

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 October 1981

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

**Chairman:**

Mr E. K. Russack

**Members:**

Mr Lynn Arnold  
 Mr H. Becker  
 Mr P. D. Blacker  
 Mr Max Brown  
 The Hon. J. D. Corcoran  
 Mr I. P. Lewis  
 Mr K. H. Plunkett  
 Mr I. Schmidt

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

Agriculture, \$21 097 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. W. E. Chapman, Minister of Agriculture and  
 Minister of Forests.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr J. C. McColl, Director-General, Department of  
 Agriculture.

Mr H. P. C. Trumble, Deputy Director-General, Depart-  
 ment of Agriculture.

Mr J. C. Radcliffe, Leader, Policy and Planning Unit,  
 Department of Agriculture.

Mr R. R. Hogarth, Chief, Overseas Project Division,  
 Department of Agriculture.

Mr A. J. Benson, Acting Chief Administrative Officer,  
 Department of Agriculture.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I point out that the Department of Agriculture receives quite considerable external funds from the Commonwealth Government and from rural industry. I am sure that many members would be aware of that. To assist the Committee generally, I draw to your attention that the programme Budget papers include all these external funds, the staff employed on them, as well as those funded from the State Treasury. So, an element of confusion may be present in relation to our department's funding system. Hence, it is not practicable to draw direct comparisons between the Loan Estimates papers and the Programme Estimates, as they deal with different total resources.

I point out that the treatment of projected inflationary effects on salaries also differs between the fund types. Standard State Treasury practice devotes State funded salaries at the rates prevailing at the beginning of the year without including any anticipatory component for inflation, subject to wage increases paid as they occur.

With respect to the other factor that is incorporated, the industry funded personnel, the external salaries paid by the Rural Industries Research Fund, etc., include an allowance for anticipated salary increases, hence the Programme Papers include different treatments for salaries according to the type of funding involved.

In the expenditure estimates on page 77, two figures have been transposed. Under the heading 'Department of Agriculture—salaries and wages', line 12, 'Overseas Project Division', the 1981-82 proposed figure should read \$124 000, not \$351 000. In line 15 'Rural Assistance' the 1981-82

proposed figure should read \$351 000, not \$124 000. This is a figurative error in the estimates for Parliamentary Papers. In the Programme Estimates on page 13 of the copy, which I understand all members of the Committee have, the 1981-82 proposed capital expenditure under sub-heading 'General Horticulture' has been wrongly debited against 'Vegetables'. To correct this error, in the subprogramme 'Vegetables', the 1981-82 proposed recurrent expenditure should read \$238 000, not \$192 000. The 1981-82 proposed capital expenditure should be nil, not \$46 000.

In the subprogramme 'General Horticulture', the recurrent expenditure proposed in 1981-82 should be \$1 035 000, not \$1 081 000 as shown. The capital expenditure proposed for 1981-82 should be \$46 000, not nil. I apologise on behalf of the Government instrumentalities that prepared the respective papers. My officers have brought forward these errors and I bring them to the attention of the Committee.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** On procedural matters, are you, Mr Chairman, proposing to continue with the method used last week of going line by line throughout the whole vote, and secondly, can we reach an approximate time when we might look to go from agriculture to forestry?

**The CHAIRMAN:** We can do that. With the concurrence of the Committee I proposed to go line by line. Last week in the Committee we tried two systems. I personally felt that the line-by-line system had advantages over the other, but that is for the Committee to decide. We will decide that first. Is any member of the Committee opposed to considering this vote line by line?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I prefer not to do so. It appears to me that in the process of going line by line there may be some lines that we may end up giving time to, time which they deserve, and we may not give sufficient time to important matters that may be printed at the bottom. Since we have only half a day for Agriculture, it would well be that we are under some time constraints.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Going line by line, it does not mean that that line is concluded. It does not mean that you pass that line and that that is concluded; as long as it is in that vote, you may return to the line later if you wish.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** That is fine.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The second point the member for Salisbury has put forward is that there be understanding as to how much time we allocate to particular votes. This afternoon at 4.30 we concluded votes relevant to the Minister of Agriculture. So we have four votes and the first one is Agriculture: \$21 097 000. Then there is a capital item: 'Department of Agriculture'; that is on page 122, and then we turn to page 78 to 'Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous': \$6 888 000. Then we go to matters of a capital nature at page 122, 'Woods and Forests Department': \$3 500 000. What is the pleasure of the Committee? Is there a suggestion for the time table?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Can I suggest that we look to getting to forestry by 3 o'clock, and that would give us 1½ hours for forestry. That would suit us.

**The CHAIRMAN:** When you say 3 p.m., are you specifically looking at Woods and Forests Department, the capital item? We will have considered it to a degree in 'Miscellaneous' just prior to that. You are suggesting 3 o'clock?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is there any opposition, or does the Committee concur with that suggestion?

**Mr BECKER:** We agree.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Committee has agreed.

**Mr BECKER:** I would like to refer to page 13, volume 2, of book 8. I am not clear on these figures that the Minister has altered in the subprogramme 'Vegetables', recurrent expenditure, \$192 000; capital expenditure, nil.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Would the Minister clarify that for the member for Hanson?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The Director-General of Agriculture, Mr McColl, will explain alteration to the figures.

**Mr McColl:** The correction is under 1981-82, proposed recurrent expenditure 'Vegetables'—instead of \$192 000, the correct figure is \$238 000. Under capital expenditure, 1981-82, 'Vegetables'—nil; 'General Horticulture' recurrent expenditure, 1981-82, \$1 035 000, and under capital expenditure, 1981-82, 'General Horticulture', \$46 000.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I understand the totals at the bottom of each column are correct.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does that clarify that?

**Mr BECKER:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other procedural matters before we begin the vote on Agriculture? I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Are there any questions?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I understand that there has been a new appointment to the personal staff of the Minister of Agriculture, Lieutenant-Colonel Kennedy, who has been released from the Army to take up the position. Can the Minister say whether that is a new appointment within the Minister's office, or whether it replaces a previous appointment? Can the Minister say why it was indicated that his early release was necessary from the Army so that he could undertake urgent work that is to be undertaken in regard to the Royal Commission into Meat Substitution on Export Markets. When dealing with this appointment, will the Minister indicate what conditions apply to this appointment and what rights exist to transfer back into any other department?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Brian Kennedy, an Army officer with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, has been employed as an executive assistant within my office, and his release from the Army is consistent with the arrangements for an officer to be relieved of his duties with the services on request to be employed within the public sector or, indeed, the private sector. There are no special circumstances in which this officer has been so relieved. He is employed in the office of the Minister of Agriculture in the capacity to which I have referred, and his employment is similar to that which would apply to a press officer or executive assistant in any other Minister's department. Accordingly, he has no special privileges in regard to a guarantee of on-going employment. In that contractual sense, there is no obligation on the Government to continue to employ him in any other office, should he cease to be employed within his present employment.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** What connection, if any, will he have with the Royal Commission?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** He will not have any direct connection with the Royal Commission that is to be undertaken at the instigation of the Commonwealth Government, generally or in particular whilst in this State, other than that which would apply to Ministerial officers of the Minister should such an inquiry extend to South Australia. The South Australian Government is not directly involved in the Commission's inquiry into the meat substitution subject, as was implied in the honourable member's question.

The South Australian Government has indicated to the Commonwealth that it will co-operate when the Commission performs within South Australia, if that is what it chooses to do. It would appear from the correspondence that we have received so far that the Commission intends to extend its inquiries extensively in other States and areas involving the movement of meat. In preparation for that anticipated movement into our State, the South Australian Government was approached by the office of the Minister for Primary

Industry seeking the sort of co-operation that is needed, more especially in the legal sense. I understand that, if challenged, Commonwealth officers involved in such a Commission can be prevented from asking questions or demanding the answers to questions that they may ask within State-based industry circles. We intend to co-operate in that regard, whereby we could be involved as a department generally, because we are the department in South Australia that is responsible for meat hygiene and the movement and inspection of meat, etc. It is in that context that my officers may well be required to assist me and the Government, should the occasion arise.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** The Minister said that, whilst in this State, the executive assistant officer would not be directly involved. Was that just a turn of phrase or is he implying that that officer may have some duties outside of South Australia?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It was not intended to imply that he might be involved outside this State at all.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I refer to the line 'Administration, Finance and Policy'. The regionalisation of the department is charted in the large yellow book, but it does not appear that that is ever referred to again in the small yellow book. I understand that the regionalisation has now been completed. What impact does regionalisation have on programmes outlined in the small yellow book?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Did the honourable member say that his question comes under 'Administration, Finance and Policy'?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** It may well come under 'Director-General of Agriculture.' The Minister could advise me under which line it should come, if my first choice was incorrect.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I think 'Regional Operations' is probably the most appropriate line. Clearly, the funding for this year is \$5 629 673.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I am trying to find out how many of the programmes listed in the small yellow book, about which I have no complaint, because they appear to contain some rather grand aims, will be attended to within the regionalisation structure. Will farmers in the country be able to call on regional officers for assistance, or will they still be required to come to a central point for many of these types of programme?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I hope members will recognise the way in which the little yellow book has been set out and the fact that these programmes are interlocked. Some of the services that are available in the regional centres are supported within the departmental office in Adelaide. The costings applicable to each service are outlined adjacent to the subject in that yellow book. I do not quite get the point of the honourable member's question, however.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** A farmer in any part of the State who wanted access to specialist information from some of the specialist branches would easily get that information through contact with the regional office. I take it that he would not have to refer back independently of the regional office to the central point.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** No, as far as I am aware the service through regional offices is given either on site or obtained from the central office for the farmer or the person inquiring, if that technical information is not available in the field.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I presume the line 'Economics and Marketing' covers the reference to market gardening and the information service that has been available to market gardeners over the past year? Will the Minister outline the way in which that programme has worked over the past 12 months? Book 8 at page 10, in referring to the targets and objectives achieved in the last year, mentions a move to

initiate advisory services to the Northern Adelaide Plains vegetable growers. Could the Minister outline how that has been achieved?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** To deal with the first question, the line \$302 000 under 'Economics and Marketing' incorporates provision for salaries of the staff of the Economics and Marketing Division, excluding the staff located in the regions. Included in this allocation for 1981-82 is \$67 000 for projects previously funded from the Commonwealth Service Extension Service Grant which are now being met by arrangement from the State. The variation between the actual and voted amounts for 1980-81 is as a result of salary payments of \$62 000 which were charged to other accounts but which were not included in the Estimates figure of \$203 000. In relation to the history of services that applied via the Economics and Marketing Division, I will call on the Director-General, Jim McColl, to reply.

**Mr McColl:** My understanding of the question is that it relates to the line 'Economics and Marketing', which refers to the Economics and Marketing Division. Services to the vegetable industry, particularly the Northern Adelaide Plains area (which I think was the direction of the question), are provided through our regional services, especially through the central region. We have strengthened our advisory services in that area by recently appointing an officer to work in that region. We have also been having considerable discussion with farmer organisations and groups with regard to the marketing problems that they face. In addition, there was an interstate trip with some of the growers to look at the Melbourne market situation to develop further a more appropriate strategy both at the marketing level and with respect to the type of variety and product that the Northern Adelaide Plains growers should move into. The most important thing is the recent appointment of a special officer who will work in that area.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I accept the point that that comes under the regional operations. I would like some further clarification as to how in the coming 12 months the Government proposes to extend the assistance to market gardeners in other areas, and to perhaps extend the scope of the work involved. It has been suggested that the officer provide marketing assistance and advice to the market gardeners in the Northern Plains. What capacity does he have to monitor the way in which marketing is performed with a view to advising the Government or the Minister as to what other actions should be undertaken to modify the situation?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It ought to be appreciated that the officer spoken of by the Director has been appointed to that position for only some four weeks now. It is as a result of an undertaking I gave in Parliament during the last financial year, whereby we recognised (and I am sure that the members of the Opposition, including the member for Salisbury also recognised) the need for on-site assistance in that region. The assistance that we hope Mr Barry Philp will extend to market gardeners is seen to be very wide. Apart from his technical knowledge of market garden production and marketing; we would hope that, being on site, he can become known personally by these people in the region and that they will develop a feeling of attachment to the services we provide that have not been available to them in the past in that direct sense.

He can, when required, seek interpreting services for those that may need them in the area. He can get alongside the scene and assist people involved in the industry not only to plant the right varieties of tomatoes and other vegetables but assist them in the presentation of their product and the marketing of that product. The member for Salisbury would recognise the multiplicity of problems that exist in this particular region.

This officer is, if possible, to bring that community together so that it produces the sort of impact in presentation and marketing of their product that is necessary to be successful under the enormous competition that our own Northern Plains growers are faced with. I refer here to the recent invasion from other States of sophisticated marketers of tomatoes and the implications and effects on our own growers in recent times; this point should help us to appreciate the need to assist these people to get their act together. These people have proved most satisfactory in their application to the job of growing vegetables and providing the community with their fruits. The department has seen a need for some co-ordination and very careful friendly on-site assistance. The particular officer that has been appointed to the position is not housed in the best accommodation at this stage, but ultimately will be set up and accepted within that community where his services can be recognised and exercised.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I was not implying that it was not a good appointment. As I have said on a previous occasion, the decision to have the advisory service is a commendable one. What I was basically after was to find out the nature of his services as envisaged by the Minister. Would there also be a function that that officer would be a collection point for information and advice to go back to the Government, or directly to the Minister, on the state of market gardening in this State? The Minister will be aware that there have been, over a period of time, a great many serious allegations made about the marketing system, the price reporting mechanism and a number of other features of market gardening in South Australia. It could prove valuable that this officer receive feedback from growers and provide that advice direct to the Minister so that the Minister can determine whether or not changes need to be made to structures within this State. Is that part of the brief for that officer?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I have not directed that the officer report to me in the direct sense. He is responsible to the Regional Officer in charge, Mr Ron Webber. Mr Ron Webber in turn is responsible to the Assistant Director, Mr John Potter. Through that system, feedback from the community would reach me, or the Minister's office, when considered appropriate. I concede that I have taken a somewhat personal interest in this particular region. We all recall the storm and horrendous damage occurring on 15 November 1979, hence the departmental officers' involvement and my own personal involvement in that region, along with the local members representing the area and adjacent areas. I agree that I have become personally involved in this section of the rural industry in South Australia. I look forward to receiving the feedback indicated by the honourable member which will come through from the officers that I mentioned. I do not know whether there has been any more at this early stage, immediately after the appointment of Mr Philp, that I can report on for the information of the Committee. If this line of questioning is to be pursued then I welcome it.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I appreciate the willingness of the Minister to hear the points of view that may be expressed by growers in the area. We can take the whole question one stage further. On the matter of growers' markets, there have been in the media for some time this year (I suppose started by the notorious cucumber criminal) a number of questions asked about what assistance and advice should be provided in the formation of such markets. What action does the Minister propose to take in the coming 12 months to further the development of such markets, if any? I know that in recent months he has taken an interest in the whole area and has given considerable support to, for example, the provision of land, and has made available a site. What

assistance will be available in the future and does the Government propose to take up some of the recommendations of the report on the East End Market in 1978, with regard to farmers' markets or growers' markets?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** As the member for Salisbury has already demonstrated, he is well aware of the desire of the plains growers to establish a growers' market in the northern region and within the confines of the Salisbury District Council area in particular. He has outlined the prominent sequence of events that have occurred in leading up to the current position. It is true that as a result of approaching the Minister of Transport that we obtained from him an area of land considered to be suitable for this purpose. Unfortunately, to date, the Salisbury District Council has chosen to decline an application from the growers to participate in marketing their produce from that site. There was also an approach made to the Minister of Education for the purpose of seeking occupation of some of his land in that immediate region for the purpose of carrying out growers' markets. Both Ministers were co-operative and, indeed, made land available for that purpose. The most favoured site happened to be the State Transport Authority land in question and, as I understand it, the other land is still unoccupied. Last week we were approached by a person in the accounting field purporting to represent the growers and seeking to assist them in following up their reapplication to the Salisbury District Council and, indeed, if that proves to be unsuccessful again, then it is my understanding that he proposes to recommend that they seek the opportunity to market their fruit and vegetables in a nearby region. I wish them luck in that venture. As a Government, we have made our position very clear. We accept that growers should be allowed to offer their produce directly to the public with the widest opportunities of disposing of that produce, particularly when it is over-produced, as occurs from time to time.

Whilst observing common sense in the occupation of public premises, which I am satisfied that this group proposed to accept, there should be an effort by all concerned to assist them in their venture. The venture we refer to, Mr Chairman, covers a period of 12 months to enable them to try their methods. I have not seen, and still do not see, any reason why that opportunity should not be extended to them to do so.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Is the Minister prepared to have staff assistance made available to market gardeners in their efforts to establish a growers' market, be that person the adviser on the Northern Plains or some other person? I ask specifically for an answer in that area because the Minister has now informed us that someone in the accounting field purported to be involved with growers. I do not know whether we are talking about the same person; I believe there was another person involved in the accounting field who last week met with the growers and who purported to be a confidante of the Premier, the Attorney-General and the Minister of Agriculture. On checking that out we found that that was not the case. So this one person seems to be running around the place purporting to be all people to all things. It has caused some confusion, I know, amongst the market gardeners who want to know where they stand as regards Government staff support. Could the Minister clear that up now by indicating what support will be offered in the coming months?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It may be that one of the early jobs of Mr Barry Philp—the new appointee in the northern region—will be to meet with these people, particularly the Agitov family and their friends and associates, and try to identify where we may be of assistance. The Government has not been, nor should it be, involved in providing of financial assistance for this trial exercise; nor

should it become involved in providing structural improvements. But having set the pattern in seeking to find a suitable site and act as a liaison between the applicants and the council, albeit a little aggravated from time to time, there is no reason at all why we should not continue in that direction. I hope, with the co-operation of the local member from Salisbury himself, as he has provided so far, that collectively as representatives of those growers we can continue to be of assistance. But to specifically identify forms of assistance before we know precisely what their next move is and how they propose to approach it, I think, is difficult if not impossible at this stage. I am looking forward to hearing from Barry Philp any information he might be able to give as how the subject might be cultivated because, whilst they have their desire to proceed, we must help them wherever we can to get over their local problems, but there is no problem as far as the Government is concerned with their approach to the job.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I notice in one of the horticulture subprogrammes a statement was made that during 1980-81 one of the targets—this is in Vol. 2, book 8, page 13—it says that during 1981 one of the targets achieved by the department was to reduce the current grape surplus problem by assisting industry with adjustments to programmes. What specifically did the department achieve in this target area? What effect did it have on grape surpluses, and what is the expected value of the programme in the future? Will we see the situation we have seen in the past where growers have had to leave grapes on the vines and suffer fairly acute economic losses because of this? What was done to relieve this situation?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Provision is there under the 'Rural Assistance' line, Mr Chairman, for our department to assist people who find themselves with a surplus, are unable to sell, and are in financial difficulties. If one goes back to page 78 of the Estimates of Payments under 'Miscellaneous', one will note that payments to rural industry adjustment fund, \$150 000, were voted in 1980-81. Indeed, whilst that was there, we found that the growers did not pick it up. At the time it was voted we anticipated there should be all sorts of problems occurring as a result of a surplus of grapes, but a number of things happened, seasonal incidents occurred, and in some cases they blew off or shook off the grapes from the vines and the crop did not yield as much as was anticipated. Markets were found for some of the grape varieties which were anticipated to be surplus, and the whole thing settled down remarkably well—not consistent with what was anticipated. So we did not require that \$150 000. That was collectively linked with a slight increase in the demand for our quality products. The problem was pretty well overcome. There were one or two regions in the State where some grapes remained on the vine. Indeed, some embarrassment was caused to a co-operative, the Southern Vale Winery Co-operative, in particular, as the honourable member will recall. An undertaking was given that the Government would pay out those particular growers for their 1980 crop; a payment of some \$86 000 was provided for that purpose. Quite apart from those incidental lines covering assistance that is proposed, I repeat that the Rural Industries Assistance Branch is available to provide carry-on financial support for growers. Strangely enough, against that background of disarray that has been anticipated from time to time within the grape industry, there has not been a great call from that sector of the community on our R.I.A. funding.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I can understand from what the Minister has said that there was no need for assistance this year, mainly because of the nature of the things he has mentioned. He can appreciate, as much as I do, that nothing stands still in this game, and I am thinking

of the future as to what assistance can be given to see that this does not happen in the future. Has the Government anything specifically in mind? I believe that one of the major thrusts in the industry at the moment is promotion of non-alcoholic and low-alcoholic wines. There has been some success with this in New South Wales, for example. They have made some inroads into the U.S.A. market and I wonder whether this Government, through the department, has given any assistance to New South Wales vintners, or are they going to give assistance to vintners in this State in order to promote that particular aspect of the industry? If that is the case, how would the assistance be given to them? I was thinking that the Minister would be looking at those things rather than just carry-on finance or things of that nature after the event has happened.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The Government is aware of the importance of the wine industry in South Australia and it seeks to assist it at every opportunity in promoting and marketing its products. Only last week we hosted a visit of delegates from two other countries of note here in Adelaide, and the subject of our wines and their quality was raised with those delegates. I have no doubt that in both cases there will be liaison with the industry responsible for marketing their products about the conversations that took place in those cases and that that will be followed up with the sort of marketing approach that is essential if we are to escape drowning in our own product.

I noticed with some interest just a matter of a day or two ago (it may even have appeared in the week-end press), where the Minister of Tourism and the member representing the Barossa Valley (Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy) and one or two other members of the State Cabinet are to involve themselves directly in a marketing campaign for the products of the Barossa Valley region. I am aware of a similar proposal being prepared by vigneron in the Southern Vales area. They will go over the border to Victoria, and their aim is to demonstrate the quality and availability of their products in that region. Within this country and without there is an on-going effort to promote our wine products, more especially in the alcoholic wine area and not so much in the non-alcoholic grape juice area referred to by the honourable member. It would be appropriate for me to take up this matter with my officers and report back to the member for Hartley on the point that he has raised about the need to venture into assisting the industry to market its raw product or its grape juice product, in which he obviously has some direct interest.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I thank the Minister for that information, and I would be grateful if he could discuss the matter with his officers. It is a product which, if marketed and promoted properly, would certainly sell much more than it currently does. I wish now to return briefly to the question of the brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication scheme. How has the scheme progressed to this time? I recall that, when we became involved in the brucellosis scheme some time ago, a programme was drawn up and it was expected that this matter would be under control. The problem in regard to tuberculosis has been going on for much longer. Can the Minister provide the Committee with a report on the progress made to date and on what the future holds in relation to these two eradication schemes? I note that we are spending about \$1 000 000 in this current financial year.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The line 'Bovine Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Eradication Scheme' provides over \$2 000 000 this year. There is a significant difference between \$1 000 000 and \$2 000 000. That sum demonstrates that it is a big programme. I take the point made by the honourable member that it is important that from time to time we do receive progress reports, and I will call

on the Director-General to explain the situation as he knows it within the department.

**Mr McColl:** The progress with this eradication scheme in South Australia has been very good. Large areas of South Australia are now declared to be provisionally free. The main problem area in which we are really concentrating our efforts is associated with the northern pastoral zone, where we would all appreciate it is extremely difficult to handle an eradication campaign. One of the assisting changes that has recently taken place is in regard to taxation, whereby pastoralists are encouraged to erect fences and achieve greater stock control themselves. This gives us a greater capacity to destock; in many cases the approach has to be complete destocking and working back later on. The Committee is possibly aware that the Industries Assistance Commission has recently been given the task of reviewing the whole campaign with the object of giving recommendations to the Federal Government and the State Governments, because it is a co-operative scheme, in regard to the future of the campaign from 1984 onwards. The hearings have been held previously and we can look forward to that report. That is about the extent of the detail that I can provide.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Has the department made submissions to the I.A.C. in its inquiry? What is the nature of the submission?

**Mr McColl:** We have been very positive in our submission. We put in a special submission of substance, and officers have appeared before the commission to answer questions. Naturally, our proposal was for the programme to continue, albeit on a somewhat lower level than previously. We see the need for a continuation of the programme to ensure that we get right on top of this problem.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** In order to inform the member for Hartley, I would explain that the provision for 1981-82 under this line consists of two distinct components. One is \$527 000 for compensation payments to producers for cattle destroyed because of positive reaction to tests for T.B. or brucellosis and, secondly, \$1 580 000 to meet the operating, travelling and capital expenditures of the eradication programme. Compensation payments are recovered in full from the Commonwealth Government. The Cattle Compensation Fund (a trust fund held at State Treasury) is financed by a levy on the sale of cattle for the purpose of compensating producers for certain proclaimed diseases. The eradication programme costs for South Australia are then shared by the Commonwealth and the State Government on the basis in 1981-82 of about 69.6 per cent from the Commonwealth and 30.4 per cent from the State. I would be happy to provide a breakdown of that proposed expenditure for the honourable member if he would like to see it. The cost-sharing arrangements already exist between the Commonwealth and the State until 1984, and our submission to the Commonwealth seeks to ensure that the programme just does not slip-off or end there after a tremendous amount of industry and Government funding that has gone into the campaign over the years. We wish to ensure that we are covered by an on-going programme. Whether or not we get to the end of this eradication campaign has to be determined in the future, but we are so far down the track that there is no way that we should be a party to relaxing from the campaign that is under way.

Finally, it is appropriate to mention that generally speaking from the grower level we have enjoyed tremendous co-operation. I raise that because without it the whole campaign would be quite useless. It is not the sort of campaign that a Government or Governments can undertake on their own, and that co-operation element from the stockowners is absolutely an essential ingredient.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I have some further comments about the ubiquitous reference to marketing advice to industry that appears under every kind of horticultural area, and presumably under other areas, too. During last year's Estimates Committee proceedings, I raised a couple of comments about marketing advice, and I am interested to know whether they were taken up and, if so, in what way. The first point I raised was that there should be some sort of future analysis on market garden produce so that growers would have some indication of likely future demand and supply. This procedure takes place overseas and it should be possible here.

Last year I also mentioned the worry I had about the suggestion put to growers that they seek the Middle East as a market for their market garden produce. At the time, I mentioned that the food and agricultural organisation was doing considerable work in the Middle East in an effort to help that region supply its own market garden produce. Therefore, at best, that region would be only a short-term market and not a long-term market on which growers could pin their hopes. If there is an overseas market on which growers can pin their hopes, it is not in that region. Were those suggestions acted on?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** If the honourable member's comments were in the form of a question last year I am embarrassed that they were not answered following the Committee examination. If his comments were suggested ventures that the department might take on board, I will ask the Director-General to comment in a moment. In the meantime, I am aware of the honourable member's motion before the House covering a wide range of material applicable to the marketing of fruit and vegetable produce in this State. I do not think it is appropriate for me to respond to that motion at this stage, because it is still before the House and I will leave my response until the appropriate time. I refer the honourable member's comments about the department to the Director-General.

**Mr McColl:** I am afraid that I cannot give the honourable member a detailed report on either of these matters. The department has not carried out a particular study on the forward projections of supply and demand for vegetables in South Australia. The honourable member's other comment related to the possibility of the Middle East becoming an appropriate market place, and he expressed some uncertainty about that possibility in the long term. The department recognises that. In relation to last year's Estimates Committee proceedings, I am not quite certain about the honourable member's request in relation to the Middle East.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** At that time, I was worried that an officer of the department was advising growers that the Middle East was a potential growth market. I was not objecting to that; I was worried that, in the absence of any information that this market did not have long-term possibilities, some growers may have been led to place their faith in that market as a means of solving their financial problems. Therefore, they could have had very serious trouble in five years or more from now. I wanted to know whether or not officers had been asked to fully advise growers on the exact state of the Middle East market and its real potential or otherwise.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am not aware of the position regarding an on-going supply avenue to the Middle East. The honourable member will recall that a couple of weeks ago I informed the House that some detailed interest had been shown by Iraq in seeking extremely large—indeed, embarrassingly large—quantities of fruit from South Australia. Without suggesting or assuming that that involves a potential and on-going market for our products, at least that country has shown interest in seeking tenders for the supply of hundreds of tonnes of specific varieties of South

Australian fruit. That information was passed on to members, the media and a number of growers, from whom we have received some interested response. As I have said, it was for extremely large quantities, and it appears from the department's investigations that we cannot meet that demand. That may well be a signal to the member for Salisbury about the nature of interest that is applying, in certain parts of the Middle East region at least.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** In relation to the specific targets and objectives for this coming year, and given the Director-General's statement that there has not been any analysis in the past 12 months, will the Government consider investigating whether it is feasible to adopt such an approach to marketing in the current 12 months to fulfil those specific targets and objectives?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I think I had better look into this. I apologise to the honourable member for not picking up from his comments last year the issue that he has raised today in this respect. I certainly undertake to have his remarks re-read and investigated, and I will report back to him on what we were able to do in that direction. I point out to the Committee that it should not be the department's intention to direct growers about what they should grow. I gather from the persistence of the honourable member that he is implying that the department should be laying down the law in this direction.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Certainly not.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I hope not, because it is not the department's function or the Government's desire to direct primary producers about what they should or should not do. However, it is clearly within the function of the Department of Agriculture to provide advice and guidance.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I make quite clear that I am not trying to impose a cucumber quota in this State. I want to know whether, as far as possible, growers can be given adequate and correct information so that they can choose what crops they should grow; the decision still being theirs.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I appreciate the honourable member's clarifying his position. After the material referred to is prepared by the technical sector of the department, albeit with certain technical ingredients in relation to varieties, methods of planting, top dressing, cultivation, and so on, there is still a further need to convey it to and discuss it with those people in the field who are seeking to apply it. It is in that context that we believe that Mr Philp, who was mentioned earlier this morning, will be of great assistance to growers, particularly those in the Northern Plains region. For that matter, similar liaison and close association between growers and officers of the department in other fruit and vegetable regions of this State is equally important. I make the point that the provision of technical information from the Department of Agriculture is one thing, but conveying and explaining it to the growers in the field is another important function of the department in that regional officer sense.

**Mr LEWIS:** Earlier the member for Salisbury in a preface to a question mentioned the word 'futures'. I wondered at the time about the context in which he used that word. I understood him to mean (and I take it the Minister also understood him to mean) that it was merely in relation to projected demand for that product and a sort of macro-description, the total description, of previous productions annually.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I appreciate that, technically, the term involves the actual exchange of money for commodities supplied, etc.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes. I would see it as a waste of public or any money to establish a futures market for perishables which are subject to enormous variation in ultimate yield according to the vagaries of the weather, which can com-

pletely change the supply position within 24 hours. I would hope that the department would not get involved in any sort of activity in analysing that aspect of marketing.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am assured by the Director-General that there is no such desire within the department. I have no desire, either, to enter that field with respect to vegetable and fruit produce.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I was talking about the analyses, and not a futures market as such.

**Mr LEWIS:** I now refer to a matter mentioned in discussion between the member for Salisbury and the Minister. The Minister referred to the manner in which a broader spectrum of information was made available to producers. I would like to think that where possible the Government and the department, as an executive arm of government, would encourage the development of consultants which have proved to be successful in providing advice about the options available to market gardeners in regard to choices of crop to spread risk within crops, and about how they can manage their money, cash flows and so on, over a 12-month period, rather than increase dependence on the public purse for the provision of these services. Would the Minister, in the course of providing these extension services from the department, not only encourage growers to focus their attention on the need for competent administration of their business, but also encourage them to seek independent advice outside the public sector so that we, as taxpayers, would not be liable to any lawsuits which may be brought against the Government if a grower believed that advice in regard to the managing of his business was wrong. We should leave that responsibility to the private sector and encourage the development of the private sector in the form of consultants. Does the Minister believe that, or is there an alternative view held by the department?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Broadly speaking, the department has within its ranks officers who can provide economic information to growers at any level. Indeed, we can hark back to one of the earlier questions raised by the member for Salisbury as to whether guidance and assistance can be available to farmers in the field or, if not available at that level, whether a farmer can seek it himself from the central division. For example, if a grower in the South-East, not just a market gardener but a producer, was seeking guidance of an economic, administrative or management nature at his own level, via the South-East office at Struan, he could seek assistance in that direction.

It may be that the advice that comes back to him is that he engage a private consultant. We do not provide a service in the full sense in regard to management of farms—that belongs to the private sector. The guidelines and advice as to the direction a farmer should go, if not immediately available from the centre, would be obtained by the centre for that farmer. The same sort of service applies in the Murraylands via the Loxton office, in the central region through the Adelaide office, in the Northern region through the Port Augusta office, and in the Eyre region through the principal office at Port Lincoln. Other district offices are associated with the regional centres. There is a wide spread of officer appointment around South Australia that developed under the previous Government over recent years, and it is a good system. There is plenty of vigor and enthusiasm at the district officer level, and those officers have access back to the central division.

This does not mean that a farmer or vegetable grower can have an accountant made available for him to do his books or to identify his administrative requirements as would a consultant. Certainly, for the purposes of the sort of service we provide, it would not be unusual for an officer, as a result of looking at a certain set up, to say, 'It is time you got your act together and engaged someone to assist

you, and this is the area in which you need assistance,' and reference could be made to consultancy for planning for growing, seeding, variety selection, for packaging and marketing of the product, or whatever. I hope I have explained the general attitude of the department towards the need of the community. We are not in the business of providing a full private sector service, but rather to guide people in the right direction as to where they can obtain services and identify, wherever possible, where the need exists.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I refer to page 10 of the yellow book, which refers to developing alternative strategies for canning of peaches by fruit growers in the State. Last week, in Victoria there was a call for a massive adjustment in assistance, including a tree-pull scheme in that State. What is the Government's policy for canning fruit growers in this State?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The subject relating to the Riverland fruit products might be more appropriately answered by the Director-General.

**Mr McColl:** The programmes associated with canning peach growers in South Australia are currently under development. It is not exactly clear yet what the future demand will be for canning fruit in South Australia. I think we are all aware that it is associated with the future of the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative cannery. However, there are indications that there can be some replanting of particular areas with the more suitable varieties to meet the long-term market requirements. Assistance will be provided through the rural adjustment mechanisms and the Rural Assistance Branch in the Department of Agriculture to assist growers to rehabilitate, if that is required and to replant with more suitable varieties and/or adjust out of the industry if necessary. I realise that we are already two or three months into the 1981-82 financial year, but these strategies will be developed during that financial year. As yet, it is not fully specified.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Have there been any meetings of growers or their representatives concerning a tree-pull scheme or alternative strategies? Have any proposals arising from such meetings or from Government sources been put before the Federal Government? Has the matter of resources for alternative strategies or a tree-pull scheme been presented to Agricultural Council?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** In reply to the honourable member's last question, no proposal, that I can recall, has been put at that level. The question regarding meetings between those involved in the industry and our officers might better be covered by the Director-General.

**Mr McColl:** Naturally, there have been a number of meetings between growers and their representatives not only with the Department of Agriculture but also with the receiver managers and other governmental representatives associated with the future arrangements for the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative cannery. To a large extent, the Department of Agriculture has been involved in an advisory sense in those meetings.

Tree-pull schemes involve one of the potential strategies. This type of scheme has been used previously, particularly for perennial-type crops. I am positive that that would be one of the potential strategies that would have been mentioned at those meetings. A positive programme that the Government could take to the Federal Government has not yet been developed. Certainly, no approaches have been made at this stage through the Australian Agricultural Council.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Does the Government plan to put officers of the Department of Agriculture to work on policy opinions and options for canning peach growers and, if so, how many? Also, will that work continue during this financial year?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Again, while we are on this subject, I ask the Director-General to respond.

**Mr McColl:** Officers are working in this area, although I could not say exactly how many, as most of the work is being done by officers of the Murraylands region based at Loxton, particularly by our Chief Regional Officer and the Regional Officer (Horticulture). Obviously, other officers are also involved, and we will continue working on and developing strategies to deal with this problem.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** When a property called Simaloo, on the road between Loxton and Mildura, was first started up several years ago, some of the biggest peaches and apricots were grown there. Can the Minister say whether this still applies, or is the property now growing different types of fruit, such as almonds or oranges? A lot of peach and apricot trees were grown there initially.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am aware of the location of the Simaloo holding. It ought to be made clear that this is a private operation and that the department would not automatically be privy to its activities. If I study the detail of the honourable member's question and seek the co-operation of those in charge of the outfit, I may be able to obtain that information for the honourable member, in which case I shall be pleased to supply the honourable member with it. Certainly, I do not have access to the operation's management and horticultural practices. I cannot say off the top of my head whether or not other varieties have been planted. It would therefore be inappropriate for me to comment on that matter. I shall be pleased to try to obtain this information for the honourable member. It may well be that our officer at Loxton, Mr Thomas, would know, as a result of his local knowledge of the area, about what the honourable member is asking. If he does not know, he may be able to obtain information.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It will be in order for the Minister to supply that information later.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I asked that question because this property used to supply a lot of fruit to the canneries. I am sure that the Government would know the amount of fruit coming from such properties. I would certainly appreciate it if the Minister would obtain that information later, if that is possible. Referring to page 10 of the document, I ask whether departmental officers have released any discussion papers on this topic.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** No. As far as I am aware, they have not produced papers of the kind described by the honourable member. The honourable member having shown a positive interest in this region, it is reasonable that we collect the information and details surrounding our officers' involvement in this subject and make that, too, available to the honourable member.

One of the department's functions has been to make available to growers the information that they need. The department recognises that it is its responsibility to assist and make available detailed information to members who show an interest in it. It is obvious from the honourable member's remarks that he has a genuine interest in this direction. The only point I make in relation to details of clients associated with Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative is that the quantities of fruit involved and the change of direction of the Simaloo property are undoubtedly known by the co-operative.

Whether it is or should be made available is something we have to determine from the private company itself. The honourable member can appreciate that, just because Riverland Fruit Products may have on its books details and records of through-put from that company, it does not mean it is automatically available to the public or, indeed, available to the Government. We will seek from the company the information that is being sought.

**Mr BLACKER:** Under the line 'Land Use and Protection Division' there is a proposed reduction for 1981-82, even though the actual expenditure in 1980-81 was higher than the voted figure. I raise the matter of the Simms Bequest Farms. The Government has a number of bequeathed properties throughout the State. There has been considerable concern expressed in the Cleve area, particularly amongst those involved in the Cleve Area School, as to the future of the Simms Farm. There are considerable rumours in the district about the Government's proposal to dispose of that property. Can the Minister indicate whether there is any substance in those rumours and, if not, whether in fact the reduced amount is an indication of the Government's scaling down operations on that property?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I thank the member for Flinders for raising the subject. I appreciate this matter is of interest to him. It should not be implied from this line that the operations of the Simms Farm at Cleve are being phased down or phased out. There is nothing in this line to confirm that that is occurring. The department is reviewing the future land use of that property, which has been bequeathed to the department, so that we can maximise its use. Representations have been made from the area school and other organisations within the immediate area for its future use. Those matters are under review. Immediately a report is available and the Government moves to act in that direction, I will make the information available forthwith to the honourable member.

**Mr BLACKER:** My question combines with regional operations and is in reference to the line where there is some \$700 000 increase, which barely covers the cost escalations over that period. What is the position in relation to stock inspectors on Eyre Peninsula? There are two covering the whole of the West Coast. Of late there has been considerable need for their services. Can the Minister say whether there has been a request for additional stock inspectors and whether the inspectors are coping with the situation?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I will take the general question first about the honourable member's concern for the inadequate provision for escalation during the current financial period. As I indicated earlier, the wages component, which is always significant in these lines, is catered for separately. If there is a wage increase or a series of wage increases applicable to officers in the department during the 1981-82 period, the required additional funding will be provided by the Government separately. It is not incorporated in the Estimates that are proposed under the respective lines. The honourable member need have no fears about that side of it. If there is an increased requirement of money for the purpose of catering for increased wage structuring during the financial period additional funds have been earmarked for the purpose.

Regarding the stock inspectors and their services to the Eyre Peninsula region, as far as I can ascertain it is the intention of the department to maintain its existing stock inspector service in the Eyre Peninsula area. If the honourable member knows of a need for additional officers, I would appreciate information to sustain that concern. From time to time people request extra officers, but generally speaking we find the Eyre Peninsula region to be responsible in this regard and, when people have come forward to the district officers and in turn the regional office in Port Lincoln with a genuine request for service, it has been provided. We appreciate the input from those sources. If the member for Flinders is aware of a need that is not being catered for in the region, and it is within the capacity of the department and within the policy of the Government to provide such services, I would be pleased to hear about it.



**Mr MAX BROWN:** I want to pursue the remarks made by the member for Mallee on the question he raised with the Minister regarding the proposition that growers should seek advice from private consultants more than they currently do. I see danger in that for two reasons: private consultants' fees would be astronomical and place the grower in a situation where he may be seeking advice that would be costly to the people buying the product; and, because of the cost factor, he might be inclined not to see consultants at all. Can the Minister give the committee an assurance that his department will continue its consultant role to the growers? Is it the intention of the department to increase the consultant obligations?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I will call on the Director-General, who himself was in private enterprise before working for the Government, and was one of those consultants. He may have some interesting, if not useful, input to respond to the remarks made by the honourable member for Whyalla. My response to the earlier mention of consultants, dealing with the assistance and guidance provided by the department in the form of directing growers to finding the services they needed, was in all a pretty cautious reply. I would have expected that members of the Committee in total would have accepted that I, in practice, would be somewhat cautious about the employment of such people. It ought not to be overlooked that there are occasions and specific circumstances in which such experts are required and in those circumstances I am sure that our department would not be hesitant in recommending their use.

Generally speaking, this is an area of common sense and I think that, as we become more sophisticated and more under pressure in marketing areas of our products in particular, there are places for expert advice. Where appropriate, it will be provided by the department and, where it is not appropriate, we will extend detailed servicing to constituents or to a producer and that producer will then be headed in the right direction.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do you wish the Director-General to comment?

**Mr McColl:** There are a few points that I would like to briefly make with respect to this area. I am a great believer that, with respect to fees, of course, the law of the market forces generally applies. If somebody is good and his fee level is appropriate, his services will be demanded. If his fees are astronomical, it is highly unlikely that he will be a success in making a living and existing in that business. I feel that the law of supply and demand will soon sort out the private sector contribution.

On the other hand, the Government, through the Department of Agriculture, should and will continue to make every effort to provide advice and information to growers and to primary producers in the framework suitable for management decision making and in a framework within the whole farming complex. This is something we have been endeavouring to do more in the past few years. I think that, when it becomes a matter of advice of what we may call an intimate business nature, that is where the private consultant, if he has a role, has a role there, because he then becomes party to some very confidential private business matters. I think growers and primary producers who wish to have that sort of advice should have access in many cases to private consultants. That is where they can form the most appropriate contribution, with intimate business advice of a continuing nature, with some technical input as well. The Department of Agriculture will continue to provide a solid base for information and advice.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Just going a little further with the Minister on that question, I would like to say to him if it is fair to say (and it is obviously fair) that the department

accepts in the main the responsibility for advice, particularly in marketing and so forth, is it also fair that, in accepting that responsibility, the department ought to be able to or be placed in the situation where it could advise growers as to what in fact they should be growing.

I point out to the Minister that it is all very well for him to say that, in the main, we do not want to have the department saying to growers, 'You ought to be growing this or that' but I think it is also fair that the Government does accept some responsibility for obtaining markets. The Government certainly accepts some responsibility for subsidies when the wrath of nature comes about, so I am suggesting to the Minister that there ought to be in his department some acceptance of his department's role and that there should be some advice given to growers as to what should be grown, as a payable proposition.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I think, if it could possibly be arranged, the member might accept an invitation to look at some of our plant research premises where we not only trial, test and retest new varieties of medics, lucerne, and cereal crops but all sorts of other field crops for the purposes outlined by the member, namely, to show the primary producers in South Australia not only what can be done but how well it does in particular climatic or soil conditions. Really, that is what our research services and facilities are for.

It is an incredible service that has been sought not only within the State but in the other States and outside of the country. We, with the co-operation of growers in some cases, and indeed in their own right, in other cases with the co-operation of the C.S.I.R.O. and the Waite Research Institute and such facilities that there have been established within the State, collectively provide a tremendous service to growers and primary producers across the board. It is as a result of the trials and the work in that direction that we have found, for example, a cereal medic rotation system of farming in the rain-fed areas of this State which we are not only demonstrating not only to visitors to our various centres within this State but also to overseas countries.

While I appreciate the interest shown in the subject by the member for Whyalla, I am proud, on behalf of the instrumentalities within the State generally and those financed and operated by the Department of Agriculture in particular, to say again how well we are doing in that direction. In conclusion, I think it is important to emphasise that we are not in the act of researching and identifying appropriate plant varieties *et cetera*, for the purposes of dictating what people should grow. Indeed, we can, after all the testing and researching procedures that I have outlined, demonstrate in various areas what their capacities and yield qualities are, but the decision as to whether they are taken on board and applied within the field of the private sector rests entirely with the private sector.

**Mr LEWIS:** I refer to the economic and marketing line. I want to ask the Minister a series of short questions on a couple of matters. The first relates to the current rapidly developing live sheep export trade, which has become of increasing significance to the stabilisation of wool and mutton production in this State and the stabilisation of the legume as part of pasture in rain-fed mixed farming areas. I am concerned about the implications of any destabilising influence that may come into that. The first question is: what does the Minister expect, to the nearest million, the number of sheep exported from Australia and through South Australia during this current year to be?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** In round figures, 5 000 000 from Australia, of which a substantial proportion we expect to be exported by South Australia. Without giving an actual figure for the South Australian component in that overall national export figure, I think it ought to be explained that

a number of sheep that are exported from New South Wales properties are road-transported into South Australia for despatch via our port facilities.

As a State we cannot really lay claim to the production of all the sheep that are exported via South Australian ports. I did produce through my department a paper embracing some recent history and the current position detail about the overseas export trade. I was prompted to collate that material in a report, or to have it collated, from various sources both within and without the Department of Agriculture because, as an industry, we are subject to a decision taken at a recent A.C.T.U. meeting in Melbourne on 13 August this year. That organisation decided on a quota of one mutton carcass for each live sheep exported to each country of destination. I was warned that this decision was pending earlier in the year and I was disturbed then, but I was even more disturbed to find that on 13 August that decision was taken.

First, it is bad enough that it ought to be one carcass for one live sheep exported from Australia but, to go as far as an attempt to enforce this (and that is the threat), of one mutton carcass for each live sheep exported to each country of destination is nothing short of ridiculous. The paper demonstrates quite deliberately the sort of impact that it would have not only on the sheep producing community of this country and South Australia but also on a number of other associated industries involved in the exporting of live stock. The point that the member for Mallee raises involving the likely upset in the pasture grazing pattern that we have adopted in this State is a real one. I do not believe that it should be other than in the category of the areas that I have mentioned that will be upset as a result of any interference in this programme that has been gradually developed.

I say that it has been gradually developed, because in 1974-75 we were exporting about 1 000 000 sheep from Australia. Over the past five or six years we have lifted that figure gradually to about 5 500 000 sheep exported in 1980-81. Also, it is important to convey to this Committee that in gradually increasing export numbers to the present level, and at a level which I hope we are able to maintain, in that period, the overall sheep numbers in Australia have increased: our sheep numbers in South Australia over that period have markedly increased and, at the same time, both nationally and particularly within South Australia, carcasses slaughtered within the abattoir industries of Australia, and particularly South Australia, have also increased. All this waffle about the export marketing of live sheep affecting our abattoir throughput is really just that—waffle. It just does not stand up.

**Mr LEWIS:** That is the throughput of sheep and lamb?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes. Indeed, our whole flock structure has changed in accordance with this developed pattern of live sheep export. The new numbers within the flock structure have increased to cope with this special demand which has not just happened but which has been purposely and deliberately developed for the reasons set out in the paper that I mentioned. One good reason is that it does dispose of our aged male sheep, our wether sheep in particular, to a market which attracts returns for our growers that they cannot enjoy in our own local demand area—returns for aged mutton carcasses that have just never been in demand in our country for carcass-type sale but limited to the areas of smallgoods and the like; hence, a somewhat substantially lower return for growers in this area. All in all, the industry has not been affected in the field. The servicing industries associated with the marketing of live sheep have had their positions enhanced and developed favourably in the interests of the employees so engaged and, in fact, we are able to supply to our customers, espe-

cially in the region of the Middle East, products in demand, and ones that we did not have a demand for in our local area before. I think that the matter involving the bit of upset this may cause in regard to our pasture development area should be taken up by the Director-General, and I would ask him to cover that specific point.

**Mr McColl:** Could the question be repeated?

**Mr LEWIS:** Would an insistence upon the policy endorsed by the A.C.T.U. and proposed by the A.M.I.E.U. of one live sheep for one carcass to each country of destination have a destabilising influence on sheep flock numbers, on the confidence in the sheep industry and, therefore, upset the stabilising of lay pasture and mixed farming throughout South Australia?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** In brief, the answer is 'Yes'. It would have the upsetting effect signalled by the honourable member, but I would ask the Director-General to comment further.

**Mr McColl:** Obviously, some years have been spent in developing the particular flock structure that we now have. It would prove embarrassing and destabilising in regard to the actual flock structure. In regard to the effect that the medic lay system is concerned, farmers could probably utilise whatever they grow effectively; irrespective of this, they would change their enterprises fairly rapidly. They could increase their cropping areas rapidly if necessary. The main destabilising effect would be with respect to the flock structure.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Will the Chairman of Samcor be available to assist the Minister this afternoon?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I will try to arrange that, if he is within reach. The Chairman (Mr G. Inns) was to be interstate on business today, but I will check that during the break. If he is not available, I can arrange for the Manager, Mr John Tidswell, to be available.

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

**Mr LEWIS:** Prior to the luncheon adjournment I was referring to the implications of the A.C.T.U. decision relating to the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union request for support for its policy of opposing exports to any destination of more than one live sheep for one carcass. Does the Minister have any specific figures relating to other kinds of meat, such as beef, which might indicate why members of the A.M.I.E.U. have experienced a downturn in the number of hours worked in abattoirs throughout Australia?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It is true that the abattoirs industry is very concerned about the throughput in their premises throughout the country. That concern is justified on behalf of its members, hence the point taken up by the A.M.I.E.U. As indicated by the member for Mallee, there has been a clear downturn in the cattle industry in terms of numbers. Accordingly, there has been a downturn in the amount of meat processed at abattoirs. To use the live sheep export trade as an excuse for the problems of the meat industry workers in Australia is really quite a false premise. On behalf of the sheep producers of this country, I believe it is our duty to demonstrate the facts surrounding that industry and the associated meat industry generally. In doing so, we have prepared the report that I have referred to earlier. I commend that report to each and every member of Parliament in South Australia to enable them to appreciate where the problems lie.

There is a problem; there is no question about that. Many abattoirs have gone out of business in Australia in recent years, and more particularly in the immediate past. As I have said, that is specifically related to the serious downturn in cattle numbers and, accordingly, the number of cattle

being processed. On the other hand, as was explained earlier, the live sheep export numbers have risen from 1 300 000 in 1974-75 to 5 700 000 last year. We hope to maintain the industry at at least that level in the supply of that stock to recipient countries in the Middle East.

**Mr LEWIS:** There are a number of procedures involved with the preparation and despatch of live sheep, as I understand it. Does the Minister have any figures, and not necessarily specific figures for each category, to indicate the following: the number of shearers engaged in, say, crutching and shearing sheep with about four months wool on them (and I understand that it pays to shear them because it does not interfere with the value of the sheep being sold to the Middle East); the number of people who work in, say, the preparation of their packed lunches (that is, the stock-feed industry) to ensure that they are well fed and cared for en route (and I suppose those people might not be members of the A.M.I.E.U., but perhaps also affiliated with the A.C.T.U.); and the number of stockmen engaged in handling those live animals from the time they leave farms to be transported and despatched at port? How many jobs in all would be put at risk if the live meat trade were undermined by industrial action in Australia, sending customer countries to other suppliers?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The honourable member has touched on an area in which some survey work has been done. Because a number of organisations were engaged in that survey, the estimated number of employees who are ancillary to this export exercise has varied. The minimum figure given to our department from such a survey was 944. The maximum figure obtained from another survey was 1 601. Therefore, one could safely say that between about 950 and 1 600 workers were involved in those jobs during 1977. Accordingly, those jobs would have been lost had this particular trade not been under way. Indeed, the employment of these people begins in the paddock with the mustering and drafting involved in obtaining the particular type of sheep that is required to service this demand. A lot of manpower involves transport workers, waterside workers, and storemen, in packing, sorting, despatching and loading. A lot of people are involved in the 18-day journey by sea between, say, Port Adelaide and Kuwait. Indeed, it is in the interests of those people that we support that particular industry being retained.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am also interested to know whether officers of the department working in the economics and marketing division, and people assisting them, were able to come up with a relevant figure for, say, meat workers' jobs over that same period. Is it true that the number of sheep carcasses that have been imported by those countries has increased since the export of live sheep began?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The consumption of sheep meat in the middle east countries is forever expanding. The system of distribution and the promotion for consumption of that meat at nomadic level is growing. Having entered this trade on the ground floor, mainly as a result of the initiative of our colleagues in the Federal Government from both political Parties, and indeed as a result of quite extensive efforts by the Deputy Prime Minister, Doug Anthony, whilst in that region, we now enjoy this growing trade. It has a self-governing factor in that we can produce lamb both on the bone and off the bone for local consumption and export to the limit of our production. There is a limit to our production of aged sheep in the overall flock management of our sheep population. There is no way in which this industry can go wild and erode our flock numbers. There is no opportunity within that region to sell our aged ewes, as indeed applies to our aged wethers. These people nominate what they want and what we are really doing is conceding to a demand in that direction which has its

inbuilt governing factors and which constitutes an outlet for our wether sheep at a price that we could not otherwise enjoy from customers within the country.

**Mr LEWIS:** What will be the effect on jobs if no further live sheep were to be exported and instead we relied on slaughtering? Is the number of jobs that might result in the A.M.I.E.U. sector (meat slaughtering sector) likely to be anything like as great as the 900 to 1 600 that we have presently created through the development of the live sheep export trade, or will it be a lesser figure? What is the approximate figure?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am unable to give the honourable member an estimated figure of employment as a result of there being either compliance with the A.C.T.U. requirements or, at worst, no live sheep exporting. I can assure the Committee that it would be markedly less than the employment figures that we now enjoy as a result of having cultivated that trade.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** In the light of the questioning that has gone on in relation to advice given by departmental advisers to farmers, growers, horticulturists or whatever, what is the current state of play in regard to the *Johnson v Crown* case? I hope the Crown is doing everything possible to see that the appeal is won. Will the Minister advise me as to the current position?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The Crown Law Department has provided officers for the purpose of appealing for the second time against the original judgment. Because the subject is still awaiting a judgment from the High Court, I am unable to comment in any detail on it except to briefly assure the member for Hartley that every effort was made initially under the direction of the previous Government to ensure that the facts surrounding the case were presented. Despite the judgment at that time, efforts have been made to ensure that facts have been re-presented and the legal aspects of the initial case debated with a view to ensuring that a fair and appropriate judgment is ultimately handed down.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Are we still waiting on the High Court?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** As I understand it, all of the evidence in relation to the appeal has concluded. We are awaiting the handing down of the judgment by the High Court. The latest information I have is that it will be given either this month or next month. I would not care to go any further on that subject.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I wish to refer to provisions for fruit fly eradication. How many people have been charged in the past 12 months with bringing produce into the State that has not been inspected by inspectors? I understand that in recent days some growers have been prosecuted who were involved in bringing in interstate tomatoes and labelling them in this State as being of South Australian origin. In fact, I understand that the shipment was part of a movement of produce into this State which has affected our own market and which has also sought to by-pass the normal inspection procedures.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** So far this financial year we have lodged prosecutions against five operators who have allegedly brought loads of tomatoes into South Australia from Queensland without complying with the Fruit and Plant Protection Act requirements, under which our department is responsible for inspecting fruit lodged at identified premises around the State. For example, in Mount Gambier, Renmark, and at Mile End in Adelaide we have stations where these shipments are to be directed for inspection before being despatched or unloaded on to our local market. Of those five for which prosecutions have been lodged or recommended, some prominent fruit and vegetable traders of South Australia are named.

I do not propose to go into detail, but I assure the honourable member that my department is fair dinkum in its attitude towards controlling fruit fly within South Australia. While we are saddled with the responsibility of administering the Fruit and Plant Protection Act, it is our aim to apply the Act and indeed the penalties to those who seek to beat the system. That is clearly how I describe what has occurred in recent times in regard to the movement of tomatoes from Queensland into South Australia. It is interesting to note that, whilst these activities have had significant impact on fluctuation of tomato prices in South Australia, during the same recent period some of our producers and marketers of tomatoes within the State have been sending their produce off to Western Australia where reportedly they have enjoyed prices up to \$80 per carton for our own home-grown produce.

These tomatoes are supplied in 10 kilogram cartons, and the price represents \$8 a kilo on the Western Australian market. There is a rip-off activity going on both ways—by those trying to capitalise by buying cheaper tomatoes in Queensland and dropping them into our market, allegedly beating the system, and at the same time by people seeking to export our own produce to capture the high prices prevailing in Western Australia.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** How were the five prosecutions proceeded with identified? Were they identified by inspectors in the field, or as a result of information received?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Both.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Is the Minister satisfied that the allocation for the inspection process is adequate and likely to pick up the bulk of this kind of smuggling?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** In ordinary circumstances, yes. Where we have some people within an industry who are seeking to beat the system as has been demonstrated in this recent issue, then our work force cannot cope with all the areas that one might like to investigate. It is commendable that our officers engaged in this activity work very hard to follow up the information that has been given them and to be abreast of the position. This morning I was involved in discussions with the industry on the subject, and there is a meeting going on today and a further meeting of the principals within the industry at around 11 a.m. tomorrow with a view to trying to tidy up the activities in this regard. In all, the co-operation by departmental officers and those who are acting responsibly and sensibly within the industry has been tremendous so far. To try to cope with a racket of this kind always calls for more personnel, if available.

This is not an area in which you can put another dozen people for the purposes of assisting the officers. These inspectors have to have some basic experience in interview, otherwise all their efforts can be in vain. They can say the wrong things or fail to approach the alleged offender correctly, and then be brought undone when charges are laid against those alleged offenders. This is an area in which a certain degree of inspectorial expertise is required, and we cannot train people in a short time. Hopefully, this is a seasonal thing and will not be around for very much longer. The indications are that, as our tomatoes in South Australia develop and demand can be met from the local level, the situation will settle down. In the meantime, we are adamant that the primary interest is for the commercial industry and, indeed, the home gardener, against the potential risk of fruit fly coming in. That is where our emphasis is.

**Mr BECKER:** Is the Minister aware of the market opportunities that exist in Japan? I understand that, because we are not a fruit fly free area, this is creating problems. What research is being done in regard to attracting markets in Japan, particularly for melons? Honeydew melons are very

expensive in Japan, and this could be an area of export potential.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I cannot give any information on our potential for fruit and vegetable export markets to Japan. I will seek to obtain the information for the honourable member. It is against that background that we are adamant that the fruit fly campaign continue vigorously, and we expect the co-operation of the industry in order to carry out the protection requirements that are laid down.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** The line 'Fruit fly eradication' shows that no money was set aside in 1980-81 but \$516 000 was actually spent. For the 1981-82 period, no expenditure is proposed. Is the \$516 000 the actual amount spent by the Government on the fruit fly outbreak at Whyalla?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** No, the amount that was actually paid during the period 1980-81 was the amount required to fund our fruit fly campaign. In ordinary circumstances, we would not vote a figure at this time. The Government has undertaken traditionally, in the event of fruit fly outbreak, to provide additional funds from Treasury when the extent of the campaign is actually known. In other words, a basic figure for the purposes of containing and maintaining our fruit fly unit is provided within the Estimates, but any additional moneys required from time to time are provided by Treasury on the basis of submitting the accounts of the actual costs incurred. There was a fruit fly outbreak in Whyalla during 1980-81, and also a significant number of other outbreaks within the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Collectively, the costs incurred when known are submitted to Treasury and reimbursement to the department is forthcoming.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Can the Minister say what was the cost of the fruit fly outbreak in Whyalla, and give the reasons for the outbreak?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** As I do not have the information with me, I will get answers to both questions for the honourable member.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** If the outbreak was caused by negligence, is there any power within the department to act against the people who may have caused the outbreak? Is there any intention by the department to do anything about that?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes, at road block level, if fruit is found to contain fruit fly or fruit fly eggs, it is confiscated. It is an offence to proceed into the State of South Australia on any road, or by ship or aircraft, with such fruit. The penalties that apply will hopefully stick if our officers find that the system has been avoided.

It is not an offence to line up at a road block, for example, or at an air or shipping terminal and present one's fruit, which might contain fruit fly. There is no infringement of the law in that, but to go past that level and be in the possession of or subject to distributing fruit or vegetables that have come in from outside the State, it is an offence. I think the penalty is \$200 maximum that can apply to such infringements.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Is the Minister satisfied that the outbreak in Whyalla has been settled in full; in other words, that the likelihood of another outbreak occurring has reasonably diminished as far as percentages are concerned. I point out to the Minister that there were some very obvious mistakes made by the department, in my opinion, as to its campaign and eradication of fruit fly in the city.

For example, I seriously point out to the department that the public, in my opinion, was not educated about to whom they were to make approaches as far as getting the solution put on their fruit trees. I became aware of this only because I became involved in this quite dramatically and it was only because there was not enough education. I would appreciate it if the Minister could advise the Committee

whether the department would examine this to see that it does not occur again.

The other major problem that I personally have experienced is that the aftermath of the fruit fly eradication is that some sections of the public are quite irate with the department, which is unfortunate. In some instances the eradication work has destroyed vegetation that people have been growing in their backyards in their own environment. I do not know what is going to happen there. Perhaps the Minister is aware. I assure him there was some aftermath about this. Has the department taken that into consideration? I hope assurances will be given by the Minister and the department that an outbreak will not happen again. If it does, will damage be avoided?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Mr Chairman, as a result of the department's activities in its campaign in Whyalla, I am aware of some correspondence that came from that district containing some, albeit minimal, complaints from residents, claiming that advice and procedure were not acceptable to them. I did not get too upset about the matter, quite frankly, because if officers are required to do a job, and particularly if it involves hundreds of residential sites and, accordingly, many hundreds of plants or trees, someone is going to be upset by an officer walking on someone's petunias, or kicking the dog, or whatever happens: I do not know.

My information is that the campaign was attacked vigorously and responsibly by our departmental officers. I do not accept that there was a breakdown of any significance by our people in that instance. It is always a problem to quickly train casual employees and it will be appreciated by the Committee that, apart from the nucleus unit that we have, most of these people are engaged on the spot where possible, locally, as in the case of a regional centre like Whyalla, and trained as quickly as can be organised for the job.

I am not too sure whether the member for Whyalla is aware of the notification and the on-site procedure that occurs, but I have been out with one of these teams in the suburban area of Adelaide to understand just how they go about their job from the time they actually advise the owner of their intentions to enter the property, the procedure that takes place upon entry and identification, and the nature of their application of solutions to the trees and plants or foliage within the grounds concerned.

Everybody is different and, therefore, the people engaged need to be fairly flexible in their attitude when entering such premises. I can honestly say that the reports from our many employees in this service and their application to the job has been good. The odd incidental complaint we have had has been followed up and an explanation has been given, where possible. I know of no breakdown in that communication within the District of Whyalla.

**Mr LEWIS:** My question again relates to the live sheep export trade. Whilst I acknowledge the importance of adequate quarantine, the line of questioning that has been followed by other members, and the importance of the matter not only because of fruit fly but also because of the enormous cost that would result if Karpa beetle and phylloxera were allowed to establish in South Australia, can the Minister confirm, with respect to the live sheep export industry, that if each sheep that is sold is worth on the market something between \$20 and \$25, and if we are selling 5 000 000 to 6 000 000 of those sheep as live sheep each year, are my sums correct in saying that industry is worth \$120 000 000 to \$160 000 000 for livestock values alone and that additional services provided would increase the value even higher than that in total?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes.

**Mr LEWIS:** Therefore, we ought not to take the risk to which we expose that industry when we allow an argument that for every pound of raw grain we export we should export one pound of frozen bread: for every couple of litres of orange juice we export we should export a couple of kilograms of oranges: and for every four tonnes of coal and one tonne of steel we export to Japan we should send over a motor car weighing a ton. Does the Minister see that as a somewhat ridiculous line for anybody with any competence in marketing in his division to accept as logical?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I see most of the cases about which fears were expressed by the member for Mallee as not likely to occur. Indeed, I would not support the examples given if they were threatened.

**Mr LEWIS:** Already the District of Mallee has a low population and that industry is significant to my constituents. That is the reason for my concern.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I wish to ask a question about the Overseas Projects Division. I refer to page 2 of book 8. In the section relating to the 1980-81 specific targets of improvements and achievements set out for the past year, the following statement is made:

Carry out market development studies on China, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Algeria and Tunisia.

Last year in the Estimates Committee, we had considerable debate about exactly what we were doing in regard to the Chinese. We never really seemed to know where we were going, whether we were doing something with them or not. Now we are told that we did something. Can the Minister outline what has been achieved in the past year and what resource involvement has taken place? What is the proposal for the forthcoming 12 months, since it appears as a specific target for 1981-82?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It is true that several of our officers have visited China as part of Australian Government missions. The last of these was in mid-1980, when an officer joined a Federal Government citrus mission for the Australian Development Systems Bureau. We have continued to receive inquiries from various organisations in China, and occasionally we receive visits from Chinese interested in agriculture. We have not entered into any discussions concerning one specific project in China. The relationship with the Chinese has been of a friendly and information-providing kind in interviews but, other than the nature of the visits that I have outlined, it is not the South Australian Government's intention to be bound into a project as such within that country in the foreseeable future.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Does that mean that the phrase 'carry out market development studies' is a little grand in regard to our relationship with China?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I do not believe so. I believe that in all the situations in which potentially there is trade and in the meantime a need for liaison and the building of relations, it should be deliberately on a steady-as-one-goes basis, and not with any great haste. I can indicate that I have received invitations to visit China and become more closely aware of its problems and requirements in relation to what it considers we are able to provide and assist it with. Similarly, I and other members of the Government have been invited to a number of other countries for similar purposes.

I made patently clear to the Estimates Committee 12 months ago, and I do so again, that it is our policy to do what we do very well. We do not aim to become extensively involved with other country projects to a degree in which we fail to manage those projects and demonstrate our procedures in that 'very well' category. As a result, invitations like the two I have personally received last week from two visiting delegations will be approached cautiously and

responsibly. I can name those invitations: one was from Cyprus and one was from Mexico.

In the previous week I received an invitation to visit Zambia, from President Kenneth David Kaunda during his visit to South Australia. There is no doubt that in his case he and his countrymen are very keen to become self-sufficient in food production. They are equally keen to maximise their yields from wheat production. The Zambians are able to produce only 2½ weeks supply of wheat for their population. Accordingly, the Zambian aim is to substantially increase production. The Zambians believe, and I agree, that by applying our sort of system, that is, cereal medic rotation, and planting the right variety in the right climate and regions of Zambia, it can in turn increase substantially its wheat yields.

There is no question about there being a need in a number of countries, including China, to increase food production, and there is no question that here in South Australia we have the expertise to be of assistance to them. However, our approach will be cautious. We must do all the necessary homework about these programmes, which can be delicate, since our State and our national reputation can be at stake if we do not perform well.

I shall be happy to provide a list of the involvements that we have in a number of countries for the honourable member if he is interested, and indeed give him information about the sort of inquiries that we have had from many other countries, more especially since the South Australian Dry Land Conference that was held here in September 1980. There were 45 countries represented at the conference and tremendous interest was cultivated at that level, as has been subsequently demonstrated.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the Minister for offering to make that information available, because I would appreciate receiving it. It would help to put into a much better context the whole question of overseas projects and this State's involvement. I think the possibility of expanding our commitment overseas is commendable. I was worried that this yellow document indicates a priority which, from the Minister's response, is not entirely there. I thank the Minister for his undertaking to provide this information which will correct that situation.

In regard to overseas projects, I am concerned that, in the information provided in relation to recurrent expenditure, we have been advised that it includes outside moneys (the Minister advised us of that earlier), but I can find no reference in the Auditor-General's Report, in the little yellow book, the big yellow book or the Budget papers to the finances of the Salger enterprise with Algeria. I understand that we have significant financial transactions with that enterprise and the Ksar Chellala project. To where has that disappeared in the documentation?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It has never appeared in the Estimates, and therefore it is not subject to Parliamentary perusal as such. It is a private company that was formed for the purposes of handling the income and expenditure applicable to overseas projects. If the honourable member is genuinely interested in the details associated with that separately operated account, I am quite happy to provide them.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I take exception to the imputation in the Minister's answer. I am genuinely interested; otherwise, I would not have asked my question. I have a number of questions that I wish to ask, and I would not have asked that question if I had not been interested. I hope the Minister will provide that information in due course. The Opposition has further questions on this vote, but we will not proceed with them because we wish to get on with the Miscellaneous vote.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I made it clear when I appeared before the Estimates Committee last year, as I did in my opening remarks this morning that, if any member of the Committee wishes to become better informed about the activities of the department in its servicing of South Australia or, indeed, its involvement with overseas projects, we are only too happy and proud to provide that information. I welcome the interest that is being shown by the member for Salisbury. Whether he does it at this meeting, or in the form of Questions on Notice in the House, or questions with notice, or through correspondence he can expect my fullest co-operation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I thank the member for Salisbury for the indication that he will not be proceeding with any more questions at this stage. The member for Mallee has indicated that he has one or two more questions on this vote and I draw his attention to the member for Salisbury's comments. I ask the member for Mallee to make his questions as brief as possible so that we can move on to the next vote.

**Mr LEWIS:** My question relates to a problem that has arisen in the immediate vicinity of the small town of Geranium, which is half-way along the Taillem Bend to Pinnaroo railway line. I refer to the emergence of an insect pest known locally as honey beetles over recent years. They are a species of coleoptera. Does the Minister have any information about this particular pest? Does the department have any plans to prevent the already extensive spread of this pest, which exceeds the rate of spread of, for instance, Portuguese millepedes from Aldgate through the foothills to the eastern suburbs?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am aware of the brown native beetle referred to by the honourable member and its growth rate. According to information obtained by my department it is not spreading to the extent referred to by the honourable member. I thank the member for Mallee for drawing that aspect to my attention. However, I point out that this pest operates in a seasonal pattern. As far as we have been able to ascertain so far, it is more prevalent in the drier regions and during dry periods of the year when it attacks the foliage of indigenous plants. Small immature trees attacked by this pest recover. They also nip the leaves of mature plants, which also recover in the next growing season. We do not have a control measure that we can recommend. I will make inquiries within the department about the level of priority it places on this particular beetle. We are conscious of the problem but we do not see it as being anymore than a nuisance at the present stage. I have noted the points made by the honourable member and I appreciate that the subject deserves attention. It will be given that attention and I will report back to the honourable member.

**Mr LEWIS:** The Mines Department has assured us of large deposits of suitable water for irrigation purposes in this region. Horticulture crops which could use that water, such as grape vines and vegetables, could not be planted successfully if this insect continues to predominate, according to advice that I have been given. That worries me, because that is the only bright spark for prospective development in this district, which could increase the number of jobs and productivity.

I now turn to the national soil conservation programme, which this year was handed over to the States by the Federal Government. Does the Minister have any details about the proposed programme that the Department of Agriculture in South Australia has to continue with the soil conservation programme? Soil erosion is and always has been a problem and it very much concerns Mallee farmers.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It is true that the Commonwealth Government has withdrawn from the national soil

conservation programme and, in turn, has incorporated the funds intended for this work into the revenue grants for the States. The South Australian Government is determined to proceed forthwith with its own State project and has increased the expenditure included in the soil, land and range management sub-programme. That detail appears in Programme Estimates No. 8 at page 21. Without going into all the detail of our programme for the next 12 months and beyond in relation to this soil conservation work, I refer to the projects to which we are applying or proposing to apply attention. The first project is in the upper Wakefield district, and involves an area about 12 miles east of Balaklava. I am sure you would be interested in that, Mr Chairman. The second project is at Magpie Creek, which is due north of Blyth and includes 10 landholders in the catchment area of some 6 000 hectares. The third project involves the arid land in the Mannahill-Olary revegetation region. The fourth project is at Chesson and Mindarie, and involves a project area of 39 000 hectares in the Wanbi and Mindarie districts. I am sure the honourable member is aware and interested to know that 25 land holders from his district are involved in that project. The levelling and stabilization work involves quite a bit of activity. The fifth project involves coastal dune reclamation. This particular project is along the coastline north-west of Beachport and includes land holders from the Millicent Dune Buggy Club and the Southern Centre of Theosophy. That work involves stabilising some 300 hectares of large active coastal dunes.

In regard to the sixth project, Cockabidnie Creek, the project covers an area 20 miles north-west of Cleve. In regard to the seventh project, the Koolunga region, the project area adjoins the township of Koolunga and includes six landholders in a catchment area of some 2 000 hectares. There is a heap of detailed information about each of these projects which I can provide to any member of the Committee. It is too much to go into now.

**Mr LEWIS:** Could the Minister incorporate that information, with the leave of the Committee?

**The CHAIRMAN:** As is the normal practice, the only matters that can be incorporated must be of a statistical nature.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It would indeed be outside that category. For obvious reasons, local council areas, local members, regions and landholders are named, and it is not truly statistical. Photocopies of the material are readily available to the member for Mallee or any other member.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote 'Agriculture, \$21 097 000', completed.

Works and Services—Department of Agriculture,  
\$507 000—Examination declared completed.

Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests,  
Miscellaneous, \$6 888 000

**Chairman:**

Mr E. K. Russack

**Members:**

Mr Lynn Arnold  
Mr H. Becker  
Mr Max Brown  
The Hon. J. D. Corcoran  
Mr I. P. Lewis  
Mr K. H. Plunkett  
Mr R. J. Randall  
Mr I. Schmidt

**Witness:**

The Hon. W. E. Chapman, Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr J. C. McColl, Director-General, Department of Agriculture.

Mr H. P. C. Trumble, Deputy Director-General, Department of Agriculture.

Mr J. C. Radcliffe, Leader, Policy and Planning Unit, Department of Agriculture.

Mr A. J. Benson, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Agriculture.

Mr J. Tidswell, General Manager, South Australian Meat Corporation.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I refer to the Country Fire Services. The Minister would be aware that recently there has been a Select Committee on the Metropolitan Fire Brigade which made certain recommendations to Parliament in the form of amendments to the Bill which has subsequently passed the Parliament. One of the features of that was that we recommended, without it being included in the Bill, that an advisory committee be set up to advise the Government on all matters relating to fire across the whole State. We bore in mind that at the same time in section 28 of the Country Fire Services Act provision does exist for an advisory committee to be set up under that Act to advise the Minister in relation to that service. The committee that sat at the time saw it as an advantage if that section was not acted upon; the authority that we had recommended as a result of our inquiry would be an advantage to the Government generally for both fire services, because it would provide better co-ordination and a better passage of information between the two groups, and not only these two groups but also essential services generally, because of the make-up of that authority. No doubt the matter has been drawn to the Minister's attention and some discussion has taken place between the Chief Secretary and himself, but I ask whether a decision has yet been made not to proceed with that committee under section 28 of the Country Fire Services Act and indeed to accept the recommendation of the Select Committee that one advisory committee be set up to service the Government on this question which would represent the whole State.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am aware of the matter raised by the member for Hartley and I can only say that discussions have taken place with the Chief Secretary as to whether or not we should have a single advisory authority for the purpose of assisting Government in this area. I am unable to advise the honourable member as to what stage of consideration the subject is at the present time. I apologise for that. I will hold discussions with the Chief Secretary and, if necessary, other members of Cabinet for the purpose of providing an answer to the honourable member on the subject. As far as I am aware, there is no decision to proceed to set up that advisory committee at this stage, but the precise details and reasons for not proceeding with it I will have to obtain and pass on to him.

**Mr RANDALL:** I thank the member for Hartley for raising this matter. I ask the Minister, in relation to Country Fire Services, whether we will in future have a programme specifically laid out which will show us the role and objectives of the Country Fire Services and the financial management of that body. Can we expect to see it laid out on a page in front of us as to what expenditure is to be allocated to such a group, how it is being spent and where it is going?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** We have an annual report on the activities of that division of Government. It is tabled in

Parliament and I can obtain a copy of the 1980-81 report, which covers our most recent period. I know that that is after the event, but it certainly signifies what has occurred in relation to expenditure and activity, and in its foreword it identifies the objectives referred to by the honourable member. Those objectives are consistent and on-going. Only the details of expenditure change. Those details are in the Estimates. If the honourable member has any other questions about that, I would be happy to hear them. The Government and insurers contribute equally to the Country Fire Services Fund, and the combined allocation covers cost of salaries, operating expenses, equipment, motor vehicles, plant, board and subcommittee fees and expenses, publicity, research, as well as C.F.S. maintenance, equipment and building subsidies. Subsidies, wages and salaries, plant and equipment, form the major portion of the total provision. The details are identified in the annual report. If details for the current period are required, I will seek to obtain them for the honourable member.

**Mr RANDALL:** I must therefore pursue my questions regarding the C.F.S. on hearsay rather than on facts. I do so following my experience on the Select Committee that inquired into the South Australian Fire Brigade. When various witnesses appeared before that committee, a number of questions regarding the C.F.S. were raised, and I suppose that this is an appropriate time to raise those matters. It has been stated that the C.F.S. will perhaps build its own training facilities in the near future or expand its existing training facilities. In which area of expansion will the C.F.S. be involved?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I will obtain details of the training programme for the honourable member. It is appropriate to state that the Government overall is keen to ensure that duplication that could result in wastage does not occur between the various divisions of our service. There is a real potential for this to occur if we consider organisations such as the Fire Brigade, Country Fire Services, ambulance services, the State Emergency Service, and even, to some degree, the Police Department. There is a potential risk of overlap of services being required in some cases and, in other cases, in the form of preparing for needs as they arise. This is an area that the Government realises must be watched.

I assure the honourable member that not all requests made by the C.F.S. are granted, even though we recognise that it is doing a tremendous job in the field. I am sensitive to criticism other than the constructive type that has been made in this instance of the C.F.S., as we are looking at about 11 000 volunteers who are involved therein. Their efforts are not to be sneezed at, and one should be cautious regarding criticism, unless it is clearly constructive and in the best interests of person and property.

We recognise constantly that half the money spent in the C.F.S. personnel and facilities area is provided by insurance companies. In round figures, only half the expenditure involved comes from the State Treasury. So, across the whole spectrum of the C.F.S. the State's contribution is really quite minimal in monetary terms.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** For the service that we get.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes.

**Mr RANDALL:** I do not intend by my line of questioning to denigrate the C.F.S. Indeed, I support the need for it and commend the work that it does. I should like to refer to certain matters that were raised before the Select Committee, about which some of us became concerned, including joint sharing facilities. Does the C.F.S. intend in the near future to build new training facilities in the form of smoke tunnels, and so on, for the training of its own fire-fighting staff?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I can obtain that information for the honourable member. I do not want to mislead the honourable member by guessing about the type and nature of specifications involved if there are intentions in that direction.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out that this will be the last call that the member for Henley Beach will get at this time. If he has any other questions to ask, the Committee can return to them. Early this morning, the Committee agreed that at about 3.30 p.m. we would proceed with the last vote. As I want to be fair to all concerned, I therefore call on the honourable member now and will thereafter call honourable members to my left.

**Mr RANDALL:** I was not here this morning, Mr Chairman, and am therefore unaware of what is involved in relation to the last vote.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am referring to the vote for the Woods and Forests Department.

**Mr RANDALL:** I should like now to pursue the matter of the C.F.S. and, if possible, return to it later. My question relates to the radio network that the C.F.S. operates. Is it intended to expand that network with the purchase of more equipment?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** As a result of a review of a number of the activities of the C.F.S., especially in the area of communications, equipment and installations, the information sought by the honourable member should be provided after consultation with our Director. Unfortunately, he is not present today and, in all fairness, despite his absence, I think that the nature of the questions asked by the honourable member are of a technical and detailed nature, and we ought to be providing the answers in reports direct to the honourable member. If any Committee member wants a copy of the information that any other honourable member seeks, I shall be pleased to provide it to him.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** My question relates to Samcor. Has a firm commitment been made to upgrade the Port Lincoln abattoir works to U.S. Department of Agriculture standards?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** If that is so, will the Minister say what feasibility studies in relation to supply, stock, economics of slaughtering, operations, and so on, were carried out before this decision was taken?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I refer first to the honourable member's question regarding the economic study. True, the Samcor board, with the expertise available to it, produced a study demonstrating that the funding required for upgrading the Samcor works at Port Lincoln was an investment rather than simply an injection of funds, and that it was in its longer-term economic interest to open up that avenue through which their supplies could be extended. That economic study accompanied the proposition that the Government was given in order to consider the programme.

As the honourable member would know, the funding is from the capital to which the Samcor board has access in its own right; it does not involve additional Treasury funding for the purposes of this upgrading. Accordingly, the staging programme of the works is for Samcor to determine. It proposes at this stage initially to spend about \$70 000 and, over the next couple of years, amounts involving, in round figures, \$200 000 a year. I should like the Chairman of Samcor to give details regarding throughput that justified the move.

**Mr Tidswell:** We have been assured by the major client operating at the Port Lincoln works that he would see an upsurge in beef processing at the works aimed mainly at the United States market increasing by at least 100 cattle a week. This is an initial figure only, and we see that



increasing in the near future, depending on supply and market conditions.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I was pleased to hear the Minister say that it was a firm commitment. The Chairman of Samcor was interviewed recently and he said that no firm decision had been taken and that it depended on the United States market for beef justifying the upgrading or whether producers would provide stock. This interview was on a country session of the ABC, and it could leave doubt in the minds of people on the West Coast whether or not the thing is to proceed.

Regarding the Chairman, he was appointed the full-time Chairman of the board. I take it that the Government saw at that time a need to have a full-time Chairman and I questioned it because I did not think that it was necessary at that time and I still do not think it is necessary. Since then he has been appointed the Director-General of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau, and I wonder whether it is the intention of the Minister to replace Mr Inns as the now part-time Chairman, with another full-time Chairman.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** When the honourable member questioned me last year, we then needed a full-time Chairman of Samcor in order to assist the Government in its objective of restructuring the finances of that statutory authority. We needed a full-time Chairman to attend to activities of management and operation of Samcor at both Gepps Cross and Port Lincoln; appropriate attention was lacking. As a result of simultaneously introducing into this Parliament meat hygiene authority legislation and revising the activities of licensing and operating abattoirs and slaughterhouse premises throughout the State, the need for a full-time Chairman was clearly demonstrated.

Mr Graham Inns, the person appointed to that position, with the assistance of his manager and associates, did a tremendous job in providing the material required by the Government in the interim period. As a result of all of those projects being implemented, the matter is now well down the track with a Meat Hygiene Authority appointed and the need for full-time application to the job has been reduced and hence the opportunity arose for the Government to appoint him in the position of Director of Tourism, as well as to carry on in the capacity of part-time Chairman of Samcor. It is my desire that, despite his heavy involvement in tourism, he continue to act as Chairman of the Samcor Board. I have no intention of replacing him.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** How could the responsibilities of full-time Chairman disappear so quickly? I wonder whether that is the case because we have a conflict already, because the Minister has not denied that the Chairman did make the statement that no decision had yet been taken in relation to upgrading the Port Lincoln works. I would like the Minister to say that the Chairman was mistaken and was not in command of the full facts at the time. I do not think that the interview was very long ago. The interview was certainly after the Minister made the statement that it was a firm commitment on the part of the Government. Therefore, there was a lack of co-ordination or something there. I want to know, in the light of the firm commitment, whether or not any contracts have been entered into in relation to the supply of beef as a result of this decision to upgrade, and, if they have, when they are likely to be filled?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am not aware of the contracts of beef supplies involved. Such contracts are clearly the responsibility of the operators at the works. In this case Freez-Pak has a commitment with the Government to continue operations in that premise for a minimum of five years. On the point raised by the member for Hartley about some apparent conflict of information emerging from the

Chairman as against that from the Government, he asked me a question today and I have given him an answer. The position is that we have a firm commitment to proceed with the upgrading of the abattoirs at Port Lincoln. There is no question about that. When he heard the remarks of the Chairman on the *Country Hour* or wherever, I do not know, but what I do know is that we are proceeding to upgrade those premises.

As I explained earlier, the staged programme of that upgrading is entirely in the hands of the board; hence my reference to the initial expenditure of \$70 000, which is not the total amount needed to secure U.S.D.A. licence standard. If the honourable member likes to refer to the official statement from the meeting at Port Lincoln when, on my behalf, the Chairman went to Port Lincoln and met with representatives of industry and local government, he will see that precisely what I am saying today is consistent with statements made by the Chairman on that occasion. If he were to see the *Port Lincoln Times* article following that meeting (and that newspaper had access to the statement made), he would again be reminded of the precise procedure that is to take place.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Is the Samcor Board or the Government demanding any commitment from producers on the West Coast to supply beef if the premises are upgraded? Can the Minister say whether a statutory declaration will be demanded similar to that required by the Playford Government in relation to grain and the bulk handling authority?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** It is not intended by either Samcor or the Government to enter into such areas of demand. What we have done is urge growers and stock producers on Eyre Peninsula and to the north of them that, in order publicly to justify our retention of the premises at Port Lincoln and their progressive upgrading to the standards required, they support the venture at that level. The more these people bypass the premises and facilities made available to the Eyre Peninsula, the more they place at risk its future economic continuance. The signs are there that the co-operation we have sought will be forthcoming, and I hope that Freez-Pak will be successful and that overall our obligation to retain that premise open will be able to be maintained and that the costs of keeping it open are minimised. The signals are good.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I have no criticism.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** You raised the subject, implying a couple of things.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Have you finished your answer?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** No. As I was saying, the signs are good. The losses last year in that premise, as a result of what we believe was good management, high morale amongst the work force, and the efforts at floor level, were reduced on the previous year. Shortly, I will be able to table in the House of Assembly, probably on the first sitting day next week, a report which demonstrates how good that operation has been, not to mention the tremendous results that we have received after our first full financial year of operations at Gepps Cross.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** It was my Government that decided to carry on the works at Port Lincoln. We knew they would lose money. The Government was prepared to pick up to the tune of, I think, \$1 000 000 a year. We did that because of the unemployment situation in Port Lincoln, which is the worst in the State, as I understand. I ask the Minister how many jobs this upgrading will create and whether it will affect jobs anywhere else in the State in this type of work.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** On the details of employment, I will ask the Chairman to answer that. I take it from the

remarks by the member for Hartley that he ought to be delighted with the new Government's attitude towards that premise that his Government got underway.

**Mr Tidswell:** While appreciating it is a seasonal industry where we have peaks and troughs in employment, we see that this move could generate an additional 20 to 30 jobs at Port Lincoln meatworks. On that basis, we would not see it having any major effect on other meatworks throughout Australia.

**Mr BECKER:** Can the Minister tell me what salary the Chairman of the Samcor board is paid and what hours are allocated to his duties as Chairman of the board?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Since the Chairman of the Samcor board took office as the Director of Tourism he no longer receives any salary for his efforts directed towards Samcor functions during ordinary working hours, but if the activities of Samcor and its board were to involve that Chairman on week-ends at night-time, or whatever, he would receive the normal Chairman's hourly rate. I cannot tell the member what that is off the top of my head, but I can get that figure for him.

No information has been brought to my attention signifying that the Chairman of Samcor, now the Director of Tourism, has drawn anything for his services since that appointment, but he may have and I will check and see. In any event, provision is made for a full-time public servant to receive an hourly rate for hours worked in the capacity as a Chairman or as a committee man out of ordinary working time. There is no provision for an additional salary any more under our Government for someone carrying on a dual role.

In other words, if an officer of my department were to become a Chairman of a statutory authority, he would receive no fees whatsoever for work done during ordinary working hours; he would receive the nominal Public Service hourly rate for hours actually engaged in that job outside ordinary working hours. That was not the policy of the previous Government but it is the policy of our Government and any new appointments in that direction, are handled accordingly.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** He was the Deputy Chairman before you appointed the full-time Chairman, and he was paid as a board member.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am talking about currently, since he became the Director of Tourism. That is the situation as far as he is concerned. It would indeed apply to members of such committees if they were public servants as well.

**Mr BECKER:** What hours would he be required to give to the position of Chairman? There would have to be at least a monthly board meeting.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** There are two board meetings a month. I would have to seek from the Chairman the details of his involvement with the board or its operations outside those two monthly meetings, which are held, in this case, in ordinary working time. I have had reason from time to time to call the part-time Chairman of Samcor, Mr Graham Innes, to my office for discussions since he became the Director of Tourism, and that is the arrangement within the Government, he continue with those two jobs. I want him to continue as part-time Chairman of Samcor.

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

Works and Services—Woods and Forests Department,  
\$3 500 000

**Chairman:**

Mr E. K. Russack

**Members:**

Mr L. M. F. Arnold  
Mr H. Becker  
Mr Max Brown  
The Hon. J. D. Corcoran  
Mr I. P. Lewis  
Mr K. H. Plunkett  
Mr R. J. Randall  
Mr I. Schmidt

**Witness:**

The Hon. W. E. Chapman, Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr P. South, Director-General, Department of Woods and Forests.

Mr M. Curtis, Accountant, Department of Woods and Forests.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the vote open for examination. Are there any questions?

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Concerning the proposed pulp plant at Snuggery, the Minister has said in recent times that this project will be going ahead, but the annual report of A.P.M. states:

We have secured from the respective State Government's extensive wood rights to State-owned pine pulpwood in both South Australia and New South Wales. The Division is now investigating the development of separate export projects to utilise these valuable resources.

On the face of that excerpt, that implies that it is still only a possibility that A.P.M. proposes to proceed, rather than a definite possibility. Would the Minister advise as to the status about the present proposed plant? Is it a definite reality or still only a possibility?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I repeat what I have said on a number of occasions publicly, and undoubtedly the remarks to which the member is currently referring. That is, that we have found from within Australia a very reputable company, a proven paper pulp producer that is capable of the sorts of installations and operations that we need to dispose of our softwood thinnings. That company, as I have said I had indicated publicly on a number of occasions, has demonstrated its capacity to handle the job.

Part of the preparation for this is to secure appropriate markets for the end product, and negotiations in that direction have been occurring and will continue to occur for some time. We were fully aware of that when we identified A.P.M. as the company to process our product. The Director could tell you of what progress has been made in recent days, as I have not had a report on this matter in the last week or two. I am satisfied that ultimately it will happen. There is no question about that. To identify a time would be quite wild and irresponsible, and that is why I have repeatedly refrained from doing that when questioned in the past few months.

As the honourable member undoubtedly knows, the paper pulp industry is a fluctuating one, and the demand for the product and the price paid for it is up and down like a yo-yo. It has never been any different and it is no different now. We do not look forward to its levelling out and remaining at any level in the foreseeable future. In recent months,

we have been in a trough in regard to world prices, as there has been a substantial quantity on hand in recipient countries, in Japan in particular. While that situation prevails, demand is not as vigorous price-wise as we would hope. I ask the Director to bring the Committee up to date on the current situation.

**Mr South:** The current position is that we expect during 1982 that we will be on the front of the list for signing contracts, the groundwork having been done, as the Minister said, by A.P.M. and others. The investigations at this stage are more concerned with the type of process rather than whether there will be a process. It is also likely that before that process commences there will be an interim period of chip export.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I take it that implicit in the Minister's answer is the fact that the company is satisfied that marketing difficulties can be coped with and that that is why the Minister feels he can say the project is a definite goer. The annual report seems to indicate that the wood rights have been granted to A.P.M., which uses the phrase 'We have secured extensive wood rights'. Has it been granted those wood rights? What conditions have been put on the granting of those rights, given that the contract has not yet been signed? Under what possibility would those rights lapse or be confirmed?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** No contracts have been signed with the company by the South Australian Government. We have identified the company as the appropriate one with whom to negotiate and assist in preparing for the project to proceed. We will not seek to enter into contracts of a firm detailed kind until the homework outlined by the Director has been concluded.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I take the Minister's point. Does it mean that A.P.M. in its annual report has not been totally correct when it says it has secured extensive wood rights?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I have not read the report.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** A.P.M. has not been granted extensive wood rights?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The Director has indicated that he has had access to the report, and I would ask him to answer the honourable member.

**Mr South:** I took the statements in A.P.M.'s report to recognise that, as a result of a tender call, it had the opportunity to take up these resources and, at the appropriate time, when it has identified its market, there is no reason why the already prepared agreement should not proceed.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** That means that beyond the tender call no other documentation has been entered into other than what has been put to us?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** No contracts at all have been entered into officially between the Government and A.P.M.

**Mr LEWIS:** Can the Minister or his officers provide information about the value of the department's gross sales in the past year?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes. I refer to the Woods and Forest Department's profit and loss statement for the year ended 30 June 1981. Receipts from trading revenue amounted to \$51 992 000, as against the previous trading income of \$46 746 000 for the year ended June 1980.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Has the Government undertaken, or does it propose to undertake, any studies on the actual benefits to this State from the various development options that may be available in regard to wood chip exploitation?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The interim measure signalled by the Director a few moments ago should be followed up by him.

**Mr South:** It is a matter of reading the markets as we go. At this time, it is expected that the sale of that wood would be in the form of wood chips initially whilst a

processing plant was in the construction stage. Meanwhile, the forests are managed to minimise the waste and maximise the wellbeing of the forests. We are looking at a number of areas that would utilise some of that wood, including its use as fuel, but I fear that in the space of time before a process of the pulp nature gets going that that would be relatively minor in quantity compared with the 230 000 cubic metres a year.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Implicit in any such investigation undertaken is a comparison of the economic advantages in regard to employment or royalty revenue to the State of the pulp plant proposal, as against the previous export proposal, as against using the material as fuel locally, and as against as what other possibilities might be considered.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Are all these possibilities being compared against each other?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Yes.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Will the results be made available to Parliament in due course?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** That had not been considered before, but I see no reason why not. I do not think there is any reason at all why they should not be made available to demonstrate the benefits of proceeding in the intended direction. I think that the appropriate time to provide this information to the honourable member and publicly would be when we ultimately cover the snippets of homework that are being undertaken and enter into a signed agreement with A.P.M.

**Mr LEWIS:** My question relates to commercial operations. I will preface my question by reading selected parts of an article appearing on page 1895 of the *Commonwealth Record*, dated 31 August 1980.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It has been agreed by the Committee that any preamble by a member would be no longer than five minutes.

**Mr LEWIS:** I appreciate, that Mr Chairman. The article states:

Australian nurserymen must rationalise and expand their operations if they want a share of the \$1 300 000 per annum indoor plant market in Europe and the United States... the present Australian indoor plant export market of \$1 500 000 could be worth \$12 000 000 in the first full year of operation after the industry adopted export development proposals made in a report which the Government commissioned.

According to the article, the planned export market could be worth \$40 000 000 a year if a capital investment of \$24 000 000 was made. In my opinion that is not a bad return. The article continues:

An indoor plant market of \$1 300 000 000 was growing at 8 per cent annually.

It is not a small market and it is not small in terms of its expanding demand. The article continues:

Australian nurserymen must try to penetrate the European market, initially through the Netherlands where a sophisticated wholesaling and auction system already operates, then move into Germany, the main European market. They should also develop links with United States wholesalers, and examine closely the Canadian and Japanese markets for Australian horticultural products... although the Australian industry has the advantages over its competitors of lower heating, land and labour costs, the report also pinpoints its disadvantages—the high cost of sea and air freight and other transport disabilities.

The article continues with the following more relevant point:

Apart from the potplant market, good export prospects exist for cut flowers, dried flowers and Australian native plants.

I now refer to an article published in the *Seed and Nursery Trader*, April 1981, volume 79, number 40, as follows:

Australian plants were already being exported to the United States and Europe from Hawaii and Israel, which had successfully hybridised natives. Nurserymen in Australia had neglected the burgeoning market overseas. Europeans, deprived of the sight of anything green for at least half the year, are eager buyers of indoor

plants. The Swiss spend \$50 a year each on indoor plants. The figure is lower in most EEC countries, but demand is increasing.

At page 23, the same article states; 'Our real handicap has been industrial disputes.' The article is entitled 'Green Fingers Sow Export Seed', and it refers to a full plant operation financed by a Mr Starr who made that comment. Has the department's capacity to collect and sustain a library of seed material been in any way impaired as a result of the necessity recently to reduce expenditure?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** There is no question that there is an incredible potential market for horticultural varieties outside of this country. I am aware of one recent order in particular which came from a Middle East country seeking the provision of a million plants. Accordingly, that order was passed on to the private sector nursery trade. I understand that the size of the order was somewhat embarrassing in terms of its size and they were unable to supply the required varieties and numbers involved. However, it certainly signals the potential market outlined by the honourable member. I do not recall any specific question asked by the honourable member.

**Mr LEWIS:** My first question related to the department's nursery section. Has the nursery section's capacity to act as a plant material and seed library been impaired in any way by recent reductions in expenditure?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am not aware of any impairment, but I will investigate that matter. In the 1980-81 period, we planned sales from our horticultural branch of some \$406 500. Our actual achievement was \$395 753 which, in money terms, was very close to the planned programme. In 1981-82, we plan sales of \$408 000, which is slightly above the previous year. That indicates that the activities have not been eroded or subject to reduction.

**Mr LEWIS:** That being so, does the Minister see some value in trying to encourage nurseries in the private sector to get cracking on this overall venture, given that it is a labour intensive industry which will create many jobs? Even if we could get only 1 per cent of the \$1 300 000 000 a year expanding at 8 per cent annually, that would be of benefit to the State, even if a partnership developed between the department and private nurseries to produce Australian native plant material here and export it. It would not have to be a commercial partnership but an industrial and developmental partnership. That would mean at least 1 300 to 1 500 jobs and it would also provide us with an additional income. If, at present, we are making only \$50 000 000 from the department's activities and gross sales at the present time we may be able to expand that at a substantial rate by diversifying from Australian softwood produce in the main. Has the department analysed development in that way to help the State's economy?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** No, we have not. However, I take the honourable member's point. The Woods and Forests Department has been involved in this area for a very long time. Understandably, the private sector has recently showed some interest and, indeed, it is providing a very real service in certain areas of the State. Out of recognition for that developing private sector industry, I think we are co-operating as much as is humanly possible, given our commitment of service to the community. It is not our policy and we do not intend to deliberately cut across the path of the private sector. Undoubtedly, because of the present situation there are areas where commercial competition takes place.

To give one or two examples, in the country areas of the State it is only in recent times that the private sector has become established. We have an arrangement, an undertaking with the private sector nursery trade, that we will not enter into those areas that they are servicing satisfactorily, at least in the opinion of the local community and

local councils. Getting back to the initial point raised by the honourable member about developing trade, as I indicated, we have handed on to the private sector the interest that has been directed to us from other countries. There is a fair degree of co-operation and, without seeking to enter into any sort of joint venture, I think the relationship between the Woods and Forests Department service, both within and without the metropolitan area, and the private sector is going pretty well.

**Mr LEWIS:** I would appreciate it if we could forget about the trivial, trite argument that the Nurserymen's Association has had with the department over the existence of real or imagined competition in regard to their respective operations for the local market. I am talking about the enormous local market which is expanding at an enormous rate compared to our market and hoping that we can see that in the same context that we have seen dry land farming technology extended to Middle East countries as a means whereby we generate jobs within the manufacturing industry for agricultural equipment, fencing and the like. We could see a parallel in the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of creating jobs in these kinds of industries and in the Woods and Forests Department. In this instance we could create the climate to generate the productivity from nurseries to supply that enormous market which has been positively identified. Can the Minister agree that it might be a desirable area in which public investment could prime the pump and get the industry expanding so that we get a slice of the action of that \$1 300 000 000 a year?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The Woods and Forests Department currently produces about 650 000 plants a year. For the Government to involve itself in seeking trade of the magnitude outlined by the member for Mallee, there would need to be a conscious decision to enter that massive field. I do not play down the significance, the importance and the potential opportunities that exist. There is no question that there is massive interest around the world in our native varieties and others that we propagate. We are not in a position to handle that under our present structure. I repeat that there would need to be a conscious policy decision in order to consider going in the direction that the honourable member has outlined. I am quite prepared to discuss the points raised by the honourable member with the Director and officers and report back to him as to what their considered views are. In that respect, could we leave it on that undertaking basis rather than pursuing further details at this time?

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I wish to turn briefly to the operations of the South Australian Timber Corporation. Before entering into the pros and cons of that operation, I have noticed that there are no figures supplied by the estimates on the operations of that corporation. I am wondering whether the Minister could supply figures as to the operation to the Committee. If he cannot do so immediately, would he be prepared to make available at a later date the actual figures in relation to the operation of that authority?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Financial details of the South Australian Timber Corporation are not the subject of our Parliamentary papers as such at the time of producing estimates. It is a private company and is in the same category as is Salger, associated with the Department of Agriculture. We do, however, provide an annual report which is tabled in Parliament each year. The South Australian Timber Corporation's annual report is in the process of being completed and covers the expenditure and income details for 1980-81. I understand that it will be available within a fortnight. I have been corrected; it is a statutory authority of Government, and is not in the strict private sector category. However, it is identified separately and does report to Parliament.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** In progressing further, I am concerned at the activity of this corporation. I am only a layman in this area of the Estimates. As I understand the role of the South Australian Timber Corporation, particularly with the collapse of the Punwood venture, the corporation has a function to hold shares in certain companies. I understand that it held shares in Shepherdson and Mewett. It was in Softwood Holdings and Zeds jointly and I understand that it had something to do with Mr Alan Scott. I am concerned that there seems to be some conflict of opinion as to what is happening in the role of the South Australian Timber Corporation. I believe that the Director made a statement recently denying that the Government had any intention of selling any of these shares, yet I also recall that the Minister once said that they were under review as far as sale was concerned. Could the Minister tell the Committee whether the Government has sold its shares in Shepherdson and Mewett? If it has not sold its shares, does it intend to sell them? The Minister may be able to tell the Committee, if these questions are answered in the negative, whether it has entered into any negotiations with any firm for this purpose and, if so, what firm. Finally, perhaps the Minister could advise whether or not the Government has sold its shares in Zeds.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The member for Whyalla has raised a number of subjects. Let us get a few points clear. The South Australian Timber Corporation is headed by the Director of Woods and Forests as its Chairman, Peter South. Bob Cowan of the Department of Woods and Forests and Mr Neil Lawson from the Department of Trade and Industry are its directors. The secretary servicing that board of directors is the officer on my left, Mr Curtis, from the Department of Woods and Forests.

The honourable member mentioned that the Timber Corporation had shares in Softwood Holdings. I do not know where he got his information from, but the Timber Corporation has never had shares in Softwood Holdings and does not now have shares in Softwood Holdings and is not likely to have shares in Softwood Holdings. The second point he raised was the involvement of the corporation in Zeds in the South-East. The Timber Corporation disposed of its share involvement in Zeds in June 1981. The honourable member also spoke of the Timber Corporation's involvement with the company Shepherdson Mewett in the Adelaide Hills. The Timber Corporation has a 50 per cent share-holding, with Softwood Holdings having the other 50 per cent shareholding. There is no intention of the Government or the Timber Corporation to dissolve or dispose of its shareholding in that company.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I take it that there is no intention by the Government to sell the 50 per cent shareholding held by the Government in Shepherdson Mewett.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** There never has been any intention by the Government to sell its shares in Shepherdson Mewett. It is true that we have been approached by the other partner on a number of occasions (that is, representatives of Softwood Holdings) to sell the shares. I made it perfectly clear to those officers what our feelings are about the matter on a number of occasions. Recently the Deputy Premier of South Australia, one of my colleagues, was approached on the subject by a senior representative of Softwood Holdings, and the Deputy Premier also made it patently clear that it was not the intention of the Government to dispose of its share in that company.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** When the Government sold its share in Zeds, can the Minister say what was obtained by the Government for the sale of those shares?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** At no stage did I tell the Committee or the honourable member that the Timber Corporation had sold its shares in Zeds. I said it 'disposed

of' its shares. There is a very real difference. It is appropriate to call on the Secretary to identify that difference and the details surrounding the disposal by the Timber Corporation of its shareholdings in that company.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Perhaps the Minister can explain to the Committee what is meant by the word 'disposal'.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** That information will be provided to the honourable member. We released a detailed statement that identified the particular method of the Timber Corporation's withdrawing from that operation. There was not a tangible asset as such to sell. There was an accrued indebtedness, and the Timber Corporation's share of that indebtedness has been taken over by the other partner, Mr A. A. Scott. As a result of the Timber Corporation's disposing of its involvement in that way, it is owned by Mr A. A. Scott entirely.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I draw to the attention of the Committee that we had a flexible agreement to have a break at quarter past four. The next Minister, the Minister of Environment, comes to the Committee at 4.30. It is up to the Committee what happens now. I propose to call the member for Salisbury and then the member for Hanson.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I have just had a chat with Mr Curtis, the Secretary of the Timber Corporation, and he is quite happy to provide to the honourable member direct the details of the actual book losses involved in the Zeds operation in the South-East and from that information he can glean the precise arrangements that were entered into by the corporation in disposing of its involvement.

**Mr MAX BROWN:** I would be grateful to receive that information. Can the Minister also point out in his figures what was the market value of this particular stock that we are talking about and what it was sold for?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** That is the sort of detail that we will supply.

**Mr BECKER:** The Auditor-General's Report on pages 186 to 189 refers to the appropriation of \$250 000 to a Forest Resource Insurance Reserve but it is not clear where this amount appears in the programme lines. Is it intended that the department will in future carry its own insurance? Where does this amount appear in the Programme Papers? I believe that there is a general policy which determines what insurance is carried by the Government and what is bought from the private sector.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Stenhouse, Wallace and Bruce is the company which carries our policies from the Woods and Forests Department and it is intended to continue with that company for the purpose of insuring the assets. I have been informed that the \$250 000 identified in the report is a disaster fund that the department proposed to put away in the event of a disaster occurring, as occurred in 1979—the Caroline fire. That is the purpose of the figure.

**Mr BECKER:** I wondered whether the \$250 000 is a fair and reasonable figure when you take in the total value of investment in forests.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am informed that the officers have discussed this matter with the Public Actuary and they have concluded that they contribute \$250 000 per year until a figure of \$2 250 000 is accrued and it will be held at that level for the purposes explained.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding the Timber Corporation in its capacity to borrow money on the open market, is it proposed that that capacity be used for the purposes of providing investment in the timber processing industry in South Australia?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** As a semi-government authority, it has the capacity to borrow \$1 200 000 per annum.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I know that. I am asking the Minister whether it is proposed to use that capacity with

a view to upgrading the timber processing industry in this State.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The Timber Corporation has no plans to exercise that opportunity. The corporation, as I have indicated, is currently involved in one enterprise and that is the Shepherdson Mewett function, and it is also involved to a somewhat lesser degree in forestry consultancy work, but the Forestry Act has been amended to give the department the borrowing powers, and that should cater for any requirement that the department needs in its own right without having to exercise such borrowings as implied in the honourable member's question, by the Timber Corporation. There are no plans for the corporation to exercise its authority to borrow as a semi-government authority; in other words, it does not see the need for that to be exercised.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I am not entirely convinced that that is the situation that applies. I believe that there could well be the opportunities in South Australia for the timber industry to make use of that borrowing capacity to further that industry, but nevertheless the Minister has taken a policy stand on that, and I accept that.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Mr Chairman, I might just say that the member has asked a question and has been given an answer. He is obviously now of the opinion that the opportunity may arise wherein the Timber Corporation, as an arm of the Government, as a semi-government authority, may want to exercise its powers to borrow. It may, but it was unrelated to the question that he asked. What I told him was true: in fact, there are no plans and it does not envisage doing so. If circumstances change and there is a need, I gather that the Timber Corporation, after consultation with its officers (and I have with me its Chairman and its Secretary) may need to consider the circumstances, but there is no change in the pipeline or envisaged.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I have one last question on a difficult matter. I understand that the company Gibbs Bright acts as the agent for the Woods and Forests Department in Victoria. I also understand that there has been some speculation in the financial press that that company may be having certain difficulties and may be the subject of a take-over. It has been suggested if, it were the subject of a take-over, it could be taken over by a company that is a direct competitor to the Woods and Forests Department in this State. What is the present situation? Has the department investigated this matter to determine whether or not the present arrangements of Gibbs Bright will be able to continue, or, if they should continue, what alterations would need to be made to the agreement?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** The company Gibbs Bright is operating as agent for the Woods and Forests Department in both New South Wales and in Victoria. It is envisaged that it continue in that operation and for the next two years be on a somewhat reduced commission basis for marketing our products. The reduced commission arrangements is a result of recent discussions with that company, with a view to securing its services at a better rate than we were required to pay for those services previously.

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

Environment and Planning, \$14 847 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr E. K. Russack

#### Members:

Mr H. Becker  
Mr G. J. Crafter  
Mr T. H. Hemmings  
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood  
Mr I. P. Lewis  
Mr R. J. Randall  
Mr I. Schmidt  
Mr J. W. Slater

#### Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Wotton, Minister of Environment and Planning.

#### Departmental Advisers:

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

Mr J. A. Lothian, Manager, Special Programmes Branch, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr N. H. Johnson, Acting Chief Accountant, Management and Administrative Services Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

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

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

Mr N. P. Newland, Superintendent, Field Operations, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Environment and Planning.

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

**The CHAIRMAN:** It has been our practice to go through the vote line by line. If there is time after going through that procedure and a member has a further question, we can go back.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Perhaps at the outset I can make some suggestions about the running of the Committee. First, in relation to the movement through line by line, the Opposition on this Committee may be found to be a little delinquent. There is no desire on our part to be delinquent but, if one looks at the Budget papers, one finds that one of the practical effects of the amalgamation of the department this year is that it is difficult to operate in the traditional way. Matters concerning urban and regional affairs are covered on several pages over from those involving the present Department of Environment and Planning. The old Department of Environment is covered on a couple of pages further on from the present Department of Environment and Planning. It is necessary to do a considerable scissors and paste job in order to get it set out, even approximately, as one would expect. In addition, if one tries to hunt through the yellow documents, it is difficult to get a reconciliation, because bits of some departments have gone all over the place.

I make no criticism of that, because the structure arrived at generally is a good one. What we would prefer to do is to outline some broad general areas which we would like to move through and indicate some sort of idea of timing, although we would not want to be held to that, and we could see how we go from there. Within that general structure we would try and co-operate as much as possible, but I am sure you would appreciate the difficulty that we are under, Mr Chairman. I would see our dealing with the natural environment and the National Parks and Wildlife Service until about 6 o'clock. Perhaps from 7.30 to 8.30 we could look at planning; from 8.30 to 9 p.m. general pollution and litter, and somewhere during that period we would get this vote through, and then move on to 'Loan' for perhaps half an hour and then deal with 'Miscellaneous' in the

remaining period. I do not suggest that we will be able to adhere to that time table except in the very broad, but that is largely as we see it. Also within those guidelines we will want to co-operate with any members who are not members of the Committee but who wish to sideline at appropriate times.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As there are no objections, we will adopt that procedure. If a member has, say, a dozen questions on an area, I intend to call him for several questions and then, if another member wishes to ask a question in the same area, he will have that opportunity.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** If the Minister is disappointed that the time allowed for the examination of his portfolio, following a decision of Parliament, is only four hours, I point out that I share that disappointment. It is interesting to look at the allocation of time and note that, in relation to recurrent and Loan, the Minister will be spending more money this year than either the Attorney-General and Minister of Corporate Affairs or the Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy. Both of those Ministers had 9½ hours devoted to their portfolios, yet the Minister of Environment and Planning has only received four hours. We have enough material here for two days of sitting and possibly the Minister's colleagues have the same amount. I am disappointed that the portfolio of Environment and Planning has not been given a full day. In future I think that Parliament should consider more flexibility or an additional allocation of time so that these matters can be discussed more fully.

I refer to an advertisement that the Minister placed in the *Advertiser* of 6 October at page 4 in which he solicited submissions from the public generally about the development of a draft management plan for the Morialta Conservation Park. I regard such documents as being crucial in setting out policy for the important aspects of our nature conservation area. I refer to the line 'Director and Staff—National Parks and Wildlife Service'. How many parks of whatever category have draft management plans? When does a draft management plan become a management plan? How many staff work on the preparation of such management plans? What does the Minister see as a reasonable target for the development of draft management plans to cover at least the larger and perhaps more critical conservation and national parks within our State?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I do not have a list of all of the questions asked by the honourable member, so I will rely on him to repeat them.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the honourable member for Baudin to ask one question at a time.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** How many parks of whatever category have draft management plans at present?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am informed that there are two in the final stage, and that there are 10 in draft form. This area has been of considerable concern for me. When my Party came to office it was recognised that previously a great deal of effort had gone into the preparation of a few draft plans. Recognising the importance of knowing the future of a park and the very real need to have a proper and adequate plan to look at forward management of that area, we decided that, rather than go into all of the detail that the previous administration had entered into, we should look at making more plans available without using quite the same detail. At this stage, two are almost ready to be recognised in final form, and 10 are in draft form.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** What staffing resources are made available for the production of such plans? The yellow book at page 18 refers to the staffing resources for park management. Obviously, there would be some input from those staffing resources, but people involved in a research or planning capacity would be responsible for the final write-up of those documents.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Previously, three officers did part-time work in this important field. I have now established a task force which is in the process of being assembled to accelerate this programme. An officer has been appointed to take charge of that task force, and we intend within 12 months to have management plans for the majority of our more important parks. That means we are looking at a staff of between 10 and 20 for the actual task force.

I also point out that LANDSAT technology will be used to carry out resource surveys, and I will have more to say about that later. It is important that the skilled professionals in different sections of the department will have an important part to play in this area. I emphasise that we recognise that it is a very important part of the responsibilities of the department. I hope to have a significant number of management plans completed within 12 months.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Will current or future management plans spell out in some reasonable detail the staffing which the authors of the plan regard as appropriate to the proper management and care of a particular park being considered? In that regard I draw attention to the draft management plan on Cleland Conservation Park, which was signed by the former Director-General, Dr Ellyard, in December 1979. I have read through this document, which is extremely well prepared and meticulously researched. In relation to staffing, that document sets out on page 273 the staffing levels at that time. Since the document was written in 1979 that information may well be out of date, so it would be only of historical interest. The document then continues:

This level of staffing is clearly inadequate to develop and maintain the proposals outlined in this management plan, especially considering the current levels of visitation and in particular the need for specialist educational, interpretive and fauna management staff.

For the purposes of this question, I am not particularly interested in how many people currently work at the Cleland Conservation Park. Despite the obvious merits of this document, I believe that the authors could have spelled out in greater detail what would appear to be an ideal level of staffing for that particular park, given all the other information they outline. Will the more detailed spelling out of staffing resources that are regarded as necessary be a feature of future plans and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I think the honourable member would recognise that this has to be tied fairly closely to Budget circumstances. We are certainly looking at resources for the next three-year period in regard to management plans. Again, it is recognised that, if we are going to have plans indicating how a park should be used, it is important that we also look at staffing at the same time.

I should also say that as part of this programme we are also looking at some limited use of contract workers. I have made an approach to the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service for some assistance in management plans in that area as well. I think the honourable member would recognise that, for example, the Coorong has been recognised nationally, and we therefore believe that the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service should be able to assist in that way. It may be of interest to the Committee to know the parks at which we are looking. As the member would recognise, we are looking at the final adoption of the management plan for Innes National Park and Flinders Ranges National Park. We are continuing draft management plans for Hallett Cove Conservation Park, Morialta Conservation Park, Belair Recreation Park, and we are about to commence work on the Coorong National Park and Coorong Game Reserve, which will be planned together, along with the Fort Glanville Conservation Park, Bool Lagoon Game Reserve, Hacks Lagoon Conservation Park, Mary Seymour Conservation Park and Big Heath

Conservation Park, those four being planned together. The Mount Remarkable National Park and the Terowie Gorge Conservation Park are being planned together as well.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I thank the Minister for that information. I hope that he takes my point that, budgets aside, the spelling out of staffing resources in a document such as we have been discussing would be a valuable tool both to his department and to the Minister himself. I personally would not be satisfied with a response that said that that depends on budgets—of course it does. We are talking about how close we can approach to what seems to be the management ideal. Having the management ideal spelt out in a document of this substance would seem to be very useful if only as a stick with which the Minister could beat the heads of his colleagues in Cabinet from time to time.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I take the point that the honourable member has made. I would like to add to what I have already said, if that is the last question on management plans, that we recognise the need for action plan components as well. It brings it down to earth in fairly basic language that people understand about future action for a park.

**Mr Millhouse:** I refer to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The Minister may remember that during the Address in Reply debate I raised the question that certain allegations had been made about the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I expect that he remembers that speech. The following day, I asked him a question about what I had said. In reply, in part, he said:

I do not intend answering them. I can tell him [that was me] that we will investigate those allegations.

That was on Wednesday 5 August. The following day he made a Ministerial statement in which he seemed to resile from the undertaking to investigate the allegations and rather to disparage me. He said, in part:

It remains true that, even after exhaustive investigation by both police officers and officers of the Crown Law Department, no evidence has come to light indicating the commission of criminal offences by staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

He then goes on to talk about Mr Field. I understand today that Mr Field has been approached by Mr Philip Winter of the Crown Law Department asking that Field provide a full statement of the allegations which I made in my speech and which would have come out in detail if the Government had not caved in on Mr Field's actions for damages and paid up. What is the nature of the inquiry in which Mr Winter is now involved? What are his terms of reference?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I want to clear up one matter. I believe the Crown Solicitor wrote to Mr Field several weeks ago; it was not just an approach today.

**Mr Millhouse:** I heard of it today.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** He was approached several weeks ago. The nature of the investigation is that, following discussions I have had with the Crown Solicitor and his department following the matter that was brought up by the member for Mitcham in the House during the Address in Reply when he suggested that he might have more information, and as I indicated in my Ministerial statement, if either the member for Mitcham or Mr Field had further information they should make it available immediately to the police. That has not happened. In fact, the exact words I used were:

If Mr Field or Mr Millhouse are possessed of relevant information not previously given to the police I consider that each has an obligation to communicate this information to the police for appropriate action.

I understand that that has not happened. There has not been an approach from Mr Millhouse or Mr Field. It was suggested that the Crown Solicitor should in fact provide

the opportunity for Mr Field to come forward with any information if he had it. That is what the approach is about at this time.

**Mr Millhouse:** What is the purpose of this? Does the Government now propose to do as I said it ought to do in my speech, that is, inquire into all the events in which Mr Field was involved in the 1970s and try to clear up the mess in the department, or what precise instructions have been given to the Crown Solicitor? Is it just a fishing expedition or is there something more to it?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It is purely to find out whether there is any new evidence that can be taken at this time.

**Mr Millhouse:** It appears from information which Mr Field should be able to give (and I may say that I have told his solicitor that, now that his claim had been settled and finished—and it is a pity it did not happen 12 months ago) he should give every co-operation to the Crown Solicitor or Mr Winter. If that does bring forth, as I think it likely that it will, information which until now has not been known to the department, what does the Government propose to do?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I recognise that that is a hypothetical question. If new evidence does come to light, the Government will consider the situation at that time.

**Mr Millhouse:** Surely the questions I asked in my speech are sufficient in any case to found an inquiry. May I remind the Minister of what I said? I asked some questions and I believe they should be answered. Why, if the whole idea of getting Field into this, was to trace the path the birds took out of this country was there so little result from it? All that the Crown would admit was one prosecution of Happy Walker? Why was there not more resulting from what Field was doing, if it were all above board? If there were going to be no results, why did the department let Field go on for five years with the work? Does the Minister not agree that there would be sufficient in the answers to those questions to found an inquiry?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I think I need to go back a little bit and say what I thought I pointed out in my Ministerial statement to the House regarding this matter. In August 1979, as a result of consultation between the Police Commissioner of this State, Commissioners in other States and the Commonwealth Commissioner, a joint task force of Commonwealth and State police officers was established to assist in the investigation, and an investigation has been conducted.

I have had discussions with the South Australian Police Commissioner and, as I said, unless more evidence comes to light, we do not intend that any further action should be taken. Even after exhaustive investigations had been carried out by police officers and officers of the Crown Law Department, I am informed that no evidence has come to light indicating the commission of criminal offences by staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Certainly, Mr Field has not provided any such information until now. If Mr Field has been instructed by his solicitor, the member for Mitcham—

**Mr Millhouse:** I am not his solicitor. I am not a solicitor at all.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am sorry, by his legal adviser. If Mr Field's legal adviser, the member for Mitcham—

**Mr Millhouse:** I am not his legal adviser.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I retract that. If Mr Field is to come out with any information, I believe it is a pity that he has waited this long to bring out that new evidence. I say in the strongest possible terms that, while allegations are being made, it is a very serious and difficult time for officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I would want this whole situation cleaned up once and for all and as quickly as possible.



If any action has to be taken, it should be taken as quickly as possible. Then, the whole matter will be cleared up. That is why I said when I made my Ministerial statement in the House of Assembly some time ago that I hoped that, if Mr Field or the member for Mitcham had any further evidence, they would bring it forward. That has not happened, and that is why we have made an approach through the Crown Solicitor to Mr Field to ask whether he has any further evidence that he should bring forward.

**Mr Millhouse:** I am pleased to hear the Minister say what he has said, especially about the department. I understand that morale in the National Parks and Wildlife Service has been almost at rock bottom, and that there has been difficulty (I do not know whether it has been overcome now) even in appointing a new Director. Is there now a Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Becker):** Yes, there is.

**Mr Millhouse:** Was not a woman called Barker acting in the position? I do not know. Anyway, that is by the by. I point out as a prelude to my further questions that I advised Mr Field not to give further information to the Government at the time because—

**Mr LEWIS:** Was that legal advice?

**Mr Millhouse:** Of course it was.

**Mr LEWIS:** Then why did you deny it?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member should let the member for Mitcham ask his question.

**Mr Millhouse:** Perhaps I should explain, as it seems that neither the Minister nor the member for Mallee understands my position. I am a barrister, not a solicitor. I was counsel for Mr Field, and his solicitor is Mr Philip Westover. I am no longer his legal adviser, but Mr Westover is still his solicitor. I acted for Mr Field in proceedings against the Crown, and in that context I gave him advice not to disclose to the police any information at all because that would have weakened his own position at a time when this Government and the former Government were obstinately refusing to settle the claim, which eventually they settled only minutes before the court case started. If they had been prepared to settle 12 months ago, Mr Field would have been free, certainly on my advice, to give all the information that he could. However, I had a duty to advise Mr Field in his own best interests. That is why I advised him, and I think that that is perfectly well known to departmental officers, if not to anyone else.

I refer again to the Minister's Ministerial statement to which he has appealed and also to the question that I had asked him the day before. When I asked the Minister the question to which I referred earlier, the Minister did not hesitate to say that the allegations that I have just read out in the form of questions would be investigated. He said, 'We will investigate those allegations.' Then someone, no doubt someone in the Minister's own department, got at him overnight, and the next day the Minister made a Ministerial statement resiling from that position. I ask the Minister whether he meant what he said when he answered my question, and whether he did change his mind overnight as a result of advice that he had been given. What is the position?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I will answer first things first. The member for Mitcham has indicated that he is not sure what is happening in the department in relation to the Director. We have called applications for the position of Director and an announcement regarding that matter will soon be made. Until then, Mr Neville Gare, who has been seconded from the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service, has been acting as Director.

I should like to return to what the member for Mitcham has said. He believes that the Government should have

taken action 12 months ago to clean up the situation in relation to Mr Field. I think that it is probably four months or five months since that settlement was reached. I cannot remember the period exactly, but it would have been four or five months ago. It is a pity that it has taken that long, if, as I have said, there is any further evidence, for either Mr Field or the member for Mitcham to come forward with any further evidence if that is to happen at this time.

**Mr Millhouse:** Did the Minister mean what he said in reply to my question, namely, 'I can tell him we will investigate those allegations,' namely, the ones that I put in the form of a question? Is so, did the Minister change his mind overnight, perhaps as a result of advice given to him, before he made his Ministerial statement?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I guess it depends on what is meant by 'investigate'. The following morning I had a meeting with the South Australian Police Commissioner and an officer of the Crown Law Department, both of whom indicated to me that they were totally satisfied with the investigations that had been conducted, and they suggested to me that, if any new evidence could be brought forward, we should consider the situation at that time. Both the Police Commissioner and the Crown Law Department officer indicated that, until such new evidence came forward, there was no reason to take any further action. I believe that I investigated the situation in having discussions with the Police Commissioner and the Crown Law Department officer.

**Mr Millhouse:** As I understand it, a whole group of South Australian Police officers who were later joined by Commonwealth officers took part in this inquiry at God knows what expense to everyone. It appears to me that, until now anyway, that the mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse, because there was absolutely no result from it, except the fiasco of the prosecution of the four people for conspiracy. What did that investigation show?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It showed that no current officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service was guilty of an offence.

**Mr Millhouse:** What about others?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The member for Mitcham is aware of the findings at that time.

**Mr Millhouse:** I am not aware of the findings at that time. All I know is that apparently no-one has ever been punished for anything which was done in connection with the bird smuggling activities in the department in the 1970s. I want to know why.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** You have asked six main questions on this line. It has been the practice to have three. I do not know whether any other member of the Committee wants to follow this line through, but I will ask the Minister to reply.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Due to the sensitivity of the situation, I am not totally *au fait* with what the situation is. Obviously with a matter as sensitive as this, I would not want to say anything that I was uncertain about. I will provide that information.

**Mr Millhouse:** Mr Acting Chairman, I appreciate what you have just said. I had a word to the member for Baudin and he is content for me to continue. I have one specific question. I do not know about the member for Mallee. Is he not happy?

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, I am not.

**Mr Millhouse:** I will go on anyway.

**Mr LEWIS:** I thought you would.

**Mr Millhouse:** The Minister has said several times in the last few minutes that there are no present officers of the department who have been shown to be guilty of any offences. That begs the question: it does not matter whether they are in the department now or not—if any previous

officers in the department are shown to have been guilty of offences, they should be punished. The man Lyons was moved as Director of the service. His position has been vacant since he was moved in about 1978. Nobody in Australia wants it and we all know that, whatever the Minister may say; that is why it has not been filled. He has been removed; Eaves was retired. What happened to the man Pollard, is he not still in the department?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Mr Pollard is still an officer of the department.

**Mr Millhouse:** Was he not in it up to his neck?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I reiterate that there were no criminal offences in regard to any current officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

**Mr Millhouse:** Is the Minister saying that he is satisfied Mr Pollard was not guilty of any offences?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** On available evidence that I have with me at the present time, yes, that is what I am saying.

**Mr Millhouse:** What is that evidence?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The member for Mitcham has made reference to it himself. There has been a thorough investigation which, as the member for Mitcham indicated, has cost everybody a fortune. There is no evidence that suggests there has been a criminal offence committed by a present officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

**Mr Millhouse:** I will come to an end in a moment. It is obvious that the Minister is hedging and is not prepared to be frank about these things. I conclude by asking, who is to make the decision, after Mr Winter has taken a statement from Mr Field, as to whether or not there is evidence?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I ask the Minister to respond, but I doubt whether it is the role of the Committee to review the evidence in the way that it has been reviewed.

**Mr Millhouse:** I am not suggesting that the Committee should review the evidence, I am asking who is to make the decision.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I will consult with my colleague, the Attorney-General.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** In the Programme Estimates book 9, page 18, I refer to park management; it is indicated that there were 124.9 staff allocations last year and it is proposed in 1981-82 that there be 132 staff allocations. The Minister may be aware that there has been an intensive campaign (and we have heard members opposite join the band waggon on this) to increase the number of field officers within the National Parks and Wildlife Service and he made reference to our comparison with New South Wales. Can the Minister point out whether that is the particular line that is highlighted in increased staffing in the National Parks and Wildlife Service and, if not, could he indicate where the correct line is?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** That is the correct line.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Could the Minister say where the extra staff will be deployed?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I will be pleased to do that. There has been much speculation in regard to the staffing of national parks. I was hoping to be able to clarify the situation; it is important that that should happen. There has been a significant increase in the manpower resources to be allocated to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It is being implemented in the context of the organisation of the new department, the Department of Environment and Planning. Prior to amalgamation, the permanent Public Service staffing was 97. This is programmed to be increased to 140 this financial year. In regard to more detail as far as that is concerned, this increase comprises 19 full-time equivalents from transfer to existing functions and 24 full-time equivalents funded by allocation of additional resources. We are looking at something like a 25 per cent increase in

resources. With regard to weekly-paid staff, notwithstanding the planned divestment of caravan parks and the Belair Golf Course (that involves a saving of 11 staff numbers), the numbers will remain approximately the same, at 108 persons. This will mean a total staffing of 248 persons, the present staffing being 230. In addition, there are three people on contract at Thorndon Park and 29 people employed on capital works. That is a total of 280 persons.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Is the Minister able to indicate whether the service has functions over and above what were carried out prior to the amalgamation?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** There are functions that have been carried out prior to the amalgamation that the Government believes should not be the responsibility of the department, and reference has been made particularly to caravan parks and the Belair Golf Course, which are just two areas.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I did not make myself clear. Are there functions which are now or in the near future to be carried out by the National Parks and Wildlife Service that were not carried out before? If so, what would be the staffing resources committed to those functions? In other words, are the additional staffing resources to do the same job that was done before or are there more jobs to be done?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I presume the honourable member is referring to Black Hill, which previously was in the trust, but will now come under the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Possibly, and also inspectorate functions.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I would like more information from the honourable member on the inspectorate functions. As far as Black Hill is concerned, that is certainly the case. There will be an extra three people coming over in regard to Black Hill (that is, in the nursery area) plus six outside that area. There is also the area of vegetation retention, where we have an extra five staff coming in.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** That in part bears out what I said in my opening statement, that it is very difficult to get a comparison from one year to another. Can the Minister assist in this respect, given that the National Parks and Wildlife Service has more staff and also more functions, is there any way of quantifying what the real increase is? If we look at what the National Parks and Wildlife Service did prior to amalgamation, what additional staff resources will be put into those traditional tasks?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** As I have said earlier, there is an increase comprising 19 full-time equivalents of transfer from existing functions and 24 full-time equivalents funded by allocations of additional resources.

**Mr LEWIS:** How many people of the total number engaged in administrative works are engaged to the extent that it occupies more than 50 per cent of their working time of the department?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I would happy to get that information for the honourable member. Is the member asking for the number of people working in the National Parks and Wildlife Division for more than 50 per cent of their time?

**Mr LEWIS:** No. I am asking how many people are working in the department and spending more than 50 per cent of their time on administrative functions where they need to have skills that relate to administration rather than skills that relate to scientific or technological expertise.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I would have to get that information for the member.

**Mr LEWIS:** Could the Minister at the same time determine how many of those people have academic qualifications of any kind at the tertiary level and how many of them have any skills at a tertiary level or have post-graduate

qualifications in administration. I do not mean to make an exception of this department but amongst administrators in the public sector, like elsewhere, the old maxim applies that, if you promote your best salesman to sales manager what you are really doing is losing your best salesman and your are not necessarily getting a good sales manager.

I think that until we recognise the necessity for people engaged in administrative activities to be qualified in those activities we will get administrative blunders and inefficiencies. Therefore, I want to know whether this department, as part of its conscious personnel policy, is determining the kinds of academic qualifications necessary and desirable for its individual personnel to have.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes, we do recognise that it is vitally important that that should be the case. I will obtain the specific information for which the member has asked. I would like to indicate that we do see the necessity in carrying out that procedure and we are in the process of looking at a short list of people who will be engaged in the law enforcement area. Those applications were called for nationally to make sure that we get the very best people we possibly can for those positions. Also, in the very near future we will be calling for the position of the Chief Wildlife Officer. That position will also be advertised nationally for that very same reason.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I want to ask a couple of questions of the Minister about the National Parks Consultative Committees. I am glad to hear that the member for Mallee is taking an active role in this committee, because I want to use him as a launching point for my questions. The member did ask the Minister a question recently in the House about the number of consultative committees associated with the National Parks and Wildlife Division. It is not necessary to rehash that, because the Minister gave the answer at the time. I was a little concerned, however, at some of the reasons given by the member for Mallee as to why it was important that such committees should be set up, because the member instanced graziers suffering loss of livestock as a result of dingo attacks in the vicinity of the Ngarkat National Park, pressure from beekeepers, and so on.

What worries me a little about this is that that sort of attitude is a little like choosing your school council from the people who live along the boundaries of the school so they can ensure the kids do not jump the fence every now and again to chase the cricket ball. I should have thought that what we were concerned with in these consultative committees (and the Minister may be concerned with it) is that we choose people whose prime concern is the national park rather than the surrounding areas and that these people on the committee would be looking at what could be done to ensure that the integrity of the park is maintained and that proper management procedures are implemented. They may act as somewhat of a pressure group to ensure that the draft management plan, once it hits the deck, is properly implemented by the Government of the day, and so on.

**Mr LEWIS:** That is exactly what motivates me.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** It is not clear from *Hansard* that that is what motivates the member. If the member wants to read that, I think he would agree with me that even a person of my limited intellect would have to put the less favourable construction on his words. To get the ball rolling my question is: what qualifications, apart from living in the local area, are required for a person to become appointed to a consultative committee? Could the Minister in due course (it may not be possible to do so now) make available to the Committee or the Parliament as a whole the names of the people who have been appointed to such committees and to give the term of employment?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** There is a fair bit that has been said in the past couple of minutes that I would like to make reference to: I hesitate to use the term 'comment on'. The main reason, of course, for setting up these consultative committees was not relating to an interest that a person may have because he lives next door to a national park, but related to improving liaison and communication between national parks officers and the general community. I believe that officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Division have always been very conscious of the need to work within the community. It has always been recognised by the national parks and wildlife services throughout Australia that they do involve themselves within the community, but it was thought that there was a need to have a small group of people that the officers would consult with, hence the name 'consultative committee'.

Regarding what is needed for a person to become eligible to be a member of a consultative committee, first, such person must live within the region. As the member would realise, these consultative committees are based on regions when they relate to national parks other than perhaps if we are looking at the Fort Glanville Consultative Committee, which relates to an actual building or site, and the person must be representative of the community.

In other words, we attempt to have people who are recognised in the community for their interest in conservation matters. Some are involved as field naturalists or in other activities specifically relating to conservation. Some have had long association with the Country Fire Services. Again, it is felt that it is good to have someone on each committee who has had an involvement in the C.F.S. We try to have people who are recognised in the community as being good land managers, and most of those people are members of the U.F. & S. It is a matter of trying to determine, and most committees have either 10 or 12 members, a mixture of people who are recognised within the community as being able to contribute on a consultative basis.

This process and programme is working well. I have access to the minutes of these consultative committees, and I am pleased with what they are doing and with the interest that is being shown on a voluntary basis by members of those committees.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I want to turn to raise the matter of acquisition of areas of bushland—

**Mr LEWIS:** Can I ask a question on the matter just dealt with?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Indeed, you can look up page 1113 of *Hansard* while you are about it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As the honourable member is about to move on to a different topic, I give the call to the member for Mallee.

**Mr LEWIS:** Whilst it seems that I am being led, let me foreshadow that I will have something to say about shacks, houseboats, access to areas in national parks, and the implications of weed control later. I seem to get the call every time after someone else has raised a matter, and it appears that I am reacting to it. I am just letting the Committee know.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Is the honourable member suggesting that the Chair is not calling him in a fair manner?

**Mr LEWIS:** I simply say that it appears, and the record might appear, as if that is happening, but it is not.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Let me assure the honourable member that the Chair is endeavouring to be scrupulously fair.

**Mr LEWIS:** I have always respected that, especially where I have found you, Mr Chairman, in the Chair. There is no question about that. I merely point out the situation. Would the Minister confirm that the overriding considera-

tion whenever a member is appointed to a consultative committee is the capacity that that individual has demonstrated in developing an understanding of the management goals of the parks in the region that the committee is serving, a sympathy with the need to have those goals, and an empathy with the natural environment and research work conducted into it?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** We certainly try and make sure that that is the case. It would be wrong for me to say that every person who is on a consultative committee is recognised because he has a direct link in some way with conservation matters. For example, one of the consultative committees has a person who is involved in tourism; because of the nature of that particular region and the importance of tourism, it is good to have someone on the committee who can represent the area.

Also, I failed to mention before that on every consultative committee we have a person or persons representing local government in that area. We do not always know that such a person has a direct interest, although we try and find people who can represent local government and who do have some interest in conservation matters, because we feel that, if they are to be involved and if they are to contribute, it is important that they do know what they are talking about in regard to conservation matters.

**Mr LEWIS:** What can the Minister say about the need to develop the management plan for parks which incorporates a policy of being a good neighbour and which at the same time ensures that the parks' integrity is not breached by grazing animals from adjacent landholders, or any other animals which are not native fauna and, to that extent, my concern relates to the need to keep kangaroos in parks and sheep on farms, to keep dingoes in parks and dogs on farms, so that the people who have to live next to parks do not suffer as a direct result of their doing so, nor do they benefit by using the adjacent park as free grazing land?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It is an important part of the planning process in regard to a management plan that all the neighbours surrounding a national park be consulted and given the opportunity to comment. It would be foolish of anyone to suggest that being a good neighbour is not an important part of the whole national park system. Obviously, it is important that we assist and work together with neighbouring landholders. In regard to the problems associated with dingoes and kangaroos, the honourable member is aware that we are very conscious (I know of his concern in regard to Ngarkat National Park particularly) and anxious to overcome the problem that is being caused by dingoes killing sheep on adjoining properties. We are presently experimenting with different forms of fencing to enable us to overcome that problem. We hope to do that as quickly as possible. To reiterate, we certainly recognise the need for community support in what we are trying to achieve in the National Parks and Wildlife Service. We are certainly encouraging the good neighbour approach in matters relating to those parks.

**Mr LEWIS:** When does the Minister think he may be able to fence Ngarkat National Park?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am not able to say exactly. I would be anxious for this to happen as quickly as possible. As the honourable member knows, a large cost is involved. We are presently in the process of determining how much it will cost to fence sections of the park. I cannot say exactly when it will happen, but we are anxious to carry out that work as soon as possible.

**Mr SLATER:** I wish to follow up the question that was just asked about consultative committees, and I seek information about their establishment. I notice that page 16 of the programme papers refers to the establishment of three more consultative committees. How many consultative com-

mittees already exist? Is it likely that more consultative committees will be established? I take it that the personnel work on an honorary basis. I also seek information about their general activities and the number of these committees in existence at the present time.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** As I said earlier, members of these committees work on a voluntary basis and, again, that is a very good point in itself—that people are prepared to spend this amount of time and show interest in this way. I think it is important for the Committee to know that I have not had one refusal from people who have been approached to sit on one of these committees. There has been a 100 per cent success rate when people have been approached and invited to become members of these committees. They have all accepted.

At present, there are consultative committees in the Lower South-East, the Upper South-East, the Fleurieu Peninsula, and Fort Glanville. We are currently setting up the Maylands Consultative Committee and also the Eyre Peninsula Consultative Committee. Appointment to these committees is for 12 months, and members can continue after that 12-month period if both parties are happy with that.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I now turn to the acquisition of land for park and conservation purposes. First, because it would be a Loan allocation, I assume that I would be out of order in asking the Minister how much money has been set aside for such acquisition in the coming year. However, we may be able to save ourselves some time if I point out that in any acquisition of land, though the purchase would be from Loan, there must be some recurrent component. Officers of the department are involved in delineating the obvious area that is to be acquired, and so on. Is any money, staff or resources to be devoted to the acquisition of additional land for national park purposes this year?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** No, only very minor amounts for rationalisation. As has been said on a number of occasions, we also recognise the responsibility that we have in 'off park' conservation. Quite considerable steps have been made in relation to that area through the heritage agreement system. I think the Committee would recognise that we have a very real management challenge, if I can refer to it in that way. I believe that the previous Government recognised the same challenge and I think that it was looking more at a high priority for the management of the land already under control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, rather than continuing to acquire more. As I have said, it is recognised that there is a need to tidy up the boundaries. That is taking place, but it is consolidation rather than further acquisition of land for national parks.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Of course, it is not compulsory for a landowner who has scrub on his property to put it under the Heritage Agreement. Does the Minister concede that there are areas of the State that really should be proclaimed as national or conservation parks, and is he looking to future Budgets to provide the necessary funds for such acquisitions to take place?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Of course, there are areas that could be acquired for further national parks. I suppose there always will be, but it is a fact of life that we have to consolidate and look at the management situation which currently exists and to concentrate on that before we continue to acquire more land. I think it is only sensible that that should happen. Further consideration will take place once we are 100 per cent satisfied that we are managing our reserves as well as we should be, and that does not necessarily mean that every park has to be managed in such a way that they are all run like Cleland, Belair, Para Wirra or any other park, because some of the areas are

reserved because of their wilderness significance. If in the not too distant future we feel totally satisfied that we have management under control, we would look at further acquisition.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I thank the Minister for his qualification in the second half of that answer, because I was genuinely alarmed at the first part. There is no doubt that there will always be calls for improvement of management, interpretative services, and so on in national parks, just as there will always be calls for additional staff and so on in primary schools, which is another interest of mine. I am glad to hear that the Minister does not feel that we have to get to Nirvana as far as management is concerned before some Government is prepared to turn around and acquire more open space. However, I will not labour the point. The Minister is aware of my feeling that an opportunity was lost recently at Newland Head. I am concerned that other opportunities will be lost in the future.

Is any thought being given to a change in the way in which such land is held? I refer to remarks made by the Premier in the House of Assembly on 5 March at page 3582 of *Hansard* in response to a motion by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister and the Premier responded to that motion. The Premier made two rather remarkable statements. The first was a throw-away and can be regarded in that way. He said:

We inherited, indeed, vast areas of national parks, and national parks are fine, but they are of little value to a community which is starved of essential services because of the cost of managing those parks.

I assume that the Premier did not mean by that that we are already suffering in other areas because of the great amount of money that is being put into national parks. I doubt very much whether he meant that it is likely in the future that we will be suffering in other areas because of the great amount of money that is likely to be put into national parks. It was just a throw-away line. I really seek information from the Minister about the Premier's other statement when he said:

Let me make one thing clear; this Government acknowledges the very necessary place of national conservation and recreation parks in contributing to our recognised quality of life. Such parks we believe are best held under a management agreement with the former owners, and this is the involvement of not only those concerned people in the community who make up the membership of conservation societies and associations but also of individuals who have a love of nature, of natural vegetation, and who are doing everything they can to preserve it.

What on earth did the Premier mean by that? To get to the nub of it, it states: 'Such parks we believe are best held under a management agreement with the former owners'. What does that mean and, if it can be given meaning, is that the way we are going in the future?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I believe that that question should be asked of the Premier because I do not really know what the Premier means in that statement. Let me say that, in regard to the first part of the honourable member's question, it is important that what the Premier did have to say on that occasion should be taken in context. What he was saying (and this is clear from the entire speech) was that resources are not unlimited. I think we recognise that that is the case. We also recognise that the vegetation retention programme embarked on by the present Government is very significant indeed.

At this stage, we have received about 300 applications in regard to heritage agreements. We are looking at about 10 000 hectares of land. The present Government believes that there is a responsibility on the part of the community as well as the Government in regard to the retention of native vegetation. That does not mean that we have to see that the community has a responsibility in relation to parks and the maintenance of those areas as parks.

The invitation has been taken up by the community through heritage agreements. Some 300 applications have been made relating to a significant area of native vegetation that will be retained under private management through a heritage agreement. That does not take away at all from the system we have, and in fact will add to the system we have at present through the National Parks and Wildlife Service with the responsibility of returning, maintaining and conserving areas of native vegetation for conservation, educational and scientific purposes.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** In relation to the question I asked, the Minister has reassured me somewhat. I think the Premier may have been referring to the heritage scheme. In any event I make the point to the Minister that there are those people in the community who have been somewhat alarmed by that statement of the Premier. It may well be worth getting some clarification from the Premier because it has been suggested that the British scheme was being mooted, involving continuing private ownership in what are otherwise regarded as public parks and so on. I do not know enough about it to comment.

One of the areas about which a lot of people are concerned in regard to conservation of natural vegetation is the Gosse scrub. That has been a matter of debate in both Houses of Parliament for some time. Is the Minister able to say whether any resources are committed in this Budget, or what it would be necessary to do to have the Gosse Crown lands annexed to the Flinders Chase National Park?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** There is no money specifically set aside for that purpose, as the honourable member would recognise. It is not necessary to provide any finance through the Budget to acquire land, since it is already unallotted Crown land.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** That is understood. However, I would have thought that the Minister would be involved in some allocation of resources where what was Crown land suddenly became a property of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Is the Minister able to give any sort of indication (and I would not want to hold him to anything too specific) as to what the cost might be to the service, if it suddenly had this addition to its empire?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** We could tackle that one when we came to it. It does not necessarily mean (and I think the honourable member would recognise this) that the retention of that land would mean it automatically became a national park or an extension to the Flinders Chase national park. It is recognised because of its value in regard to the habitat of fauna and, of course, significant flora. That does not necessarily mean that we would have to look at making it a national park.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Does the Minister favour the retention of the Gosse Crown lands in their present state?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I have already said that I recognise that that is an important area for conservation purposes.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I refer to comments made by the member for Baudin in regard to private ownership of land and looking after that land. I accompanied the Minister to the launching of 'The greening of the Fleurieu' where the first heritage agreement was signed. I am interested to know what progress has been made in that regard. At that launching, a film was being produced by the department under the auspices of the South Australian Film Corporation trying to demonstrate to farmers that they themselves can manage land in a better way and conserve their natural environment, particularly in regard to natural vegetation and fauna. On page 17, reference is made to publicity incentives in relation to the community awareness promotion aspect of the department. Can the Minister further

highlight to what extent this film has been used throughout South Australia, and whether we are getting any positive results from it?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The film to which the honourable member is referring is entitled *Bush Corridors*. It is an excellent film and is being circulated and received very well, as I think the honourable member would agree. It was certainly recognised on that occasion. I point out that other initiatives have been taken in regard to further communication from the department in the way of posters and that type of thing. I think that is what the honourable member was referring to. The film has been well received, and is playing an important part in advising people generally within the community what we are attempting to achieve in the retention of native vegetation on privately owned land.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I also asked about the success of the 'Greening of the Fleurieu' programme.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I believe it is working well, and I understand that a meeting was held recently in the community as a follow-up of that initial launching on 'The greening of the Fleurieu'. I understand that a number of people in the community have expressed interest and a desire to become involved in that project.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** The member for Baudin also referred to the acquisition of land. At page 94, the Auditor-General's Report, states that during 1980-81 a new reserve, Mary Seymour Conservation Park, was dedicated, and the area of existing reserves was increased by 1 820 hectares. If we relate that to figures on page 17 of the programme booklet, that page refers to 168 conservation parks and it says that 24 parcels are awaiting proclamation. Can the Minister say where these parcels are and what progress has been made on these proclamations?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the Minister to take that question on notice as it is now 6 p.m.

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

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The question asked relating to book 9, page 17, where reference was made to 168 conservation parks plus 24 parcels awaiting proclamation. It is not possible for me to give the names of all of those 24 areas awaiting proclamation. Most of the areas relate to changes in regard to boundaries and are only small areas, with the exception of the Balcanooga property, which will be in addition to the Gammon Ranges National Park. About 93 000 hectares will be added to the Gammon Ranges National Park, making it one of the most significant parks in Australia. We hope to be able soon to proclaim that area. This is a significant increase to the State's national parks and one that we are very pleased about.

**Mr SLATER:** In regard to the divestment of the Belair Golf Course and caravan park, and including the Brownhill Creek Caravan Park, can the Minister give the reason for the divestment of the caravan parks and say to whom they will be divested?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The Government feels strongly that the maintenance of caravan parks, and the golf course in the case of Belair, should not be the responsibility, or certainly not have a high priority of responsibility, of the Department of Environment and Planning. Negotiations have taken place in regard to the future involvement of organisations responsible for those caravan parks. Some caravan parks will be going to local government and in relation to others we have asked for an expression of interest from the public. Negotiations have been taking place for some time about the future of the Belair Golf Course and much discussion has taken place. If possible, we are keen that the area should be retained as a public course. That is why it has taken as long as it has to find the most

appropriate body that can be responsible for the golf course. It is not our intention that the golf course be sold; we believe it should stay as part of the Belair National Park.

**Mr SLATER:** I take it from what the Minister has just said that it will still remain as part of the property owned by the department. What is the story regarding the actual administration of the golf course? Will the people who regularly play there still have an opportunity to do that, or will the course be administered by a club? If it is under the administration of the department, how will the golf course be operated? Will it be a commercial venture or a public course?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It is intended that the area of the Belair Golf Course will remain within the park. We are currently looking at alternative ways of having involvement other than that of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, or indeed, of the department. We are looking at the possibility of a long-term lease to a private developer who will guarantee public access to and use of the golf course itself.

**Mr SLATER:** From what the Minister has just said no definite arrangements have yet been made. What specific arrangements have been made in regard to persons who play there regularly? Will persons who use the course at the present time be allowed to continue to do so? Presuming arrangements are not made, what is the likely fate of the golf course?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** As I have just explained, there have been negotiations with a number of people, including members of the golf club there at present. I repeat that it is our intention that at least some time, if not all, be made available to the public to use that golf course. I am not able to give any final details on it, as negotiations are still taking place.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** In the Programme Estimates book 9, page 17, under the heading 'Fixed Assets Information' it is indicated that Kingston House is an asset of the department. The Minister recently announced that an historian architect was to be assigned to draw up plans of Kingston House. Has that architect been appointed and has work begun on the drawing up of those plans?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The restoration study is imminent. I am not sure whether the architect has been appointed. I will check on that and make the information available to the member.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The Minister will be aware that there was a good deal of concern in the local community recently about Kingston House. Have adequate negotiations continued to take place with local people? Is the Minister now satisfied that the course of action that both he and the City of Brighton agreed upon is generally accepted by the local people?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am aware that concern was expressed by the local community. I have received a deputation from representatives of the local community. There has been quite a deal of consultation among representatives of the community, the council and our own department. A committee has been set up with a representative of the department, of the council, and of the community itself. No action will be taken until further discussion has taken place within that committee.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Reverting to the matter raised by the member for Gilles, there is a document that is widely available in the community headed 'Department of the Environment: Savings required to reduce over-expenditure to \$244 000 by 30.6.81'. It details \$148 000 of savings required. The page is headed 'Closure of caravan parks, wages \$20 000, contingencies \$12 000, estimated savings \$32 000, division unit, N.P.W.S.' Can we assume that, because the parks were not closed, those savings did not

occur, or were savings obtained by some run-down in services available at those parks?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** There certainly were savings carried out. There certainly was not a run down in general activities, as far as that area is concerned. I refer the member to the Auditor-General's Report, page 455, where it is indicated that the Department of Environment and Planning was one of the very few departments that actually underspent last year, and it underspent by the sum of \$95 813.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Having backtracked twice now, can I go back to the matter that I was referring to before the dinner adjournment?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think we were arriving at the stage where perhaps this vote is coming to a conclusion. In those circumstances, I think that some of other members may want to backtrack a little also.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I have no objection to that, Sir. In relation to the Gosse scrub, which matter I referred to before the dinner adjournment, I am aware that there is concern about the possible salinity effects of clearing at the western end of Kangaroo Island. In fact, the particular inter-departmental report on the matter quoted quite a few figures in relation to salinity in the Middle River, South East River, and so on. The Minister will remember this, because I quoted from it extensively in the House.

Has the department been involved in the measurement of salinity, or environmental degradation that either would arise from future clearing or may have arisen from clearing that occurred in the past? In short, has the Minister had some input into this matter, will he continue to have some input, and are funds and manpower appropriated this financial year for that to happen?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** My department has had no involvement at all in regard to salinity problems or matters relating to salinity raised by the member.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Is the Minister aware that his colleague the Minister of Water Resources has expressed to the Minister of Agriculture his fears about the possible impact of the clearing of the land adjacent to Flinders Chase?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Mr Chairman, I have not seen the reports of either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Lands. The Department of Environment and Planning has certainly completed its report but I have not seen the reports of my colleagues.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** On what matters has the Minister been asked to report if, in fact, his department has not been involved specifically in the problem of salinity?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** My department has looked at the environmental significance of retaining that land.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I wonder, therefore, in that case, whether I would be doing the Committee a service if I were to read into the record a document. It has only five paragraphs, the first two containing only one sentence. It may be of some use to members who may wish to take the matter up. On this I will conclude any questions I have in relation to the Gosse Crown Lands, although the Minister may feel led to comment. The document states:

As requested, I have enclosed a copy of my reply to Dr A. Black, President, The Nature Conservation Society of South Australia Incorporated.

This does not come to me from Dr Black, who was sent a letter, not this document, nor have I discussed this document with Dr Black. The document continues:

You will note that the tone of my reply to him is at variance with the letter sent from the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief to your Director-General on 7 May 1981.

The reason for this is that the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief has advised me that the monitoring programme at the inlet to the Middle River reservoir has shown that the salinity level of

the water entering the reservoir is rising. Even though there is only limited data available to date, indications are that this increase is the result of land salinisation due to clearing activities.

The rate of deterioration and the final stabilised natural level of salinity are not able to be determined as yet. Nor have the yield, quality and cost of water from the North West River been estimated. To obtain such information will require a more detailed investigation, the estimated cost of which is currently being determined. With the present restrictions on funds, and the higher priorities of work currently being undertaken, the investigation could not be conducted during this financial year. Manpower and funds could be arranged during 1982-1983. Staff of the Department of Agriculture have verbally indicated their capacity to provide assistance to this investigation at that time.

Given the increasing salinity of the Middle River reservoir and the fact that the North West River represents one of the few remaining sources of good quality water on Kangaroo Island, I am of the opinion that it would be preferable for the North West River catchment area to be retained in its natural state until an examination of the problems at Middle River and the feasibility of the North West River to be used as an alternative source have been undertaken.

This is dated 22 September 1981 and is to the Minister of Agriculture from his colleague the Minister of Water Resources.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the honourable Minister wish to comment?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I do not know what I am supposed to say to that. Is the member asking me a question?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think the member is suggesting that you may wish to comment or you may not.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I do not intend commenting on a minute that is prepared for a Minister and one of my colleagues by his department.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I will make one further comment. I can understand the Minister's reaction. He said before the dinner adjournment that he felt the area was of high ecological significance. They were not his words, but I think that would be a reasonable interpretation of what he said. I would hope that the Minister would take some comfort from the existence of such a minute, because it would strengthen his arm in this matter.

**Mr LEWIS:** I have a few questions on national parks and wildlife services. They relate to the way in which people use those facilities provided by the parks. Has the Minister any objections to the use of the Coorong by operators of house boats, whether they be house boats that are hired to the operator, owner-operator house hire boats, or boats operated by friends of owners?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Just off the top of my head, my main concern is whether the people operating those house boats were to cause any concern whatsoever to the environment. When I say that, I refer particularly to the vegetation and also to the area itself. As the member would appreciate, there is always concern expressed when campers or other people come to the Coorong itself, if they act irresponsibly and if they cause any damage at all to the native bushland or anything else. I think the member will appreciate that the professional fisherman, for example, has been using the area for many years, and I would just answer the question by saying it would depend on the way that the area is used by the houseboat people.

**Mr LEWIS:** What does vandalism cost the department in the National Parks and Wildlife Division each year, what form does it take?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Are you asking for a figure, if there is one? I cannot indicate that. I can take that on notice and try to get an approximate cost to the department. Vandalism does appear in a number of ways, of course, as I have mentioned. Some people act irresponsibly in the destruction of native vegetation, for example, and in areas of Aboriginal heritage significance, and areas of heritage significance generally. Also, there are the general problems

in relation to damage caused to facilities, whether they be camping facilities, toilets or the like, or the removal of signs, but it would be impossible for me tonight to give a figure of the cost to the department of vandalism.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is in order for the Minister to take the question on notice.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes.

**Mr LEWIS:** Where in the Budget papers is the expense incurred by the department each year for vandalism causing damage to departmental property? I do not mind if the Minister takes the question on notice.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It is allowed for in normal park maintenance. There is not a special line or sum allocated in relation to costs arising from acts of vandalism; it comes under the normal maintenance of the park. I might say that generally this is not significant, certainly not significant enough to have a special line.

**Mr LEWIS:** When examining the likely total cost in money terms, I would be grateful if the number of occasions on which repairs had to be effected could be given to the nearest \$100, because I doubt that the figure will otherwise indicate the labour costs involved. I would like to make an informed guesstimate. I would like to then tie that in eventually with some other questions which I intend to ask and about which I seek further information. If the Minister can find it within his department's power to indicate the number of times that repairs had to be effected to departmental property, as well as the cash cost of the materials used, I would be most grateful.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I will try to get that information. I would imagine that it would be (and this is only a guess) about \$10 000. It is not simply a cost as far as dollars are concerned. What dollar value does one put on damage to flora and fauna?

**Mr LEWIS:** My question related only to the materials which the department has to replace in national parks, such as signs and fence posts that were burnt or otherwise knocked down by vandals, toilet facilities destroyed, and buildings desecrated or otherwise damaged beyond repair. Has the department ever done any surveys or obtained figures from interstate or overseas to indicate the kind of park user who causes such vandalism?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Surveys are carried out in regard to park visitation. For example, it is estimated that about 600 000 people visit Belair every year. I can only say that, as a result of 600 000 people going through Belair, the damage caused is minimal. About 144 000 people go through Cleland annually, and I would not suggest to the Committee that the problem of vandalism is a major problem in regard to cost. It is always a concern, because one wonders when irresponsible people will strike next, but it is not a major concern financially.

**Mr LEWIS:** Of the funds allocated to parks such as the Coorong, what proportion goes to repairing damage caused by vandalism? How often are signs knocked off, fence posts burnt, and how much of the ranger's time is spent actually rectifying that rather than doing other things? I am seeking that information whether it is available this evening or otherwise. Then I would restate my earlier question, because I was after not the total number of people who use the park but the kind of person who does the damage. Has the department attempted any research on that or does it know of any research conducted interstate or overseas which indicates the kind of users who do the damage, whether it is the person who drives in on a day trip, the person who seeks to use the park for a week, or the person with some permanent stake in the park and its facilities as, for example, at Wilpena, or in the Coorong with shack owners? What category of park user tends to damage the signs and

the property of the department and leave rubbish behind? Has the department done any research into that?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The department has not done any research on that, and I am not aware of any such research interstate. The time that is spent by rangers rectifying damage caused by irresponsible people is far too high. The Committee would agree that it would be better if rangers did not have to spend any valuable time rectifying any damage. It is an important question, and it is one of the reasons why we have looked at setting up within the new department a community information service to attempt to educate people about why we need to have parks and why they should act responsibly in them. It is important we get the message across to the community. Generally, people recognise their responsibility and realise that they should take a pride in their parks. It is important that we educate people to make sure that that happens.

**Mr LEWIS:** This question will not exhaust the kind of inquiry that I wish to make in this direction, because I can see that, as this State's economy recovers, the demand for access to recreation facilities will increase with the higher levels of prosperity and confidence by consumers. For better or for worse, shacks which have previously provided some limited access for park usage, are now out, and we have substituted a straight-out option (whether we like it or not) of houseboats in their place, so that people can take their families for some time to aquatic parks, and the amount of rubbish that will end up in the environment from that kind of use of the amenities concerns me more than the amount of rubbish which ends up in the environment at present from people who own and use shacks as permanent fixtures. There are no silage points. Already, I have received correspondence from people asking whether they can set up houseboat operations which will encompass not only the use of the lakes, game reserves and facilities adjacent to them but also the Coorong.

Knowing that and knowing that there is no other way out, I think the department should carefully examine its present policy in relation to shacks, and its non-existent policy in relation to house boats and the access of four-wheel drive and conventional camper vans to determine what level of impact all those options in various mixes, as utilisation forms, will have on parks that are used in that way. Does the Minister have any plans afoot to examine the impact that those options will have on the environments of the parks to which the public has access, because they are not wilderness reserves but recreational parks in the National Parks and Wildlife group.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I said earlier that I recognise that this is an important question. Yes, we certainly are considering the problems raised by the honourable member. Obviously, that is a very important part of a management plan, particularly in relation to the Coorong. In the answer that I provided earlier I mentioned that the Coorong was one of those parks that was recognised as having priority in regard to a management plan. Obviously, that is one of the more important areas to be considered in regard to a management plan. Other things to be considered are the type of people who will use the parks, how they will use those parks and the facilities they will require in those parks.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I draw the Committee's attention to the fact that we have already spent two hours on this vote. There is about two hours left, and there are three other votes to be dealt with. While members ask questions they have the right to be called, but I bring this matter to the Committee's attention.

**Mr SLATER:** My question relates to the line 'Botanic Gardens'. I note at page 4 of the Programme Estimates that one objective is landscape treatment along the Torrens



River bank and Hackney Road. Will the Minister explain that specific objective, and is it associated with the north-eastern busway project?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** No, it is not connected with the north-eastern busway. It relates to the area of the river that forms the boundary of Botanic Park. It has been a fairly untidy area for some time. The board of the Botanic Gardens recognised that it should be a high priority to clean up and beautify that area. The landscape treatment along the Torrens River and Hackney Road relates to that.

**Mr BECKER:** My question relates to, I assume, 'Conservation Programmes Division, Coastal management, natural resources'. I refer to page 13, volume 9. I point out that from time to time I experience difficulty in linking up the programmes with the lines in the Estimates of Payments. According to volume 9, the total programme expenditure will be \$353 000 this year compared with \$308 000 last year. There is also an increase of three full-time equivalents in staff. I also note that there is a proposed 50 per cent increase in capital expenditure and a 50 per cent reduction in programme receipts. What is the Government's programme for coastal protection in the metropolitan area this financial year? Does it include the foreshore in front of Marineland between West Beach and Glenelg North?

The Minister might remember that some months ago he visited this area and said that a committee would be established to decide what could be done to protect the sea pump serving Marineland. Of course, as the Minister is aware, that is the only part of the metropolitan sand dunes that is not protected by the stone walling. Will the Minister give the Committee a general outline about what is envisaged under this programme this year, and who will the three extra full-time equivalents be? Why is there a 50 per cent increase in capital works and a 50 per cent decrease in programme receipts?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** First, in relation to the area on the coastal side of Marineland, the honourable member would be aware that following the last major storm, which resulted in two record high tides on the South Australian coast, I visited the coastline, and one of the areas that I looked at was the area referred to by the member for Hanson. Discussions have been and are taking place with the West Beach Trust in regard to the work that needs to be carried out. However, I cannot give the honourable member final details. We have had to look at a priority listing, and we are determining that priority list at this time. As the honourable member would be aware, we had to determine the situation in relation to the Budget before we finalised that priority list. It was recognised that one of the areas of highest priority was the area of coastline at Henley Beach where a number of houses were in some danger. We have already announced that some \$320 000 will be spent in this area.

In relation to the area referred to by the honourable member, I recognise its importance and I hope to be able to announce a firm decision about that area in the very near future. In relation to capital expenditure generally, a considerable amount will be spent on the damage caused by the storm in the form of protective works, sand replenishment and general coastal matters relating to storm damage rehabilitation works, restoration and general protection. A considerable amount of money will be spent in that regard. A metropolitan sand replenishment programme will also be carried out, and another significant programme is to be carried out in relation to wave recording on the South Australian coast. There is a list of areas to be rectified as a result of the storm damage. It is a fairly lengthy list and I am quite happy to make it available to the member for Hanson rather than take up the Committee's time at this stage. That list refers to quite a number of areas. The

rehabilitation work relates to drift fencing and various other areas, not only in the metropolitan area but the South Australian coast generally. As I said, I am quite happy to make that list available to the honourable member.

**Mr BECKER:** I am also concerned about the role of the Coast Protection Board. Can the Minister assure me that this board will continue? I am concerned that there seems to be discussion that this board may not continue and I would be disappointed in that. Will the Minister advise the Committee of the future role of the Coast Protection Board?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am very pleased that the member for Hanson has asked that question because I would certainly want to give an assurance to the Committee that the responsibility of the Coast Protection Board will continue on an advisory basis as is set down under the legislation. The Coast Protection Board is a most important instrument in regard to coast protection. I would not want to interfere with the responsibility of that board in any way, shape or form. In fairly recent times (I have had the Coast Protection Board in to discuss matters) I have given that board an assurance that I would be looking to their expertise in the future as I have in the past.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I wish to refer again to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. We could spend the rest of the evening on that line but I will restrict my questions. The Opposition is not concerned if we do not spend a great deal of time on the North Haven or the miscellaneous lines. However, there are other general matters that we wish to raise. I refer to fire control both in parks and in areas adjacent to parks, as it is an area of concern to many people. Has the Minister or his department looked at the New South Wales system which I know is not through all that State's parks because it is fairly costly? It is known as PREPLAN. No doubt it is known to the Minister or his advisers so I will not detain the Committee further. Has the department looked at the possibility of at least limited implementation of the PREPLAN system at least in some of the parks?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes, we have looked at the New South Wales situation and we are considering the implementation of such a system in South Australia.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Has any costing been done and what are we looking at to implement such a system in, say, Deep Creek?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** We are looking at the possibility of such an implementation. We are in the process of looking at the costing side of it; and that will be a significant area in regard to whether or not we go ahead with that scheme.

**Mr LEWIS:** I return to that matter I was canvassing earlier and ask the Minister, in relation to the questions I raised, whether he believes that there is a need for an inter-departmental committee to consider the implications of the demand pressures that will be put on parks and other natural resources like the river. By way of explanation, I mention the implications for the Murray River as a source of potable water at least after chlorination and filtration. I know that it comes under the control and jurisdiction of the Minister of Water Resources. It is also a navigation channel under the Marine and Harbors Department. There are a number of reserves and parks along the water course through the State. Is there a need for an inter-departmental committee to be established? If there is, has one been established and, if not, does the Minister think it would be a good idea if we establish one now or at some time in the future as and when resources allow? Can the Minister express an opinion?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am informed that a committee has been set up, namely, the Riverland Water and Land Use Committee. One of the areas it looks at is the one mentioned by the honourable member. The Land Resource

Management Committee has a responsibility in this area as well. It has representation by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Departments of Agriculture, Lands, Environment and Planning, and Local Government. I am not 100 per cent certain as to how much work has been done by that committee on the matters that have been raised by the honourable member. As the Director-General is a member of that committee I would be happy for him to make representations and find out what has been covered by that committee in the areas mentioned by the member and, if it has not been considered, that it should be considered by that committee.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am reassured that something is happening. I am not critical, nor would I have been if nothing was happening. I just wanted to know the current state of play. I am also anxious to know whether that committee will be taking into account the interests of fresh water and inland salt water fishing licence holders and fishing reaches in any proposals that they may be working upon in relation to the utilisation of recreational resources.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I suggest that that is one of the responsibilities of the Water Resources Council. I think the honourable member would agree that it is the responsibility of that council.

**Mr LEWIS:** Do I take it that any proposal to acquire land for public access or to provide facilities and the like would take into account in that management plan the effects it would have on fishing reaches and fishing licence holders?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes, it would.

**Mr LEWIS:** Is the marine park in Spencer Gulf something for which officers of the department are responsible in any way in the area north of Redcliff Point?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I understand that there have been discussions in regard to the establishment of a marine park in that area. It certainly has not been proclaimed. If the honourable member has any further information on that or any other question I will be quite happy to get some details. There is not a proclaimed park in that area.

**Mr LEWIS:** I read of a proposal to proclaim a park there and wondered whether or not it was still being seriously considered.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It could quite easily be an aquatic reserve, in which case it would come under the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Fisheries.

**Mr LEWIS:** I shall be pleased if I can get some information about another matter entirely, namely, the opinion expressed by the Civic Trust.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If that will lead to more questions, I will ask the honourable member to leave his question now and return to it later.

**Mr LEWIS:** Very well, Sir.

**Mr CRAFTER:** My question relates to the Land Commission. I refer the Minister to this year's Commonwealth Budget Papers and the reference contained therein to the Land Commission and urban land councils, as follows:

Under the terms on which loans were provided under this program, repayments on the first of these loans are due to commence in 1983-84. However, a provision of an estimated \$36 000 000 is included in respect of an expected repayment in 1981-82 in settlement of loans provided in earlier years to South Australia for assistance to its Land Commission.

Will the Minister explain to the Committee why it is necessary to repay that sum of \$36 000 000 two years before the requirement established by the agreement?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** First, we are doing it because it is a worthwhile proposition. We are looking at a debt to the Commonwealth of something like \$90 000 000. Although a figure of \$36 000 000 has been suggested in the Commonwealth Budget papers, negotiations (which at this stage

are between Premier and Prime Minister) are still proceeding on the exact figure.

**Mr CRAFTER:** Will this repayment money come from the Land Commission or from money allocated in the State Budget?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** This has not yet been finalised, and it is impossible to finalise it until we know exactly how much money will change hands. We are looking at a certain sum of money coming out of the balance of the Land Commission, the balance to be repaid over a period of time. I imagine that we would be looking at about \$20 000 000 to be paid out of the Land Commission balance.

**Mr CRAFTER:** The Minister referred to 'we' in respect of the responsibility for the debt repayment. Will he explain to the Committee who in law is responsible for the repayment to the Commonwealth of this sum of money, involving the grant money and the capitalised debt? I understand from the agreement that it is not the State but the Land Commission that is responsible for this debt repayment. Is that correct?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It was an inter-governmental agreement, so it would be the State Government.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I understand that that agreement also indicates that, if there is a shortfall, the Commonwealth will have to make up the difference and that the State will not have to bear that burden.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I reiterate that negotiations are taking place and that the Act would suggest that it is certainly a State Government responsibility.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I imagine that the Commonwealth, by stating in its Budget papers that it expects to recover \$36 000 000 from South Australia, holds that view. However, my question was directed to enforcement, as we are doing with the Commonwealth-State railways agreement. I refer to some legal basis by which we can protect our limited resources. Would the Minister make available to the Committee at some future date comparative positions with respect to structures in other States in relation to our Land Commission, and would he say what position they are in regarding negotiations with the Commonwealth and repayments, so that we could have a comparative analysis of this matter? This is a national programme.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I should be pleased to make that available. There was quite a lengthy discussion earlier this year at the annual meeting of planning Ministers on the matter of the Land Commission in this State and equivalent bodies in other States. We took the opportunity to discuss with the Federal Minister who was present at that meeting the matter of financial agreements. I should be pleased to make that information available to the Committee later.

**Mr CRAFTER:** Will the Minister explain the Government's policy with respect to the maintenance of the relatively low prices for urban land for house building that obtains in South Australia compared to the position in other States? It is true to say that this is one of the cost advantages that we in this State enjoy, and it is used in economic terms as an advantage for locating in South Australia. With the Government's proposals to change the structure and role of the Land Commission, I should be interested to know whether the Government believes that it can maintain the cost of an urban allotment at its present low position.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes, we do. I am sure the honourable member would recognise that, even with the change in the responsibility for the Land Commission in relation to the legislation that was passed some time ago setting up the Urban Land Trust, the Government believes that it should retain a land bank. Of course, that will happen under the Urban Land Trust: it will retain the role as a land bank.

Certainly, we will maintain a supply of land. I think we said when the changes to the Land Commission and the setting up of the Urban Land Trust were announced that land would be released responsibly, and that it would involve a timely release. As a good example, the Committee would be aware of the Government's involvement in Golden Grove, where we have carried on the former Government's responsibility. For the Committee's information, we are nearing the stage where we will have planned release of land in the Golden Grove area. I repeat that it is certainly the Government's intention that the Urban Land Trust should continue to be a land bank and to release land as required in a responsible manner.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I understand that the aim of the Government is to establish the Land Trust as a land bank, but to eliminate from the former Land Commission the marketing side of its activities. Is that the position? I notice from the annual report of the Land Commission that the commissioner has maintained over the past three financial years a fairly static one-quarter share of the market of growth area sales. This would seem to indicate that the commission has in fact established a niche in the marketing area and has maintained that over a very difficult period. It is true that the Land Commission sells many less developed blocks of land than it did previously. However, it has maintained that share of a declining market in recent years. What studies has the Government done, and how is it expected that there will be a saving to the taxpayer by eliminating that section of the market that it covers by its current activities?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It is recognised that broad acre supply is the major bottleneck that can push up prices with regard to urban land. Through the Urban Land Trust, we are seeking to avoid these bottlenecks.

**Mr CRAFTER:** Have any studies been done of the likely saving that this would be to the taxpayer by eliminating that section of work formerly carried out by the commission in the area of marketing?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes. This matter was looked at some time ago when we first determined the future of the Land Commission.

**Mr LEWIS:** I express my gratitude to the department, and the Minister, through whom I have had contact with the department, for the assistance they have given me in sorting out problems between neighbours (whether temporary or permanent neighbours) in involving noise emanating from cockerels, motor bikes, or anything else that made life difficult. How many complaints of this nature does the department deal with each year? Is it considered desirable to eliminate noise pollution of the domestic environment by requiring lawn mowers and/or trail bikes, or motors that make noises that people find objectionable, to be properly muffled?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I appreciate the seriousness of the question. We are certainly concerned that we do not regulate any more than we have to. Because of the relatively few cases that cause problems, it would be using a sledge hammer to crack an almond if we looked at putting special mufflers on lawn mowers and trail bikes. We do not have any intention of taking such action. I will make available later the list of complaints received and the action taken.

**Mr LEWIS:** My interest in asking this question was to determine the likely cost in terms of time taken to investigate those inquiries and try to settle the disputes. I know that you cannot muffle cockerels, but lawn mowers and motor bikes are another matter, certainly trail bikes. If that annually recurring cost paid by the taxpayer would be less than the annually recurring cost that otherwise would be paid by the user of the noisy trail bike, I do not see any

reason why the noisy trail bike should not be properly muffled. I will leave it at that.

Is there any interdepartmental consultation between both this arm of the pollution management sector of the Natural Resources Division and the air quality section, with the division of the South Australian Health Commission known as Environmental and Occupational Health, which I understand considers the same kinds of problems? Is there also consultation with the Department of Industrial Affairs, as it relates to industrial noise and air pollution.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** A considerable amount of interdepartmental communication takes place between my own department and the Health Commission, for example, in regard to lead levels. There is a lot of communication between my department and the Department of Industrial Affairs as well. At its last meeting, the Australian Environment Council, which is the Council of Environment Ministers throughout Australia, looked at the problem of the noise associated with lawn mowers. It was suggested that we should tackle that problem through manufacturing standards. I am not too sure about muffling roosters, but I can assure the member for Mallee that we have had a couple of complaints from his own electorate about noisy roosters.

**Mr LEWIS:** I was bearing that in mind when I asked the question. You cannot muffle roosters without doing other things to them. It takes so much time to deal with these problems that are very serious to the people affected by them. At the time you are discussing difficulties with the people affected by both the noise and then the complaint made about it, it is anything but funny. I do not imply any criticism to anybody; I speak from personal experience.

I turn now to the Botanic Gardens, which comes under the same vote. I am interested to learn from volume 9, page 14, in the first instance, regarding solanum (native potatoes), that there is, as part of the target this year, publication of an illustrated manual on native potatoes. I wonder what their habitat is in the economic system and what relevance, in all seriousness, they might have one way or the other in their economic context.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am informed that solanum potatoes are recognised as an important economic part of the natural environment. The study has been completed. It was treated very seriously as an important project and I would be very happy to make any research papers available to the member if he is interested in that subject.

**Mr LEWIS:** Are they edible?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** No. I think we should take that question on notice.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am interested in the research work that is being conducted by the Botanic Gardens and nonetheless seeking information about those four species, namely, *eremophila* (emu bushes), *kunzea*, *schrophulariaceae* and *verbenaceae*. What kind of plants are they? Are they simply botanists' curios in the spectrum of native flora occurring in our environment or do they in any way have any economic relevance as garden plants, ornamentals, or prospective food sources for humans or animals on which humans depend economically?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The broad objective on the studies that are carried out is to collect and curate. That relates to the drying, pressing, storing, etc. of specimens of plants, the fungae of South Australia, to establish and maintain the correct naming of native plants in South Australia. That is some of the work and related research that is being carried out but obviously the question asked by the member who is interested in this particular subject, is in a very technical area. If the member is happy, I would

make available more information in regard to those particular studies.

The member made reference to the solanum. That was a target and objective for 1980-81 and the continuing research on the four species referred to is to continue into 1981-82. Obviously, that is not complete, but I would certainly be happy to make more information available to the member.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Could I suggest to the honourable member that, with questions of a technical nature such as that, perhaps it would be more appropriate for the honourable member to obtain his information from the department direct.

**Mr LEWIS:** I will be delighted if they could provide it and will attempt to get it from them in due course. I am interested in that in particular because the general case that I was referring to in the previous Minister's vote we discussed relating to that \$1 300 000 000 worth annually of pot plants, which are sold in Canada, the United States and Europe, annually is a market which is identified by the Federal Government's market research and which was announced in the Commonwealth Report of December last year and a substantial proportion of it is now being supplied by countries such as Mexico and Israel. They have taken Australia's native plants and used them in the existing varieties as well as in their hybridised form to supply that market.

If we can get a 1 per cent slice of that action we would be doing a fair bit for South Australia; it is a completely new industry and it would be eliminating that area and any other section of the economy. I am interested to know whether the Botanic Gardens would be interested in being involved or capable of being involved in the development of a comprehensive plant library of seeds and other materials suitable for propagation and suitable to supply consumer demand in this market. I am interested to know that. That is quite apart from my personal and considerable interest in the plants of which the natural economic systems in South Australia is comprised.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I certainly appreciate the question that is asked and the importance of this matter of research, because that is what the State herbarium is all about. I do not know whether members of the Committee are aware that the State herbarium building has been extended quite significantly of late and the research carried out in the herbarium is very important indeed. If members have not taken the opportunity to see the work that is being done by the herbarium in regard to research, I invite them to do so, because the work is most important. I am informed, as an example, that kunzea research is being carried out in regard to the use of that particular plant for stabilisation in coastal areas. That is one of the areas where research is being carried out.

**Mr LEWIS:** That would have application in stabilising sand dunes, even in the Middle-East.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I have referred to the marketing function of the Land Commission and the elimination of that function of the commission in regard to the Land Trust. In its annual report the following statement is made:

In compliance with the Government's decision that the resources of the private sector should be used to the greatest extent possible in selling its stock of serviced allotments the commission invited participation of all real estate agents.

The report made this comment:

Apart from those agents associated with builders, the response was disappointing.

Is that an indication of some of the complexities that are associated with the marketing function of the Land Commission, given the social context in which its aims and objectives are couched, and that it may not be the simple

process to transfer to the private sector the marketing function of such a complex social plan as was originally envisaged for the commission?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The matter of the marketing and the involvement of the private sector is still under negotiation. The member for Norwood has referred to the response on the part of real estate agents. That matter is still open, and we are aware that, with some of the companies involved, there could be further negotiations with regard to marketing on the part of the private sector.

**Mr CRAFTER:** Finally, in regard to the Land Commission and its role in the provision of community facilities, shopping centres and similar community assets in newly subdivided areas, I note that considerable attention is given to this matter in the commission's annual report. These facilities have been established in areas that would not normally have obtained such facilities without the help of some governmental authority. I refer to the Hub at Aberfoyle Park, the Craigmore Community Centre, and the like. Is it intended that the commission will continue to provide such facilities, or will this be the function of some other private or public authority?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** In the new legislation, provision is made for funding to be provided, and this would probably be through matching grants. There is a provision in the new legislation setting up the Urban Land Trust for funding to be made available for the type of facility referred to by the honourable member.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I would like to refer to other areas of the Minister's lines.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As the honourable member has another commitment, I will permit him to change to another subject.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I refer to matters of pollution, and the problems of noise associated with licensed and other premises. I realise that this matter comes within the responsibility of two other Ministers, too, but can the Minister explain the present status of the report which was made public about 12 months ago? I understand that it is under review by Cabinet. Can the Minister indicate which recommendations of the report have been accepted by the Government and which have been rejected?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The member for Norwood is correct; the matter is still before a Cabinet subcommittee. As the honourable member would be aware, it is a very complex question. It involves the Chief Secretary, who is responsible for the police; the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who is responsible for the Licensing Act; and myself as the Minister responsible for noise legislation. The matter is currently with the Minister of Consumer Affairs who is looking at provisions under the Licensing Act. Some weeks ago, I received a deputation from the Adelaide City Council and reference was made to matters that are being considered in New South Wales, particularly in Sydney, in relation to these problems. We are currently looking at the situation there. I assure the honourable member that the subject is receiving active consideration.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I understand that the Government has circulated a clean air Bill to local government authorities and other interested persons for comment. What role does the Government perceive for local government in the policing and implementation of legislation to bring down clean air provisions? In my experience, much of the offensive air pollution comes from such mundane areas as backyard burning and small fires at the back of light industry in residential areas and the like. Does the Government intend that this matter is to become the responsibility of local government, or will the State police it on a uniform basis?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The draft Bill has been circulated as a discussion paper. It is considered that local

government should be responsible for the areas mentioned by the member for Norwood in relation to backyard burning. The Bill has been circulated to interest parties, to industry, to local government and to other interested individuals who have expressed concern about or interest in the subject. Once the draft has been circulated properly, it will come back to the department and I will then await a recommendation from the executive of the department in relation to the introduction of legislation.

**Mr CRAFTER:** My final question relates to the use of incentives to transfer out of residential areas noisy industry or other industry which is harmful to nearby residents. I have been involved with several Government departments, including the Department for Environment and Planning, in trying to encourage industry to transfer out. The Budget papers seem to indicate that no financial incentive is provided to any department for industry to relocate in these circumstances. It is a great shame that no such provision exists to assist in overcoming this very vexed problem in communities which often brings about a great deal of hardship, particularly to older people.

As an example, in my electorate almost 100 people are living in aged persons premises alongside the milk factory. That factory operates throughout the night in summer in a residential area, which is highly built up. It is obviously desirable that that industry should be relocated. Under legislation relating to milk suppliers, it has to be located within a certain radius of delivery points. There are great problems. I believe there should be some incentives, financial and otherwise, or the relocation of industry of this nature. However, I cannot find any line where that can come about.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** There would be no mention in a line concerning my responsibility. The responsibility of the Department of Environment and Planning relates to environmental protection and education in particular, but certainly there is no funding for relocation, which is the responsibility of the Department of Industrial Affairs. Discussions have taken place and will continue to take place in relation to the relocation of particular industries that are causing problems in built-up areas. In one or two cases to which I could refer it has been suggested that some assistance could be given in relocating particular industries. This complex question has been around for a very long time. Certainly, I know that this matter was looked at closely by the previous Government in its responsibility of these matters. We are looking at it, of course. It is a costly operation. Some of the industries would cost a vast amount of money to relocate. It is a matter that has to be looked at very carefully before action is taken in the provision of such an incentive.

**Mr BECKER:** I understand that the department has undergone a considerable amount of reorganisation structurally. I am trying to ascertain from the documents what savings have resulted, if any.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** When we were discussing the National Parks and Wildlife Service I mentioned that there was a significant increase in that area. In fact, there has been a significant increase in the professional resources of the new Department of Environment and Planning; for example, in the National Parks and Wildlife Service and in conservation programmes, where there has been an increase of between six and seven positions. In management there has been an increase. They are recognised as priority areas. It was recognised, when we first looked at the amalgamation of the two departments, that we should be able to achieve overall funding savings and benefit as a result of that amalgamation. That has been achieved. In the administrative services area, we have been able to save 22 positions; in the development management area, we have

been able to save 20 positions. In those two areas alone, we are looking at 42 positions, which is quite significant. We have also recognised that there is a need to look at the priorities of the department.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I have several questions in relation to the development management positions. We note from the Budget papers on page 80 that the allocation for the Director and staff, Development Management Division, is \$1 654 000. My first question follows on from the question raised by the member for Hanson, particularly in the sense that the Minister referred to areas of saving. Page 28 of document 9 suggests in 1980-81 the outcome employment level in terms of average full-time equivalents was 115.1 and the 1981-82 equivalent is 93 positions. That is 22.1 positions less. I am approaching this from a slightly different direction from that of the member for Hanson. Can the Minister give an assurance that this work force can do the job that the previous urban and regional affairs people did? Have funds been dropped or gone elsewhere? We should have some assurances in relation to this matter. They are the people who control the whole urban development.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am happy to be able to give that assurance. The development management area is an important one and there certainly has been a reduction in staffing. I need to explain that reduction; it comes about as a result of the cessation of the project group. In that area we were looking at 10¾ full-time equivalents. There was a reduction in divisional administration from 30.4 to 24. The implications of that are that the project group assisted a small number of councils with their supplementary development plans. It has been recognised that that is the important responsibility of that area. Councils in the main do this work with their own resources. Many of them use consultants for this work. Financial assistance is sometimes provided in lieu of officers in the department. I make it clear the the environmental assessment is being made at its present level. I am sure that the Committee would recognise that that is an important area. Economies are also being achieved by streamlining development and assessment through computerised process control. There have been problems in that area in the past and as a result of the new process we can streamline that assessment. There have been economies through rationalisation of administrative support. There have been economies but I want to give a firm assurance that it is not the intention of the Government that any services provided in the past be withdrawn unless it is recognised that that can happen without any problems associated with local government or any other areas.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I can understand that there will be savings in the rationalisation of administration. We have one department instead of two and we need only one person making up the pay cheques whereas previously there were separate sections for each department. It is obvious that there are some areas of fairly specific activity where there have been some cut-backs.

If I interpret the Minister correctly, he is saying, 'Yes, there are some areas where possibly services that were available from the department earlier will no longer be available. These are either areas that do not matter too much or are areas in which local government is now able to bear the brunt, whereas previously it was rather more dependent on the department?' Is that a fair interpretation of what the Minister is saying?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I think that that is a fair enough interpretation. Some people have said that we are dumping some of our responsibility on local government without its being prepared or in a position to accept that responsibility. However, we are being careful to ensure that, if the responsibility is to be shared with local government, we make provision to assist where necessary in those areas. As I said

earlier, we have been able to provide resources such as finance and manpower for the preparation of supplementary development plans. That is one example.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The contingencies aspect of this part of the line refers to the transfer of \$100 000 to the Planning and Development Fund. Last year's vote is not itemised, as it was previously under the 'Miscellaneous' heading. However, I note from 'Miscellaneous' that the figure involved was also \$100 000. I understand that the Planning and Development Fund traditionally had three sources of revenue. First, a surcharge was put on urban land tax. That was one of the occasions when a group of politicians promised to increase a tax. In 1970, the Dunstan Opposition said that, if elected, it would impose a surcharge and that the money would be paid into the Planning and Development Fund. I take it that, for the most part, that is no longer available because of what this Government did to the Land Tax Act after the last election.

Secondly, there is the provision in the Planning and Development Act for setting aside 12.5 per cent of open space for new subdivisions, or, if that subdivision is below a statutory area (which would make nonsense of providing open space), instead a certain sum of money could be paid into the Planning and Development Fund. The third source is a general allocation from the Treasury. The Government has made a mess of the first thing, because the surcharge went with the land tax. So, that leaves only the payment in lieu of the 12.5 per cent open space and any money that comes from Treasurer. The Committee would be interested in due course to have a return indicating the sources of this money.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I shall be pleased to make that available.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** On the other side of the coin, it is one thing to get money in. However, it is another thing to determine how it should be spent. Traditionally, these funds were spent on those areas of open land designated in the 1961 town plan and subsequently, I guess, through the Planning and Development Act as either regional parks or major distant open spaces. Cherry Gardens comes to mind; O'Halloran Hill is another; and the Onkaparinga Estuary in my district would be a third.

I am well aware that, under this Government and the former Government, not enough money has been available in the fund to do the work that needed to be done in these areas. I recall several years ago seeing in the foyer of the State Administration Centre a plan for a most ambitious development of a major district open space at O'Halloran Hill. All that was there at the time were some trees that had been planted; they are still all that is there. Is this still the fund from which those parcels of land are to be developed and, given the amalgamation that has occurred, what is the form of administration within the new department in relation to those parcels of land that were previously under the separate State Planning Authority?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The Planning and Development Fund is to provide part of the funding. Regarding the administrative responsibility in relation to these areas, the member would be aware that we have stated publicly that many of these areas set aside for recreation purposes only have no special environmental significance. We are looking at areas such as the Onkaparinga Gorge, to which the honourable member referred, and the estuary, which are important areas environmentally. We are looking to transfer out of the department some of the areas that were purchased under the Planning and Development Fund for recreation use. Some will go to local government. Negotiations are currently proceeding with the Department of Recreation and Sport regarding handing over to the administration of

that department areas that were set aside for sporting purposes, and that sort of thing.

**Mr RANDALL:** I have had to wait some time to ask my question, which is along the lines taken by the member for Norwood and somewhat along the lines taken by the member for Mallee earlier. I refer to noise legislation. Does the Minister's noise pollution section conduct noise measuring tests on main roads in order to detect noisy motor vehicles?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Occasionally. Does the honourable member want me to be more specific?

**Mr RANDALL:** Yes.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** This is more the responsibility of the Minister of Transport and is under the Department of Transport, but I know that we do carry out some surveys.

**Mr RANDALL:** Why are those measurements taken?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** They are taken to seek technical advice in regard to noise emitted from motor vehicles.

**Mr RANDALL:** In regard to discotheque noise which occurs quite often in the early hours of the morning, how much does the department involve itself in the measuring of those sorts of noise levels?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** The honourable member would be aware that the department is involved when requested, particularly if we are made aware of a nuisance area. We then carry out tests in regard to the decibel level. The department seems to be receiving more and more complaints in regard to matters relating to noise from discos and that type of activity. The department is certainly involved in carrying out tests in regard to decibel readings in those areas.

**Mr RANDALL:** Can the Minister say whether there have been any prosecutions in the last few years under the noise legislation?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I would need to get exact details in regard to that. If there have been any, I do not think it is a significant number. I will get that information for you. The member would be aware, because of discussions previously on this subject, that most people respond to a warning, and prosecution is not generally necessary. Most people act on a warning.

**Mr RANDALL:** The Minister indicated that there has been an increase in the number of complaints to his department and that his officers are spending more and more time taking those noise measurements. Why are we doing this when we do not seem to be achieving a lot, given the present noise legislation, unless we are perhaps gathering data for future legislation on which to act, or building a case on which to justify new action? Quite a significant amount of time is spent measuring noise levels outside normal working hours purely in response to complaints from the general public.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** By far the majority of cases that we are referred to are solved. It is the minority that we were talking about earlier that we are concerned about and that we tend to hear a lot about through the media. They are the cases that I am looking at currently with my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I move on to the Technical Services Division, \$732 000. We read in yesterday morning's paper, 'South Australians about to plug into satellites'. It is not necessary for me to remind the Committee what is on page 3 of that edition of the *Advertiser*. In the Programme Estimates, book 9, page 33, it seems to me that the area that we are concerned with here is 'Environmental Survey' and 'Remote Sensing'. I note from the 'fixed asset information' that they have one microscope; I hope that is sufficient for their purposes. I note that 'Environmental Survey' is to be boosted this year from one full-time equivalent to four, that the 'Remote Sensing' goes down from 6.5 full-time equivalents to 4, and the total programme

expenditure from 7.5 full-time equivalents to 8. I am glad we are getting this system; there is a great deal that can be done with it. It is the sort of system which is going to create work rather than replace manpower and is going to provide a great deal of information that will need processing. In these circumstances, is the Minister able to assure us that the manpower level set here is sufficient for that job traditionally that has been done by this section and the new work will be created by our being plugged into this new system?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** As far as the 'Remote Sensing' is concerned, the computer programmes will be moving into the A.D.P. applications branch this year, and that explains why there seems to be a reduction. The LANDSAT image analysis system is a very important area. We are placing a great deal of importance on that acquisition. The system is going to enable the department to map and monitor the environmental resources of the State. The honourable member will appreciate that there has been a need for us to know for a long time what is going on. Over recent times we have been accused, as was the previous Government, that we were not 100 per cent certain of what was happening in regard to vegetation clearance. This is going to assist the department to map and monitor those resources. The system also enables the local analysis of satellite imagery and is recognised as being the most cost-effective means of providing this service.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I did not fully understand that, but perhaps in asking my next question I can attempt to understand what I think the Minister was saying. He does not have to comment on it if he thinks that is correct. What I think the Minister is saying is that there are some tasks that have now gone over to the A.D.P. centre and that his department will have full access to that information, and therefore it is not necessary that the work be done in the department.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** No, it is going over to the A.D.P. branch within the department.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** That is listed elsewhere in this document?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I am glad that the Minister raised the matter of vegetation clearance. The map of the agricultural regions, which shows the location of remnant areas of scrub, is in wide circulation, including the second floor of this building, in my office. Is there an equivalent map available for the pastoral areas of the State? If not, is one in course of preparation and will this programme assist the preparation of such information?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** No, there is not, because we do not get the same clearing of land in the pastoral area. To answer the question, there is not the map that is referred to by the honourable member.

**Mr BECKER:** What progress is being made regarding pollution in letterboxes. The Minister may remember that some time ago I wrote to him following a complaint from one of my constituents who believed that this letterbox literature ought to be an environmental problem. Has the department formulated any further policy on this growing problem, or is it leaving it up to Federal authorities?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** There has been involvement by the Department of the Environment and Planning on this matter. Some time ago a committee was set up with a representative from the KESAB committee, and also representatives of my own department and the Litter Control Council. That committee is the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Local Government. That Minister for Local Government has taken the major responsibility in that area. Members will have seen recently that a release was made about the progress being achieved by that com-

mittee; it was an interim release indicating that work was being carried out.

I have had some discussion with the Minister of Local Government on this matter because I am certainly getting a number of requests from people who are interested in just what Government policy is in regard to this matter. It is a subject that is being handled by KESAB and the two Government departments. As soon as a report is finalised, I am sure that we can make a copy available to the member for Hanson. That member and a couple of my other colleagues have written to me on this subject. They will be automatically informed when the report is released as a result of those inquiries.

**Mr BECKER:** Has this matter been raised with meetings of other Environment Minister throughout the Commonwealth?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am not aware that it has been raised by the Australian Environmental Council since I have been a member of that council.

**Mr BECKER:** Do you intend to put it forward? Why have you not raised it?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I have been informed by the Director-General, who is a member of the Standing Committee of the Australian Environment Council, that this matter has been discussed by that committee and will again be brought forward by it. It will in turn report to the Australian Environmental Council.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As there are no further questions, I declare the examination of this vote completed.

Works and Services—Department of Environment and Planning, \$5 800 000

**Chairman:**

Mr E. K. Russack

**Members:**

Mr H. Becker  
Mr G. J. Crafter  
Mr T. H. Hemmings  
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood  
Mr I. P. Lewis  
Mr R. J. Randall  
Mr I. Schmidt  
Mr J. W. Slater.

**Witness:**

The Hon. D. C. Wotton, Minister of Environment and Planning.

**Department Advisers:**

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

Mr J. A. Lothian, Manager, Special Programmes Branch, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr N. H. Johnson, Acting Chief Accountant, Management and Administrative Services Division, Department of Environment and Planning.

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

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

Mr N. P. Newland, Superintendent Field Operations, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Environment and Planning.

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

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I refer to the line 'Development of national parks and reserves', for which \$990 000 is allocated. I refer to Cleland Conservation Park, the trust and the future of this project. I do not know the full background to it, but I understand that, when the project for the development of the park as a major interpretive centre for the service was initiated, I think, by former Minister Corcoran, the total project was to cost \$7 500 000 and was to include Mount Lofty and Waterfall Gully and was to be developed over a three-year to five-year period, but I am not sure about that. There are those who have been to me and who have expressed concern about the future of the project. At the weekend, the Duke of Edinburgh opened the swamp aviary. That is part of the general development, but there are those who say, first, that the development is running well behind time and, secondly, they fear that either the five-year period may be extended almost indefinitely or that some parts of the project, as drawn up by the consultants, have been abandoned. Is any part of the money set out here to be expended on any projects associated with Cleland? Can the Minister confirm or deny that some of the original plan has been drastically modified?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** It is still certainly part of a long-time plan as envisaged by the then Minister for the Environment (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) when the trust was established. In regard to this year, about \$916 000 has been set aside for development at Cleland. Some areas are being reviewed. Some of the original ideas advanced in that forward planning have been reconsidered or are in the process of being reconsidered as to whether or not they should continue. That relates particularly, for example, to the setting up of a Mallee arid zone, which was one of the plans proposed. If we were to look at the setting up of a Mallee arid zone with the climate that is experienced at Cleland, we would have all the problems in the world. There are some changes in that area. To answer the specific question of the honourable member, about \$916 000 has been set aside for development in Cleland this year. The honourable member has reference to the opening of the swamp aviary. Of course, that was part of the development that is taking place. If the honourable member has not seen that development at this stage, I suggest he look at it, because it is worth seeing.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I will certainly do that soon. Is the Cleland Trust properly constituted at present? Is the constitution of the trust as is required under the Act, and will the minister give details of members of the trust?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Yes, it is properly constituted. At present, the members of the trust are Mr Nicholas Newland, Dr Sue Barker, Mr Phipps, and Mr Gair. There is also one vacancy.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I understand that five such bodies have been set up (and this information is available to members in the Minister's section of the big yellow book), partly because they had the capacity to borrow outside of the Loan Council agreement, and one can see the advantage of that. Will the Minister say what is his broad general policy in relation to the future of these committees? The Coast Protection Board is one such committee, and the others are all listed in the big yellow book. Perhaps the Minister does not want to generalise but would prefer to look at specific cases. Is it the Government's general intention that the committees should continue to be able to borrow outside of the Loan Council agreement, and therefore not have to compete with other agencies for Loan Council funds? If so, what constraints currently operate on them, either from the Minister or Treasury?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** First, I point out that, as far as the Cleland Trust is concerned, there is only \$24 000 in

that trust. The Government intends to wind down those trusts, and that has been said publicly. All of the funding has come under the Cosar fund, which is the consolidated fund. The Government and I have been concerned about these trusts. I know they were set up by the previous Government to enable outside borrowing to take place, but that has not necessarily meant that they were the most appropriate method of administering these parks. Whilst the people who have worked on these trusts have served them and the parks very well indeed, it was felt eventually that these parks should come back under the administration of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The trusts are being replaced by the consolidated fund known as the Cosar fund.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I do not want to get into Treasury matters with the Minister, and I appreciate that there may be situations in which the administration of an area of land should perhaps not always be administered in this way. However, I point out that, if the Government is hell bent on this course, it is throwing money away. If in fact these areas are to be funded as far as capital acquisition is concerned from general Loan Revenue, then obviously the Minister is involved in an argument with other Ministers about the funds he can obtain. I am well aware that it is not always possible for these agencies, which can borrow money outside the Loan Council agreement, to borrow up to the limit, because a servicing charge has to be met from General Revenue, and the Treasury would want to keep a fairly close control on that. I believe that the Treasury, under this Government, has probably been able to have more to say about that than it did under the previous Government. I hope the Minister takes my point.

I assume that we are talking about the Black Hill Native Flora Park Trust, Cleland, the General Reserves Trust and certainly the Coast Protection Board. I cannot remember the other one, but I am sure the Minister will pick it up for me. Money is available under a concession that was extracted from the Federal Government some time ago. Every year the amount that can be borrowed outside the Loan Council agreement tends to be raised somewhat.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I want to clarify (and I thought I made it clear before) that it is not my intention to wind down the Coast Protection Board. I am only referring to the trusts set up in regard to the responsibility for administration in certain national parks. It needs to be spelt out that, in regard to the total capital funding, there has been no decrease; in fact, there has been an increase from \$8 033 000 for 1980-81 to \$9 312 000 for 1981-82; that is all sources of funding, excluding interest in capital repayments. There certainly has not been a reduction in capital funds at all. I make the point again that the main reason for our winding down the trust was in regard to management and administrative roles. I believe that that is as important, if not more important, than just being able to borrow from outside, bearing in mind that that money has to be repaid at some stage or other.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** We have had some assurance from the Minister in regard to the Cleland Trust and its membership. Could the Minister give some information as to the membership of the other trusts.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I will make that information available at a later stage. The members of the General Reserve Trust are the same as those of the Cleland Conservation Park Trust, namely, Nicholas Newland, Dr Barker, Mr Phipps and Mr Gare. I will make available a list of personnel on the Black Hill Trust.

**Mr LEWIS:** Can the Minister tell me what effects and benefits he thinks the Civic Trust has on the development of effective civic design and planning and what can be done with funds available not only from Government agencies



but also from private resources for the improvement of the environment in which we have to live, as it relates to all the expenditures presently being sought? By way of explanation, I point out that these Loans funds are to be applied to specific projects, many of them involving construction. In recent times, South Australia has shown a capacity for sensitive consideration of design and its impact on general levels of stress in the community, both on individuals in the work place—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the honourable member link up his question with one of the lines in the vote? There are only four lines.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am referring to minor improvements of parks and reserves and recreation and open space improvements which will involve the establishment of street furniture and park furniture. I am asking a question about the Civic Trust and whether or not the Minister regards that organisation as a completely voluntarily funded body, funded by its members, as performing a useful service in the kind of encouragement it gives to good design and the kind of discouragement it gives to bad design.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I recognise the important role that the Civic Trust plays in an educational manner and in encouraging people to be more aware of architectural design.

I am also very much aware that the Civic Trust not long ago presented with a brickbat the building in which we now reside. I have also had a recent involvement with the Civic Trust, in that it is once again sponsoring and encouraging young people to participate in an essay competition relating to environmental matters generally.

The Civic Trust is one of many voluntary organisations that do much to make people aware of their responsibility in relation to environmental matters. This Government will give such bodies every support and encouragement that it can so that they can continue in a voluntary manner to make people more aware.

**Mr LEWIS:** I understand that the Civic Trust does not seek any financial support but indeed enjoys verbal support such as that which the Minister has just been prepared to give it. The trust seeks and welcomes any support for the kinds of activity in which it is engaged. I am sure that the Minister would appreciate that point.

Did the Minister agree with the opinion which is contrary to that put by the member for Baudin when he was speaking about the desirability of trusts being able to borrow outside Loan Council allocations, so that the money comes from the total economy? If the public sector takes them, they are not then available for development in the private sector

for housing development or for individuals. The money must still come from somewhere, and only so much is available. I wonder whether that is not at the back of the Government's decision to reduce the amount of borrowing by the public sector in favour of allowing the private sector to develop where jobs are created.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** I am not sure what the question was.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think it was more of a comment than a question. I gave the Minister an opportunity to comment on it.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I meant to raise this matter when the Committee referred previously to Cleland. I understand that park keepers at Cleland last week were busy digging holes, and they understood why when a whole lot of plants turned up. The keepers were bemused when asked to leave the plants in their plastic pots when putting them into the ground. Are those same keepers now digging up those plants and putting them back on a truck? In other words, did the Minister lease plants from a nursery somewhere for use in a conservation reserve, simply because the Duke of Edinburgh would be there?

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** No, I am not aware that that happened. I do know that we were running a little behind schedule and that, probably if there is any reason for that happening, it was because, although we might have had time to dig the holes, we did not have time to tip the plants out of the pots. We were working until 7.30 the night before the opening, and I am sure that, if any Committee members look at the swamp aviary at Cleland, the plants referred to will be safely planted in the ground.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As there is no time for further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

---

Works and Services—North Haven Trust,  
\$2 000 000—Examination declared completed.

---

Minister of Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous,  
\$1 71 000—Examination declared completed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 14 October at 11 a.m.