should do so.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Minister indicate whether the sharing of radio frequencies and common approach to mass problems will go beyond the fire services and will embrace (without going into it in depth) the police and/or the State Emergency Service?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There is no immediate plan for that. Perhaps I should get more detailed information for the Committee and when the police lines come before us perhaps we could raise that matter again.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** There is a problem often referred to of some areas of the MFS and CFS having access to equipment for the extraction of persons from crashed vehicles. In earlier years I understand that some jaws of life units were associated with the MFS units. Is that still the case? Is there a combined effort to rationalise or deliver the best possible service from that coordination?

**Mr Bruce:** The current situation is that there is a very close liaison between the emergency services in South Australia. A joint committee with representatives from the Police Department, the State Emergency Service, St John, the MFS and the CFS meets regularly. It has put together a rescue resource directory which covers the entire area of South Australia, or as much as is accessible, and it ensures that the nearest resource, irrespective of which service has the equipment, responds to any emergency, accident or anything of that kind. In summary, it can be clearly shown that the greatest possible use is now being made of all emergency services rescue resources.

**Mr De LAINE:** What are the details, expected commencement and completion dates of the new metropolitan fire stations at Port Adelaide, Angle Park, Taperoo and Northfield?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Port Adelaide station on Grand Junction Road is scheduled for construction this current financial year and is estimated to cost \$887 000. Angle Park is scheduled for construction this financial year

and is estimated to cost \$690 000. The Largs North station, which is a relocation from Semaphore, is again scheduled for this financial year and is estimated to cost \$790 000. The Gepps Cross to Grand Junction Road, Northfield, station is scheduled this financial year at an estimated cost of \$787 000.

**Mr De LAINE:** Does the fire service intend to set up a complete hazardous materials register so that when it is called to a factory fire, for example, it is known what types of hazardous materials are kept on site?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** This matter was dealt with peripherally this afternoon, when I said that the major role at Commonwealth level is now being taken by the Minister with responsibility for labour rather than the Minister for Environment and Planning and, therefore, it has devolved on our Minister of Labour in this State and his department. So the Department of Labour, along with the MFS, is working on a scheme (known as the Hazchem scheme in other places) to ensure that there is completely identifiable labelling of hazardous materials.

**Mr De LAINE:** What is the department's policy in relation to the employment of women firefighters?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There has been a good deal of publicity about a young woman—Adrienne Clarke—who was recently recruited to the service. She was recruited on merit. A very stringent series of tests of both physical and mental capacity are given to all recruits. We are fortunate in that a large number of people come forward seeking employment in the fire services and they are graded according to merit based on those tests. Adrienne Clarke obtained employment because she was in the top 17 candidates. This is the first time that this has happened and it has necessitated a few changes at headquarters, such as the inside locking of showers and toilets. It has been undertaken, along with advice from the Equal Opportunities Adviser, and we are ensuring that all our procedures are in train so that this officer does not in any way suffer any discrimination because she is the first woman recruited to our numbers. I make the point again that she sought and gained employment on merit.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I refer to personnel matters within the Metropolitan Fire Service. It has been common knowledge that there has been some industrial disputation and a spate of appointment appeals at senior management level leading, it is suggested, to some reduction in the level of morale within the service. Is that now a matter of the past? Has it been resolved and, if so, in what way or does it remain a matter of some concern?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There have been industrial disputes within the fire service from time to time, but fairly recently and notably since the amalgamation of the two unions the level of disputation has dropped quite considerably. I have no details on the specific matter referred to, but perhaps the chief can help us out.

**Mr Bruce:** Under the promotion policy devised some years ago, which was based on merit promotion to officer ranks above station officer, an appeal system was introduced into the Act, and it is correct that there have been a number of appeals against appointments, but I believe this is to be expected because it was a departure from previous systems that were strictly service orientated. It is really a question of the rights of an individual being protected with the right of appeal. A number of appeals are currently outstanding before the appeal board and are being dealt with at the moment.

We have agreement with the union, following recent discussions, that there will be some modifications to the promotion system that I believe will help to overcome some

of the initial difficulties and perhaps will lead to a lessening in the number of appeals. The appeal system is part of the service and protects the rights of individuals and I think it is right and proper that it continues. I do not believe that it is having much effect on morale at all, but obviously those who do not get appointed will be concerned. I think that is really as far as it goes.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has implementation of the appeal system been at great cost to the service? Is it breaking new ground and therefore can one quantify it?

**Mr Bruce:** Legal costs last year amounted to about \$14 000 to deal with a number of appeals conducted at that time.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** At page 122 of the yellow book, under '1986-87 specific targets/objectives', it is stated that a revised part 27 of the Building Act Regulations is at present before the Building Advisory Committee for debate and subsequent public comment. Can the Minister indicate what is being discussed at that level? There is also reference to regulations for buildings in bushfire prone areas. Following questions I asked of the Minister this afternoon in relation to environment and planning, I ask what involvement the MFS has had in preparing those regulations? What ongoing involvement will there be with the MFS, recognising that there is, as I understand it, the responsibility of local government to consult with the CFS? Does that also apply in the section of the Hills, for example, that comes under the metropolitan area? Does that also apply with the MFS?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am wondering whether part 27 of the Building Act Regulations deals with regulations brought down by the Minister of Local Government under the Building Act to give power for local government to withhold building approval for structures seen to be a fire hazard. If I am correct, that regulation may still be before the Subordinate Legislation Committee for report to Parliament, but I understand that it has been gazetted. The Fire Prevention Division of the MFS has established a monitoring system whereby opinions sought by local councils under part 27 of the Building Act Regulations are processed.

Plans processed so far have amounted to 1 122 from 56 councils throughout the State. So it is keeping us reasonably busy. Fifty-nine of them have required written reports, which is a 5 per cent decrease in the number actually requiring a written report and a 19 per cent decrease in the number of plans actually stamped. So it appears that there is greater understanding of our requirements by consultants and architects. As to whether there is a similar requirement in relation to the MFS as to bushfire hazards in its area of responsibility, I am not too sure and will have to seek advice. I know that all the discussions that I have had have been on the CFS and its responsibilities under the new arrangements.

**Mr Bruce:** The only comment I can make is that currently there are discussions with the Building Advisory Committee, CFS officers and MFS officers in relation to this whole area. Certainly parts of this need to be addressed, identified and settled.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** At this stage there is no statutory requirement.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I refer to 'Issues/Trends' in relation to fire suppression and control where it is suggested that radio communication for the metropolitan area, including the Adelaide Hills, will be reviewed and upgraded to ensure compatibility with the CFS. I am aware that concerns have been expressed about that matter, and I would appreciate any further information that can be provided.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Mr Bruce has specific information on this matter.

**Mr Bruce:** Following discussions between the Director of the Country Fire Services and myself earlier this year, we have been able to move positively toward a joint committee with an independent chairman to consider the whole question of communications as they affect both fire services. The main area identified at present relates to radio communications. We propose that there be a system compatible to both fire services and, hopefully, integrated so that whichever fire service attends we will be able to work on the same frequency and respond to the same points of control. That will be applicable throughout the State as well as in metropolitan Adelaide. The committee has met on a number of occasions and is presently interviewing applicants for the position of communications engineer. That person will be involved jointly with the CFS and the MFS and will be responsible to the Director and myself for working towards this common communication set up.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I cannot see the matter raised mentioned under specific targets or objectives. When do you hope to have this implemented?

**Mr Bruce:** We have set some initial objectives for the plan to be fully developed by 1 July 1988. We have also asked the committee to examine urgent problems, some of which we hope will be solved and the solutions implemented before the coming bushfire season. Most of those things will be fine tuning to ensure that we are better prepared. In terms of a long-term plan, there will be joint costs involved by which we hope that in the end we will have a much more cost effective situation because, as you would appreciate, up until about three years ago both fire services were working independently and in different directions in terms of their radio communications.

We anticipate that we will be moving towards a common system and have the plan completed by 1988. Implementation of that plan will be progressive after that time according to how the groups are phased in.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I note \$168 000 for communication systems, \$45 000 of which is to be for communication equipment in the country. Is the Minister able to identify where that expenditure will take place and also say what are the components of the \$19 000 for rescue equipment and how that equipment will be utilised, etc.?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The proposed figure of \$168 000 includes the following: second phase of upgrading the metropolitan radio networks as recommended by the consultant; two concentrators for the new fire stations at Port Adelaide and Largs North; radio base test equipment and spare; instant recall recorders for the communications centre; additional equipment for the command communication unit; and the first phase of the new radio control and turn-out equipment. The \$45 000 is for joint fire service repeater bases and radio telephone interconnections. If the Committee requires more specific information on these matters I will have to refer to my officers or get the information for the Committee. The \$19 000 is to purchase a Halmatro unit for the support tender—the jaws of life.

**Mr Bruce:** That is an additional unit. Because of the high cost of this equipment we can only afford to have it strategically placed, so that is what is being done: it is being placed at stations where we can provide effective cover throughout the metropolitan area and at certain strategic country stations, for example, Port Pirie. Main stations such as Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln will ultimately have this sort of equipment. With regard to the joint use of equipment by emergency services, there is now a distinct rationalisation occurring, as it should, and we are endeavouring to avoid duplication where another service has appropriate equipment.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Can the Minister explain the recurrent expenditure increase of \$2.06 million? In many cases it is the cost of inflation or an increase in the number of officers following the Cox Report, but are there any other charges or inclusions at variance with previous practice?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The figures I have do not quite coincide with what the honourable member has put to me, although the reasons for the various changes can be made absolutely clear. I will ask Mr Treagus to give the Committee that information.

**Mr Treagus:** The major areas of the increase of \$2.046 million comprise, first, the carryover effect of salaries partly paid during last year. Predominant among them was the last phase of the Cox manning, recruitment for which commenced last February and became fully operative in July this year, so there was a substantial carryover of wages there. There was also a Treasury approved wage factor escalation for the current year of 4.5 per cent flat throughout the year. Further, there was superannuation in line with the 3 per cent approved by Cabinet in recent times. That will have only a minor effect this year, the major effect occurring next year. There are the normal annual increments related to career structure of the staff and debt servicing, and the balance is inflation on consumable items and minor plant. They are offset by increasing our fees right across the board in line with Government policy and, hopefully, increasing the Commonwealth Government rebate.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will add two points to that. It has been necessary to increase by \$40 000 our provision for vehicle replacement and, in addition, there is an amount of \$40 000 to cover the appointment of a dangerous substances officer. This is part of the necessity to advise private enterprise and Government agencies on storage requirements, and so on, for dangerous substances, so that salary and the support necessary for that officer demands an additional \$40 000.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I note that there is some capital to be set aside for operating the tower headquarters. Was this tower part of the new building complex or was it built prior to this? Why is there a necessity, if it is part of the new complex, for capital works to be set aside for upgrading?

**Mr Bruce:** That is presumably because of a drainage problem that occurred at the base of the tower. There was quite a major problem that necessitated the tower area being put out of commission for a period, the brickwork being lifted and the necessary repairs and changes being made. Anything else in regard to that would only be minor work within the tower and changes in the general layout. Overall, that training complex exceeded our expectations in every other regard.

I have just had my attention drawn to the fact that the breathing apparatus training area of the tower—and it is all part of the same complex, so if we are talking about the tower we are talking about the breathing apparatus complex as well—requires an upgrade of the air exhaust system and drying and chalking rooms on the ground floor, which reminds me that there were some problems of dampness at the base with the constant use of hose jets inside the tower. I think that these were areas that even the builders and architects had not really expected to be as bad as they were.

**Mr De LAINE:** Can the Minister give reasons why this year's proposed recurrent expenditure on fire cause investigations referred to on page 115 is 30 per cent less than for last year?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will get that specific information for the honourable member.

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

Works and Services—Country Fire Services Board,  
\$1 100 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

Mr D.S. Baker

Mr M.R. De Laine

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr M.D. Rann

Mr D.J. Robertson

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD, Minister of Emergency Services.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr A.D. Macarthur, Director.

Mr B.M. Barker, Administration Manager.

Mr A.G. Ferris, Executive Officer.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The \$1.1 million to be replacement capital or made available for the replacement of units is, first, a commendable move to satisfy the need for upgrading equipment in the field. The Auditor-General, at page 252 of his report, notes in the accounts of the Country Fire Services that \$833 000 is pre-committed on an order. I assume that is an order for equipment which will be covered in total by the \$1.1 million, and that there is still some to go round; is that the case?

The Treasurer has indicated a capital expenditure of \$4.790 million, and the \$1.1 million is certainly in that. I presume that the balance of the \$4.790 million is recurrent funds which are contained within the miscellaneous lines at page 55. I believe that the claim for capital benefit to the Country Fire Services is erroneous in the Treasurer's document, unless the whole of the recurrent funding associated with the CFS is to be met out of capital funds.

**Mr Macarthur:** I do not have the documents in front of me, but \$1.1 million in capital loan funds will be taken up later in this financial year to enable payment for bulk orders of appliances currently being built or to be further ordered in the early months of 1988.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In the figures I have in front of me there is the capital allocation of \$1.1 million for replacement; an additional \$1.5 million from general subsidies; then \$830 000 carry-over from 1986-87.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The figures contained on page 55 under the miscellaneous line and the \$1.1 million referred to on page 185 of the Treasurer's document certainly add up to the \$4.790 million, but in the capital works program the total amount is shown as capital expenditure against the CFS. I believe that that is an error. The total expenditure figure for the CFS is the same, and that is not to be denied, but it does perpetuate a position which might be misunderstood unless it is drawn to your attention.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am sure that the honourable member is correct, and I thank him for drawing it to our attention. We will find out how the error occurred.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is indicated that the \$1.1 million which will be utilised as shown is the first sum to be made available in a four-year program. I am led to

believe from statements made elsewhere that the total for that four-year period for replacement of equipment is \$5 million. Is that a firm commitment? Will the program of ensuring that units in the field are less than 20 years old—which was to have been effected by this financial year but which has now been extended until 1991-92—have Government assistance guaranteed for that period of time, so that it can be effectively concluded?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Yes, I can be pretty confident in giving that assurance to the honourable member and to the Committee.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Is it clear that any of that distribution of funds will assist in getting some of the unroadworthy vehicles back on the road or will that be funded from elsewhere, or are the local governing bodies expected to be responsible for getting such vehicles back on the road in the short term until they are replaced?

**Mr Macarthur:** The loan fund program, generally speaking, is the result of the board's resolve to look at all the appliances in our State, or the bulk of them—some 700 odd—of which a high percentage are in a not too roadworthy condition. As the honourable member has stated, it has been determined by the board that preference will be given to new or good second-hand units. There is also a subsidy allocation to councils for maintenance, and we hope that money will be used on repairing those vehicles that are not fit to be on the roads.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the board indicate to councils its expectation in relation to that matter against the background that a number of councils appear to be using the fact that some vehicles are unroadworthy (albeit that they need only a relatively small sum to put them in roadworthy condition) as a means of rationalising the number of units in their council areas?

**Mr Macarthur:** Taking the latter part of the question first, there is no decision by the board in any way to rationalise the vehicles that are currently in the fleet. It has been pointed out to councils that in a lot of places there is an oversupply of equipment. Where they have vehicles that are not in first class order for an emergency service the obvious answer is to have one better one rather than two or three that are out of order. In one way, it can be assumed that it is a policy of enforcing a rationalisation, but we can well afford that. There are far too many vehicles in some areas, but a shortage in others. We do not have the ability, unfortunately, to distribute the vehicles, fairly and equitably around the State.

In relation to the earlier question, we hope that the allocation of subsidy moneys at the end of December would be used by councils to correct deficiencies in any vehicles. That money—somewhere in the vicinity of \$440 000—will be paid to local government councils at the end of this calendar year, and can be appropriated to whatever they wish, it is on a per-brigade basis.

**Mr RANN:** Referring to the allocation of resources to training, I know that the CFS, apart from a technological upgrading in recent years after Ash Wednesday, has undertaken a major campaign of upgrading its training programs. What progress has been made in terms of throughput of volunteers to increase the number of volunteers receiving training under the auspices of the CFS?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** In 12 months the number going through the program has doubled: it has gone from just over 1 000 last year to just over 2 000 this year. We are going from \$236 000 to \$290 500 in money generally allocated under training. So, the additional money is there and is being well spent. We are getting very good results from it. That can only mean a much higher morale out there in

the brigades and also a greater technical capacity to deal with the situations as they arise.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The local council and CFS have had a fairly close relationship over a long period. In fact, the local governing bodies have a particular part to play as the Act exists at present. I am aware that one of the big difficulties in determining the future of the CFS from a funding point of view is the question whether the local governing body as a whole wants to maintain a direct input or whether there should be some new funding arrangement, taking up perhaps a more positive income from insurable property than is currently being made available from the insurance companies, specifically since a number of insurance companies have moved interstate, and some offshore, for their operations.

On a number of occasions, local government has expressed the belief that it is paying too dearly and that too many people who have an insurable risk are not playing the full part that they should play in providing funds for both the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Services. Is this matter near resolve, does the Minister intend that the local governing body will continue to have a direct input, or is the matter still in course of resolution with local government?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** This is a problem that is common to the funding of both fire services. There have been calls, particularly from the insurance companies, but also from time to time from local government, for a radical restructuring of the way in which the funding operates. In addition—the honourable member is right—the present situation is one where those who are responsible for taking out fire insurance pay a disproportionate amount of the total allocation from the community, which goes into the effort of fire prevention and suppression. So, yes, I can confirm that the Government has been examining alternative schemes.

This examination is well advanced. If it is successful in coming up with a system that we think bears further examination, we will naturally want to discuss it with the honourable member, with local government and with the community generally. We are not at that point yet, but I can confirm that we have been examining this. In that examination I do not know that we are doing anything that is very novel. I imagine that every Government that has operated the Treasury benches in the past 15 years has made some examination—in some cases, in some detail—of the possibility of generating an alternative system, if only because it has been urged by, amongst others, the insurance companies.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. Prior to discussing Country Fire Services, we dealt, under the Metropolitan Fire Service, with radio communication and the rationalisation and cooperation which is taking place. The area of cooperation is not the same in the sense of the broad acres. Is the Minister or his staff able to indicate whether the rationalisation of communication in the field of the Country Fire Services is part of the total consideration and whether it will be possible to get a common frequency or common form of radio communication which provides for a better integrated service both inside and outside the district should units be, of their own volition or on call, required to go to another area?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I will ask Mr Macarthur to answer that question.

**Mr Macarthur:** In answer to the question on Country Fire Services communications, the proposal is to put together a master plan for the total State communications so that there is total integration of the radio networks right across

the State and so that, whether it is a CFS vehicle or an MFS vehicle, it will have radio communication not only to its local base but hopefully through a network to headquarters in Adelaide. A total system will be planned and within the existing resources out there by reallocation of frequencies we should be able to have a first class radio network in place at very little cost. There is some cost which is identified by the Chief Officer of the MFS. There is an allocation in our budget for a salary component of an engineer and members will see there are also some deferrals of communication equipment until such time as the master plan has been adopted.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** If I could refer to one of the capital works program that involves the police communication centre but go no further than that, it is to be noted that there are police radio towers across the State. Have discussions taken place or is there likely to be a compatible use of existing radio towers to the benefit of the Country Fire Services or the Metropolitan Fire Service in the longer term or will the style of communication be entirely different? I have in mind the circumstances which exist in some other countries where for true emergency situations, particularly on Ash Wednesday-type days, mutual aid packages are put together where there is total communication responsibility within all services providing a service to the emergency which has arisen.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Mr Macarthur will answer that question.

**Mr Macarthur:** I can answer that by simply saying that the master plan that we are putting together will involve towers that are in existence right across the State, whether they are telecommunication towers or those used by some other agency at this point in time. Until the master plan is put on paper and finalised, I cannot give an undertaking that there may not be a need for another tower somewhere, but it is designed around the use of existing facilities and it is all done in close cooperation with the Government Management Board Communications Committee.

So, I can assure the Committee that a lot of common sense is being applied to the new system and we have already designated channels for emergencies like Ash Wednesday with a common frequency which can be used. This is already in place right across the State in the CFS vehicles.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Regarding the subsidisation of equipment, there have been two particular components in the minds of people associated with the CFS in recent times. One is the subsidisation of the equipment and the payment involving insurance, telephone lines, land lines, etc. More recently, there has been the subsidisation of equipment packs where people have been required to take a complete pack rather than a replacement part from within an existing pack. Is the Minister or the Director able to indicate how those two areas of subsidisation are to be conducted in this financial year or into the future and, more particularly, whether there has been any relief to those units which have been able to demonstrate that they require, say, a \$25 piece of equipment to make up a \$3 500 kit but do not want to buy the kit to replace the \$25 piece of equipment?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will ask the Director to reply.

**Mr Macarthur:** In terms of the bulk purchasing arrangements that the board has made, considerable savings have been achieved by purchase in bulk lots—about 40 per cent to 45 per cent on retail prices. There is a shortage of equipment on a State-wide basis which will absorb all the bulk purchases that we can make with the money that we have allocated on which to pay subsidy. If a brigade needs \$25 worth, I assume that the brigade should purchase that

at the best possible price because no subsidy would be available. The cost of administering the subsidy system for small one-off purchases was far greater than the savings that were made by the end user.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Director and I were at the commissioning of a new unit recently when the Chairman of the Stirling District Council came forward with a new idea in regard to funding and he went to pains to indicate that it was his idea and not that of the council, but I would be interested in the Minister's reaction. He suggested that a fire service levy be collected by local government; that the levy could include a basic sum for each property and a further amount based on the value of the assets to be protected from fire; that money collected through the levy would be kept in a special fund and used only for firefighting services; that it would replace the money currently provided out of council funds to support the CFS; and that it would mean the abolition of the present fire levy on insurance policies. He believed that the proposed levy should not be collected by either insurance companies or the State Government and that local government was the appropriate body to collect and administer the fund. The level of payment would relate to the value of the property to be protected. He concluded that the amount of the levy should be determined by the councils concerned in conjunction with an advisory committee of the CFS. Has any consideration been given to such a proposal or any proposal similar to that put forward?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I would be surprised if the people who are doing the work to which I referred earlier for the Government had not considered a system like that, because the general outlines of the scheme are, I guess, the obvious replacement for the interesting mixture of funding that we currently have. I would have thought that perhaps the first set of objections that one might hear in relation to such a scheme would be from local government itself, which might object to acting as the collection agency for such a scheme. It is interesting that the gentleman to whom the honourable member refers was at pains to say that he was not committing his elected colleagues to the scheme but that it was simply his own suggestion.

It is one that could possibly work. Most of these schemes can probably work with community support if there is confidence on the part of the community that what is being levied is reasonable and, of course, if it is believed that all the funds are going into the purposes for which they have been identified in the first place. There remain questions relating to the collection agency and whether local government would see that as its role; what component of the charge would have to go towards the local council's charges for collecting the funds, since I assume that it would not necessarily believe that it should be a fairly godparent to the whole community at this point; and so on. All I can say is that what was put to the honourable member is a scheme that may well work. Whether local government would cooperate as being the collection agency is something that could only be negotiated once such a scheme was approved for direct negotiation with them.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Earlier today I referred on a couple of occasions to the bushfire prone areas SDP. As I stated, I am not privy to what is in that SDP. I have not seen it, but I am aware of concern that has been expressed by local councils in regard to liability. I mentioned that this afternoon. One of the matters that I believe is raised is the absolute need for consultation between the CFS and local government when approval is sought for a development to take place within this area covered by the SDP. The uncertainty that I have is whether the CFS is in the form of the

local CFS or whether these discussions are taking place with the CFS at a regional level or whether it is with head office.

Whatever the case, I can imagine that there will be quite a considerable demand placed on the CFS in regard to that ongoing consultation, and I wonder whether any special consideration has been given to extra resources, and so on, to help implement that process.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We already have bushfire prevention staff appointed. They have been trained, they are located at the CFS Stirling office, and they have had direct input into the preparation of the supplementary development plan. The answer is that it is at the regional level that consultation has taken and will continue to take place. I would not anticipate that it would provide a large resource drain on the total resources available to the service, because these people are in place.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I suggest that there would be a considerable drain. It depends entirely on the number of applications that come forward, but it is a large area. The area under the SDP is large, and I imagine that there would be a significant amount of time required if that consultation is to take place. I do not see it as being a cut and dried situation and I would imagine that there would be a need for ongoing consultation between the particular local government authority and the CFS personnel.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I have no doubt that these people will be busy. In appointing five officers, we have followed the recommendations of the Lewis report. It is a matter of 'taste and see': as we go along will adjust the resources according to the job identified, according to the demand but, at this stage, all we have to go on is the mature consideration of the people who were involved in the Lewis report.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** There has been some criticism in the past 18 months that the size of CFS headquarters staff has grown and that the funds put into the management level have been at the expense of subsidisation in the field. That can be questioned on the figures in a number of respects but, more specifically, have we got to the stage where headquarters staff has grown as much as it will grow or is there likely to be further cost associated with the reorganisation of the force?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will ask Mr Macarthur to address himself to that. I guess there is an invitation to some crystal ball gazing, and whatever recommendations he and his staff may come up with will be subject both to the board and the Government but, within those parameters, I am happy for him to address himself to the question.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Perhaps he might expand to indicate the benefits or otherwise of the increase.

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

**Mr Macarthur:** First, the CFS as it is now has just completed the development of a corporate plan. I will come to the question this way, if I may. In that corporate plan we have tried to crystal ball gaze five years hence with some of the changes that are contemplated: changes in legislation and the changes in responsibilities and accountabilities of CFS staff. If all things happen, that corporate plan has identified a need in a couple of instances for further additional staff somewhere down the track if certain legislative changes take place. In the interim, I would see that we have been very successful in recruiting some very competent staff, who have fitted into the organisation well.

While that may look excessive in terms of what was there, say, 2½ to three years ago, I can assure the member that the organisation needed some skills in certain areas and we are fortunate to have those people now on board. The organisation is running fairly smoothly. In terms of com-

parison with the subsidy moneys, those moneys are set aside within the legislation—\$2.675 million—and we cannot use them for other things. It is a grant by Treasury and that money must be appropriated for subsidy moneys to councils. Although the total budget of CFS has increased in terms of staff numbers and their salaries, subsidy money is set aside as a separate item.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Finally, can the Minister or Director indicate to the Committee a description of the prototype vehicle that will be available to the service in the not too distant future?

**Mr Macarthur:** In conjunction with a committee basically of volunteers from various regions around the State we have tried to design an appliance that will be suitable to the wishes of all the people. It is a fairly simple and basic appliance that has been produced. We have had tenders for 26 and the first ones have already been delivered to Kalangadoo, one to Roxby, and one to the West Coast somewhere. They carry 3 000 litres of water; they have a diesel powered pump on the back; they are a basic fire appliance with few frills attached, but they are built with safety and crew protection in mind. They have diesel motors to overcome the vapourisation problems with present day fuels.

The next run of appliances for which the additional funding is required is for a vehicle of 2 000 litre carrying capacity. It is of similar design: a basic fire unit to go out to country areas to replace those appliances that are not in such good condition. There is a 3 000 litre and a 2 000 litre carrying capacity unit. I shall be pleased to post a sketch plan of those vehicles.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Can the Director indicate what is the cost in the field of these units?

**Mr Macarthur:** The 3 000 litre carrying capacity unit, allowing for a small amount of money for design, development and preparation of the plans, costs about \$84 000. As for the 2 000 litre carrying capacity, we believe there will be considerable savings because we will be buying more and we have asked the manufacturer to sharpen his pencils and I hope the cost will be \$12 000 to \$15 000 less for a marginally smaller vehicle.

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

Police, \$158 191 000

**Chairman:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson

**Members:**

Mr D.S. Baker

Mr M.R. De Laine

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr M.D. Rann

Mr D.J. Robertson

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witnesses:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Minister of Emergency Services.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D.A. Hunt, Commissioner of Police.

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

Mr J.A. Humphries, Manager, Resources.

Mr F.E. Bowering, Chief Finance Officer.

Mr M.D. Wall, Chief Resource Analyst.

Mr A.R. Cunningham, Police Complaints Authority



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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I think that the general resources of the police come into programs 1 and 2, both the crime detection and crime prevention matters. The yellow book at page 102 under '1987-88 Specific Targets/Objectives' states:

To continue to monitor the department's capacity to investigate the relationships between organised crime and possible corruption of public officials and private enterprises.

In 1986-87 it stated:

... has been reviewed and is continually being monitored.

Are the police in this sense referred to or looked on as public officials? If that be the case, how effective can Caesar to Caesar be in the sense of doing that monitoring? I have the greatest respect for the South Australian Police Force, but recent circumstances regrettably have put a question mark over some aspects of the force, and it is on that basis that I ask how the force can be Caesar to Caesar and whether the recent actions of the National Crime Authority have in any way dented the opportunity or possibility of that strategy being met?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I can probably answer the question in three different ways, all of which would be complementary to each other. The first is that there are various internal procedures in the Police Department which have been in place for quite some considerable time—and I will ask the Commissioner to expand on them in a few moments. Secondly, the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence, with which we have extensive links, has particular responsibilities in this area and is able to bring a different sort of insight, to approach the problem from a different direction, and also give some further assurance to the community that any possibility (and in our society there is always the possibility) of corruption by public officials, whether they be in the police area or in any other public area, is kept under very close surveillance and that any suspicions or complaints are immediately investigated. This additional input of resources, both in the physical sense and also in relation to the amount of brain power and intelligence that is available, is important to us.

Finally, there is the setting up of the Police Complaints Authority, where people have an entirely independent means whereby they can bring forward complaints where they feel that complaints that they have brought forward have not been dealt with and that has been quite deliberate and improper, or where they feel that they have been unfairly treated in the way in which those complaints have been taken from that point. I am quite happy with the procedures that we currently have, but I will look to the Commissioner to say something further about how the Police Department, from an internal point of view, handles this matter.

**Mr Hunt:** I refer to what we might call a quality assurance program which really comes under the formal name of the Policy Audit Section. This unit is directly responsible to me and is staffed by quite senior officers. It originated some three years ago and has been going through some testing times. It has been involved, on a trial and error basis, in getting itself to a position where it is now a very viable and sensible unit. It has been looking to model itself on the overseas experience that we have had, tailored, of course, to fit our peculiar circumstance.

The emphasis of this type of audit is consultation within the department, and it checks spot audits and gives policy guidelines on auditing practices. I refer not only to audits in the sense of cash flow audits but audits on the matter of policy to see whether or not policies that are adopted formally by the department are being complied with—a kind

of corruption seeker, a corruption of systems, if you like to put it that way.

It would be worthwhile, because it is such an important thing, to enumerate the special functions of the unit. They are: to carry out inspections and/or audits in all areas of the department to ensure that policies, including General Orders, regulations and set procedures, are being followed; to report to the Commissioner on the adequacy of current policy, including General Orders, regulations and set procedures, in respect to eliminating corruption and improper practices in the department; to report to the Commissioner on any remedial action that may be necessary for current policy to be executed successfully, either in particular areas or department-wide; to act as consultant on policy execution at the invitation of area managers; to ensure in post-implementation reviews that new systems or procedures or alterations to existing systems or procedures arising in the functions above achieve their objectives in so far as policy is concerned; to ensure that new systems or procedures do not conflict with policy and to make recommendations on any changes that may be necessary to ensure that they comply with policy; research and identify potential corruptive influences in the community and recommend to the Commissioner ways of combating those influences; and to ensure a policy library is assembled for all areas of the department.

That, in part, leads on to a quality assurance system which exists within the department and which is being developed to a very high degree at the moment. It also relates to the facility mentioned earlier of the interaction between our department and the National Crime Authority.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Following the comment about the creation of the Police Complaints Authority (and I believe that this has been well received publicly) there would appear to be in police management some difficulty in determining when matters of concern should be directed to the officer and when they should be considered in-house. For example, the member for Coles recently requested information about unfinished files at Holden Hill and Darlington, the suggestion being that there were 10 000 files in each place which had not been satisfactorily concluded, purely and simply because of a lack of resources. The question by my colleague to the Commissioner was in turn referred to the Complaints Division. I question whether that was a complaint against the police rather than a complaint against the system where the resources were unable to cope. There have been other examples of like nature.

The question really is: do the police actually know what are the right questions or issues to be directed to the Commissioner, and does the Commissioner believe that some of the things being directed should have been more properly determined in house? Where some of the problems that I have drawn to the attention of both the Minister and the police have been followed up with a copy of a letter from the police to the complaints department saying, in effect, 'I submit this under the relevant section. If you believe that you have a responsibility for this particular issue...' that begs the question that there is a doubt that it should have been directed there, but was so directed, with an abundance of caution. That is the basis of my question.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** That seems to be very much directed to the Commissioner, so I will ask him to respond.

**Mr Hunt:** It depends to a great degree on the perception of who was asking or answering the question as to whether or not there was a doubt in the mind. The principles for consideration of these things are fairly well documented and very broadly, without knowing any of the specifics, matters of complaint from the community quite rightly

should be referred to the Police Complaints Authority. However, there are many other matters which do not arise as complaints from the community but are detected by our own system and do not fall within the ambit of the Police Complaints Authority; and there are other occasions when because of the nature of a complaint arrangements are made with the authority. I am not aware of any generalised view that there is a dilemma in making a decision about who is responsible for investigating particular kinds of incidents. It might be an individual viewpoint, perhaps, but I cannot take it any further than that.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** It might be appropriate if I invite Mr Cunningham to say whether there are any real glitches in the system.

**Mr Cunningham:** I do not know about glitches, but the particular matter raised affords quite a good illustration of the interface between the Police Complaints Authority and the Police Department. The Act which establishes my office, the Police Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings Act 1985, makes it quite clear that citizens have the right to make complaints not only about the conduct of police officers but also about policies and procedures of the Police Department. When a complaint is received, under section 23 of the Act I must decide as the Police Complaints Authority whether I will investigate it or whether I will refer it to the Internal Investigations Branch for a decision. I have no discretion about whether or not I will register a police complaint. If a matter is referred to me, whatever view I take, under the Act I must register it.

The particular matter mentioned was raised with the police, which also has no discretion about notifying me that it has received a police complaint for me to register. The issue that was open to debate was whether in my discretion I should make a determination that I would investigate the complaint under section 23 or leave the investigation to the Internal Investigations Branch of the Police Force. I decided to leave it with the IIB. I do not think that there is any major jurisdictional difficulty between the Police Department and me. There are individual cases, as always, when a jurisdictional line can be drawn. We have had two cases where, if you had to decide whether they were on one side of the fence or the other, the complainant was walking right along the top and refused to overbalance on to one side or the other, but that is worked out in the system.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I refer to 'Program 2—Crime Detection and Investigation Services' on page 51 of the Estimates of Payments. According to page 102 of the yellow book, under '1987-88 specific targets/objectives', one initiative is to continue providing the public with an opportunity to share information with the department regarding illegal drugs. The Minister will recall that questions have been asked in the House about the degree with which some members of the public might feel ill at ease in revealing information on drugs. My question is quite broad. How effective has the notification scheme been, and how effective has Operation NOAH been as a total operation? Have there been any events in the knowledge of the police or the Minister which may have caused embarrassment of either a physical or some other form to any person who has cooperated with the operation, particularly in relation to informants?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** In relation to that last specific question, I have no knowledge of this, but I will ask the Commissioner to comment before discussing Operation NOAH.

**Mr Hunt:** There has been a number of telephone calls even though the line has been operative for only a short time. As at 21 August, 30 of the telephone calls received

have been assessed as requiring action, and as a result one person has been arrested for possessing heroin and three have been charged with cannabis offences. I have no information that anyone has been embarrassed or compromised in any way.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I have a good deal of information about Operation NOAH, but to save the Committee's time I will convey it to the honourable member directly by letter or simply give him the report directly. In relation to arrests and reports arising out of the most recent Operation NOAH, 128 persons were reported or arrested for 210 drug offences up until 13 January 1987, and 179 incident reports were still being investigated at that time. From 31 January to 1 March 1987 a further 12 persons were reported or arrested for 20 drug offences. National figures to 31 January 1987 reveal that 343 persons were arrested or reported for 635 drug offences. There is a good deal of additional detail but, in terms of reports and arrests, Operation NOAH is very worth while.

**Mr RANN:** Will the Government and the police consider introducing another firearms amnesty, perhaps over the summer season, so that people with unlicensed or illegal firearms can come forward with immunity? I ask this question because of concerns raised with me at my electorate office about a series of indiscriminate killings in recent months both in Australia and overseas. Obviously, there is considerable agitation about the illegal use of firearms.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Yes, I can indicate that there is a decision, part of a long-standing arrangement between Police Commissioners around the country, for a national firearms amnesty to be held from 1 October to 31 December 1988. My earlier advice was that there was to be one closer to this date than that. I will have that information checked as to whether that should be 1987 and not 1988.

**Mr RANN:** What action is being taken to secure national uniform gun laws in Australia?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Without going into great detail, last week when the Minister of Correctional Services and I were at a conference in Melbourne considering the matter of suicides and deaths, both in general custody and police custody, of people of both Caucasian and Aboriginal descent, the Victorian Minister, Mr Race Mathews, took the opportunity to raise the matter of a uniform firearms code. This discussion was joined by Ministers from Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland. At least one Commonwealth Minister was present, as well. It has been agreed that we will nominate to the Victorian Minister officers who can work together on a proposition to be placed before the Police Ministers' Council, which is meeting in November of this year. Earlier I think that I indicated to the Committee that I asked for the matter to be placed on the November agenda. We are now in a position where there should be a quite specific proposition before us when we meet in November.

**Mr RANN:** There is considerable community interest, indeed excitement, about the Neighbourhood Watch scheme. I understand that 30 Neighbourhood Watch areas have been established. Do the police have a further program of expansion for this scheme in mind, or will further areas be started as a result of local initiative? Will consideration be given to extending Neighbourhood Watch to cover local schools following recent fires in schools?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I may defer to the Commissioner on one or two of these matters. Local initiative is always involved in Neighbourhood Watch. Typically, a group of people put together a proposition and come to us to set up a Neighbourhood Watch in their area. This seems to be the sensible way to go about it because it indicates a good

deal of local support for the initiative and that is the only way that it will work. At the Federal election, while I was giving out how to vote cards at the Christie Downs Primary School, there was a gentleman collecting signatures for a Neighbourhood Watch in one of the local areas.

There is a limit to how quickly we can expand this program, because we seek a degree of sponsorship or support of the program for the printing of material and that sort of thing. We have been very pleased with the level of sponsorship that we have received so far, but it is not a bottomless pool. I do not have specific information before me about additional areas to be brought immediately into the scheme, except that in country areas there are firm propositions for Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Ceduna.

Murray Bridge and Port Augusta have already applied and, rather than taking up the time of the Committee, I can get that information for the honourable member. I am not aware of exactly how the school system works into the Neighbourhood Watch system, and I will defer to the Commissioner on that; he may wish to make additional points.

**Mr Hunt:** As a general overview, interest from the community is the driving force of the Neighbourhood Watch program, with police guidance and limited control. There is a waiting list of some 50 groups which have made application to be registered for Neighbourhood Watch programs. If all goes well, by the middle of next year we could have about 90 units installed throughout the metropolitan and country areas.

*Apropos* of some kind of school watch program, I have been in consultation this week with the Director-General of Education and, as a result of that, one of my senior officers, Mr Steinle and people from the Education Department and the Department of Housing and Construction have been discussing the matter of school security and considering whether or not there is an avenue for some kind of incorporation of school security into a Neighbourhood Watch kind of program. That is at the preliminary stage, because it is a separate kind of initiative and not one which should be introduced to the detriment of the overall Neighbourhood Watch program. However, there are possibilities, and that is being discussed actively.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is noted in the yellow book that there has been a review of community policing and that there will be an endeavour to seek to implement the changes identified as necessary as a result of that review. For 'community policing' I often use the term 'police presence', because that is what I believe it is about—police presence within the community. There is certainly some criticism that the police presence is not as good as it might be.

For example, there are documents available relating to recent events at Renmark where cars have been interfered with outside the police office, which is no longer manned at night but which provides sleeping quarters for police officers. There have been burglaries immediately opposite the old police station, and letters from the Corporation of Renmark through my colleague the member for Chaffey highlighted these concerns. I know they occur elsewhere. In my own district the congregation of younger people, particularly bikies, around hotels and the like is cause for concern; there is the throwing of bottles and hooliganism and vandalism in many areas of the State.

I notice that part of the program is for the police, apparently, to be used as gatherers of funds, because they are expected to raise almost an additional \$1.7 million by way of expiation fees and the like. It would appear to be counterproductive to an appreciation of the police presence in

the community if they are to be tax gatherers rather than providing a police presence as such. Did the review pick up any of these concerns amongst the public, and what is being done to enhance what I believe is a worthwhile program?

**Mr Hunt:** Could I expand a little on the true nature of the philosophy of community policing. It involves a little more than police being more visible. Community policing is a name given to what I call a suite of programs. The first thing that must be done is to develop a strategy for involving the community in self protection and the self motivated enhancement of crime prevention. In order to do that there must be rationalisation of the resources that exist at the time. We did that by dividing the community into various organised areas and by opening more police stations to give a greater beneficial identity to the police in the community in the 16 areas that now comprise the metropolitan area rather than the four or five larger bases that existed before.

Having done that, the driving force is the programs that are crime prevention based, such as the Neighbourhood Watch program, the Blue Light Discos, the School Liaison Committee, road safety groups, and so on. Some time after that was done on 2 January last year, a review was conducted to iron out any of the bugs that might have occurred organisationally: that matter is receiving attention at the moment. In fact, numerous changes are under consideration, or have been made. I emphasise that there is no diminution of the original concept; rather, there are refinements to what had already been implemented as the major community policing strategy.

My department does not have a stated expectation to realise any particular sums through expiation notices: rather, road safety is one of our major functions. It just happens that the traffic infringement notices and expiations are the methods for dealing with that, from the departmental point of view.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In the documents at pages 101 to 102, we find a number of costs associated with the police service and related to the 38-hour week, inflation and so forth. The yellow book (page 112) indicates that there is to be a reduced number of cadets, which is shown as an offset against those other costs. At a time when there appears to be a new surge of resignations from the forces for reasons other than invalidity or age—and one only has to read the most recent edition of the *Police Journal* to see the rather vehement tones in which some people write relative to their resignation from the force—can we afford not to keep up the flow of cadets to provide sufficient forces in the field?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Mr Hughes has some information for the Committee about some of the figures quoted.

**Mr Hughes:** Regarding the reduction in the number of cadets as offsetting the costs of the 38-hour week, and so on, in 1987-88 there was an unusually high number of cadets because of the high attrition rate in the previous financial year and to bring the strength up to an additional 140 personnel for the 38-hour week. Once the force returned to its approved active strength and the numbers were recruited for the 38-hour week, the number of cadets returned to normal, sufficient to maintain the approved active strength. So that certainly does not refer to any reduction in the overall strength of the force.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** There appears to be another surge in resignations, as there was in April-May 1986, before the review of general policing was undertaken. The position seemed to settle down, because there was an expectation that a number of problems identified would be corrected. From announcements, for example, in the *Police Journal* over the past two months, and specifically this week, it is my perception that there is a further dive in morale and

that more people are seeking to leave the force for reasons other than age or invalidity. If that is the case, and if there is the likelihood of that occurring, I suggest that we will need an increase in the number of cadets and not a reduction as is contemplated in 1987-88.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood:** If the assumptions were correct, the honourable member's conclusion would obviously follow, but I believe that the statistics that we have suggest that that impressionistic conclusion is not borne out by the figures which Mr Hughes has.

**Mr Hughes:** The current recruitment program, as I indicated previously, is based on the expected attrition rate, and we usually work two years ahead in our cadet numbers that are calculated. While the training program is for a 12 month period, we normally try to project attrition two years ahead and at this stage the numbers appear to have settled down on the situation in 1985-86. Although we are predicting about 160 attritions from the active strength of the force and have recruited against that, our indications for the first couple of months of this financial year are that that prediction is not short of the mark at this stage and we are recruiting appropriately.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is a matter that will unfold as the months go by. Concerning duty resources, considerable concern has been expressed about the vaccination program and precisely who is to be vaccinated. How will the 600 of the front line force to be vaccinated be selected? There is also concern that the period of time between doses may or may not have influenced the effectiveness of the vaccination program, and that concern extends beyond the police into the nursing profession, where it has been suggested that some nurses who have been vaccinated may not have the degree of immunity that was expected, because of the variation in the time between the doses. Has there been a monitoring of the police in that regard?

At the same time, instances are quoted of traffic units having to wait in the police station because the car is not available. The number of cars directly available for the number of units to work on them has been reduced. Recently, it has been suggested that there are insufficient batons to equip completely a watch or a team: the figure quoted is five for eight rather than eight for eight in one instance. The question of the cost of raincoats, whether they are necessary, and whether they are too dear has also been raised. I consider that these matters concern duty resources. Have they been considered and what is the situation?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood:** I shall refer to the Commissioner some points of detail but, on the subject of vaccination, my information is that the initial program was for 175, that additional funds were approved in May 1987 for an additional 383, and that further funds were approved in July this year for an additional 600. That made a total of 1 158 officers to be vaccinated. There is then to be an additional 200 who will be vaccinated as a result of transfer into high risk areas. I will ask the Commissioner to explain the procedure whereby these people are identified. There could be a problem, because it has been brought to my notice that there have been several cases of people in high risk areas who, having had their initial vaccination and been transferred to another area, considered that it was not necessary to have the follow up vaccination and the actual follow-up procedure.

In our view that follow up should certainly have taken place. These are being checked to find out whether now they have to be vaccinated *ab initio* because, after a certain period the booster does not have effect, although I understand the numbers in that category would be very low. As the honourable member raised other matters, I will ask the

Commissioner to give a brief response, because time is short.

**Mr Hunt:** The traffic function is one of the matters being considered and improved under the metropolitan reorganisation review to which we referred earlier. I indicated that there were a number of issues that were either in train or being remedied. That is one that is in train at the moment. A pilot program is about to be commenced after discussions with the Police Association and the individual members in Region D, that is, the Holden Hill area. That is a move to remedy that situation. The Minister has already mentioned the batons. It is a matter of supply and training. As to raincoats, we have purchased 3 641 raincoats and 1 785 have so far been sold at a cost to police of \$91.85. Much concern has been expressed by members. However, as members have been advised, under the award their uniform allowance covers the cost of buying a raincoat and appropriate arrangements have been made for instructions to members to equip themselves with raincoats unless they have a specific exemption from doing so.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood:** We also have at the table information on handcuffs and torches, which are also part of the personal equipment and, if the honourable member would like specific details, they can be made available.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I wish to come back to the question I began to raise earlier about the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron. I understand that the job of performing search and rescue operations off the metropolitan foreshore is divided between a number of jurisdictions coordinated by the police. If there is a case of a missing boat of some kind, the normal procedure would be for the relatives of the missing boaters to get in touch with the police and that a rescue operation would swing into operation from there.

As I understand it, the roles of the Sea Rescue Squadron, the Surf Life Saving Association and the Volunteer Coast Guard are divided roughly along the lines of the coast guard handling education courses of navigation, boat safety, and so on. The Surf Life Saving Association does the inshore work, where there is a nearby surf life saving club, with the rest going to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron. There is a budgetary allocation to supply fuel and other things for the squadron that I note with approval has increased again this year. Do the Minister and the Commissioner regard the arrangement as it stands as effective for sea rescue and, in particular, do they regard the job done by the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron as adequate and effective, as I believe it to be?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppgood:** Yes, we value highly the service that voluntary agencies such as that provide. We believe that they have thus far been able to work effectively within our network. I have no doubt that the procedures could be improved from time to time, but we have worked closely with them to try to ensure that they are improved. So, when from time to time disasters do unfortunately occur, blame cannot be laid to the highly motivated individuals who are part of these organisations.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I relate my second question to program 9 on page 109 of the yellow book. One of the specific targets for 1987-88 is to examine the feasibility of using light aircraft in traffic law enforcement. I note that this system appears to be working well in Western Australia and anyone who has driven across the Nullabor will have had nightmares about the time it takes to go from one white line to the next—the fear of surveillance from above. Do the South Australian police regard that, at least in the preliminary stage, as having potential to contain what is a real problem on our country roads, that is, excessive speed? If we go down the path followed by Western Australia, is

it envisaged that the light aircraft surveillance will be operable on most South Australian country roads or will it be restricted to major national highways and the like?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We have had a look at this. Trials were conducted in 1984. The result is that it would appear that aerial speed surveillance is cost prohibitive. The problems about getting a suitable type of aircraft have to be taken into account. You are dealing with a high wing single engine aeroplane—not the most common aircraft these days—and it is necessary to have a team on the ground to complement what is happening in the air. Therefore, there is some duplication of staffing resources. It may work in Western Australia—I really do not know. However, our best advice is that it is probably not worth the cost that would have to be put into it. The radar gun seems to be a better way to go in terms of purchasing equipment.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Will the police greys be in action again this summer on Adelaide metropolitan beaches?

**Mr Hunt:** As everyone would know through media coverage up to now, there has been a serious rationalisation of the function of the police greys. In fact, the emphasis is very much on operational usage, and the greys at the beach and in some of the parkland areas are a very valuable asset. I would imagine that, other taskings permitting, there would be a resumption of the operation of the police greys in beach areas.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** There has been concern, and in fact I would go so far as to say anger, about the recent announcement that a user-pays scheme would be introduced in relation to major sporting and entertainment events when the police are present. I share that concern. It is extremely difficult to get appropriate information as to the scope of this user-pays scheme and whether or not it will involve all major sporting activities or events. I am aware of the cost to the police of such activities as the Papal visit and the Grand Prix. Will the Minister provide information in relation to the scheme?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The first task of the police was to secure the agreement of the Government to a full examination of the initiative and discussion with people who might be directly affected by it. The Government felt that in giving its approval it should also make public its intentions, and did so. The police have spent some considerable time since then in developing a policy that will shortly be conveyed to those organisations and companies whose activities may attract the new policy.

I understand that the questions examined include the criteria to be used in any decision on whether or not to charge for police presence, the method of charging and the legal ramifications of the scheme. That is proceeding, and shortly a policy will enable officers to approach the organisations that will be affected by it. There are further matters as to whether the user will be able to request a specific level of policing; whether the user will be able to request policing within nominated time frames and have the request met as a matter of course; the level of direction that a promoter will be able to give as to how police will be deployed at an event; the process to be adopted when an organisation indicates that it will not pay for police services; the approach to be taken when an organisation opts to use private security in lieu of police; and other issues identified by the working party. These matters have been dealt with in some detail.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I repeat that I think there is a need for more public information about that program.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There certainly will be when the issues have been resolved.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What progress has been made in relation to the Justice Information Service (and it might

be more beneficial to place that question on notice)? It has been put to me that part of the cost of that service should include provision for a copy to be made available to all bodies storing information on that service. I recognise that that would be a considerable expense, but it has been put to me that, if copies cannot be provided because of the cost, the service should not be proceeded with.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Attorney-General has a special committee looking at this (and I think we are represented on it), so perhaps it would be more appropriate to refer the question to the Attorney-General. Of course we would comply with any decisions endorsed by the committee looking at privacy aspects in this area. I will refer the question to the Attorney-General and bring back the information.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Last week while at the Royal Show I visited the police display, which I thought was excellent. I was particularly interested in the section dealing with the breathalyser and the activities of that squad. A very intelligent young fellow explained the process and the draeger alcotest unit. I hope that this will not reflect in any way on the young chap because, as I say, he did an excellent job, but he happened to say that there was a desperate need for more equipment of this type if the breathalyser unit is to be effective.

**Mr Hughes:** During 1986-87 when the random breath-testing function was expanded an additional \$365 000 was spent with \$164 000 used for equipment and some \$80 000 for an additional special random breath-testing bus. So I am not aware of any specific shortage of draeger units, but perhaps we can examine that matter.

**Mr RANN:** Basically, I will follow up on a question asked last year about a suggestion in this Parliament that crack had been detected in our State. Has there been any reported incidence of crack in South Australia or any convictions in relation to this substance? The Leader of the Opposition has made a number of statements in relation to a cover-up about the incidence of crack in this State.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The position is the same as it was last year, that is, that there has been no crack detected anywhere in this State. Not only is this our information, it is also the information from the Australian Federal Police who have not seized any crack, nor charged any person with any offence involving crack. The same can be said of information that we have received from the Department of Chemistry and the Forensic Science Centre. That does not mean that we are not alert to the possibilities, but none has been detected. It is interesting, in the light of overseas experience, that generally cocaine derivatives are heavily under-represented, if you like, in the drug scene in this country, and long may that situation obtain.

**Mr RANN:** Can the Minister or the Commissioner advise what action is being taken to reduce the incidence of Aboriginal deaths or other deaths in custody?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** My colleague, the Minister of Correctional Services, and I went to a meeting last week and we have agreed to cooperate fully in a national program. In addition, of course, there is a Royal Commission looking into this matter. On the figures I have available, which relate to deaths in police custody, there is no indication, given the incidence of people of Aboriginal descent who find themselves in our custody, that they were in any way over-represented in the statistics available. However, one death is one too many, of course. The conference considered a whole number of suggestions and matters relating to how best to treat people brought into custody obviously suffering from the effects of alcohol and how one can detect that, under the masking effects of alcohol, there is another prob-

lem such as pneumonia, and further work is being done on that matter along with the Health Commissions in various States.

My information is that eight people of Aboriginal descent have died while in custody in this State, of whom five were in police custody. Four deaths were from natural causes and one while under guard in hospital, that person having injured himself in a fall from a hotel roof. In the same time, since 1980, there have been 12 Caucasian deaths in custody. None of the Aboriginal deaths could be regarded as suicide.

**Mr RANN:** There was public disquiet following a report in one of the newspapers suggesting that the police unit dealing with armed robberies 'Operation Acorn' had been disbanded. I think that disquiet was formed on the basis that people thought it was a permanent program that had been wound up rather than a specific purpose program related to the incidence of armed robbery earlier this year. To satisfy that public interest, can the Minister or the Commissioner point out what is happening in terms of police operations against armed robbers?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Commissioner has information about this matter.

**Mr Hunt:** I am not aware of the particular reference of which the honourable member speaks but, in so far as the clear up rate for armed robberies on financial institutions is concerned, I do not have the exact figures here but it is about 70 per cent, which is extremely high. That relates to total financial institutions. In 1987-88, 37 bank robberies have been committed and 25 offences have been cleared up.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I feel disposed to apologise to the Minister's advisers that we have not been able to give them all the attention that their activities require. The time available does not permit that. How close are we to implementing the phone tapping arrangements in conjunction with the Federal police relative to drug issues?

**Mr Hunt:** There has been some agreement, of course, but this will require the introduction of complementary State legislation. There would be administrative machinery to set up in order to service that, and that would require cross-funding between the State and the Federal Government, because the Federal Government will be the operating centre for such a facility. At the moment I am not able to forecast the exact time at which that might be introduced.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Is anyone able to indicate the profile relative to the places where persons are being apprehended in relation to the expiation fee for marijuana? For example, are the apprehensions occurring in the street, in the home, at discos or restaurants? What is the general profile?

**Mr Hunt:** Private use—that is, in the home—seems to be a predominant factor at the moment, if I recall correctly.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Over half the number of reported offences have occurred on private property, usually in the defendant's home; a further 36 per cent were associated with vehicles, streets or car parks; 9 per cent were issued in police stations; and less than 5 per cent were associated with other public buildings or places including hotels, entertainment or sporting venues, shopping centres and other open public spaces.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It sounds as though 9 per cent like putting their heads in a noose. In relation to the audit of drugs which are taken during police investigations, has there been any progress towards determining a review of those procedures in light of recent events?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This matter was raised in the House a week or so ago.

**Mr Hunt:** Some two or three years ago new procedures were introduced, and there has been ongoing monitoring of those facilities where drugs are stored. Only in the past couple of days there has been a firm direction to the policy audit section to investigate and report on that. There have been other aspects of review undertaken by the crime command, but in order to give it proper policy footing it is being undertaken by my unit in policy audit.

**Mr De LAINE:** As the Minister would be aware, the Regency Park police, since being set up, have been operating out of the Hindmarsh police station. What is the timetable for the provision of a new subdivisional headquarters to accommodate the Regency Park subdivisional police personnel?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** In light of the time, we will obtain that information for the honourable member.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Due to the effluxion of time declare the examination completed.

---

Works and Services—Police Department, \$11 800 000—  
Examination declared completed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 17 September at 11 a.m.