

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 5 October 1983

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

**Chairman:**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold  
 The Hon. Peter Duncan  
 Mr S.G. Evans  
 Mr R.J. Gregory  
 Mr G.M. Gunn  
 Mr K.C. Hamilton  
 Mr M.K. Mayes  
 The Hon. Michael Wilson

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** I advise the Committee that the required notice of discharge and substitution of members is as follows: Mr Mayes in place of Mr Groom; the Hon. Peter Duncan in place of Mrs Appleby; the Hon. Michael Wilson in place of the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy; the Hon. Peter Arnold in place of Mr Lewis; and Mr Evans in place of Mr Mathwin. Further changes or substitutions will be made only at the end of a vote, or at 1 p.m. or 6 p.m. All questions must be directed to the Minister and not to the officers; however, the Minister may at any time call on his officers to answer a question or to supplement an answer. All questions should relate to a particular vote and not to matters of policy, and second reading debates or grievance debates will not be allowed. It has been suggested that at 1 p.m. there be a meeting between the Minister, the Hon. Mr Arnold and me so that we can come to some sort of agreement in regard to the time at which officers from the Department of Recreation and Sport will be required to attend the Committee.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** There is no question that those officers would be required before 4 p.m., but after lunch we could give a more precise time.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That arrangement is all right with me.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Members who are not members of the Committee may ask questions but only in co-operation with the lead speaker from the Opposition side. I will not encourage that sort of questioning, but if there is agreement, such members may ask questions. I intend to allow the Opposition lead speaker the opportunity to speak for 15 minutes, and in that time he can say anything he wishes to say. I will then allow the Minister the same time. I call on the Opposition lead speaker, the Hon. Peter Arnold.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** At the commencement of this review of the Estimates, I would like to take the opportunity to refer to three or four areas of a policy nature that are extremely important. First, during my time as Minister and my involvement with the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it was pointed out to me, and rightly so, that enormous capital investment, for which the Government and the Department is responsible, is directed to the water distribution systems and sewerage works in the metropolitan and country areas of the State, and to water storage.

However, over a period of years there has been the ever-increasing problem of insufficient funds adequately to maintain and replace this valuable resource. Obviously, the time

will come when this resource, no matter how much maintenance is carried out on it, must be replaced. An ongoing problem for Governments for a considerable time has been how they are going to replace countless millions of dollars worth of assets. One has only to look at the country distribution system of water mains where I believe there is about 22 000 km of mains in agricultural areas taking stock and domestic water to farms and country towns.

In the past, maintenance has been carried out to the best of the ability of the Department, but no real provision has been made for the ultimate replacement of mains. However, the day for that replacement is going to come soon. One has only to look at certain sections of the mains on West-Coast that are in a bad state of repair. It will not be long before those mains can no longer be maintained and must be replaced. Will the Minister say what is his attitude to this problem and what is the Government's policy regarding the replacement of this capital asset? Also, how does he envisage this replacement will be undertaken?

The same comments apply to the replacement of sewers, particularly in the metropolitan area, where there is a tremendous intrusion of ground water in certain areas into the sewers, thereby complicating and increasing problems at sewage treatment works. These two areas involve vast sums of money when one looks at a replacement programme. It would appear that in the past replacements have only occurred where an urgent problem has developed. However, the whole system is ageing and the replacement crunch is going to come in the near future. If the water distribution system is allowed to continue as it is for much longer it will be subjected to a serious breakdown with enormous consequences to many people in South Australia, particularly in rural areas. Will the Minister indicate what is the Government's attitude to this problem, how does he see the future of the capital assets of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and how does he envisage the Government will fund their replacement?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Chaffey has completed his remarks and the Minister now has an opportunity to speak for up to 15 minutes.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** In considering the Budget results for 1982-83 and the proposals for 1983-84 I would remind honourable members that 1982-83 saw one of the worst droughts on record throughout southern Australia. As an indication of the severity of that drought, it may be of interest for members to know that intakes from natural streams totalled 37 790 megalitres last year compared with 154 547 megalitres in 1981-82.

The lack of natural intake necessitated extensive pumping from the Murray River, to which I will refer lately. Fortunately for South Australia, the season broke in March 1983 and has continued favourably. I am pleased to report that currently the metropolitan reservoirs are holding 174 000 megalitres, which is 86 per cent of capacity. Somewhat surprisingly, total water consumption for 1982-83 was 282 000 megalitres, which is 2 000 megalitres less than the previous year. The consumption in non-metropolitan areas was also down, probably due to the reduction of stock over the season.

Notwithstanding the severe drought conditions that prevailed, services were maintained virtually without exception. No water restrictions were required, unlike other capital cities, such as Melbourne, which had very severe restrictions. As a result of the drought and of the increase in the price of water applied by the previous Government, some 56 per cent of consumers used water in excess of their allowances. The price of water has been increasing at a greater rate than base rates, thereby reducing allowances and increasing the emphasis on payment for water used.

The Government believes that increasing the emphasis on payment for water used is the appropriate policy to follow and, accordingly, the price of water was increased on 1 July 1983 to a greater extent than base rates. Notwithstanding the rises in water and sewerage rates applied on 1 July 1983, the rates payable in Adelaide per head of population are significantly below those of other capital cities in Australia.

I will now deal with each budget in turn. The first is the Recurrent Budget, where the total expenditure by the E. & W.S. Department was \$104.8 million. This exceeded the Budget estimate by \$14.1 million, which arose due to the following circumstances: \$9.1 million of the excess was the result of increased pumping from the Murray River due to the adverse seasonal conditions; \$4 million was the result of salary and wage award increases provided from the lump sum allowance for this purpose; the remainder resulted mainly from increased chlorination and fluoridation costs—a total of \$255 000; as a result of increased pumping; water carting, \$180 000; a greater than planned use of the workforce on maintenance, \$730 000; and increased costs generally, \$574 000. This was offset partly by savings on chemical costs, which was \$299 000; reduced overhead rates, \$424 000; and terminal leave payments, \$126 000.

The proposed Recurrent Budget for 1983-84 totals \$100 million, to which the share of the round sum allowance for wage increases of \$2.3 million can be added. Provision for electricity for pumping has been reduced from that actually spent in 1982-83, reflecting the improved reservoir holdings currently available. The proposed recurrent expenditure represents a reduction in real terms and is to be achieved by a reduction in Public Service Act full-time equivalents by about 37 positions and a reduction in the weekly-paid workforce of approximately 54 employees. These reductions are proposed to be achieved by natural attrition. An examination of the Programme Budget Papers will show that the proposed average full-time equivalents for 1982-83 was not achieved due to attrition being less than budgeted for.

Turning now to the estimates of a capital nature, it can be seen that total payments proposed are \$64.3 million, compared with \$57.8 million in 1982-83. The 1982-83 expenditure was some \$1.6 million short of the estimate due to delays in letting and completion of contracts. Although the programme papers refer to a reduction in real terms in the capital budget, this is now not likely to be so as additional funds are available as a result of some Government initiatives in respect of housing through the South Australian Housing Trust and the increase in the water filtration programme arising from a \$4 million increase in Commonwealth funding for water filtration.

The \$4 million will be matched by \$1 million from State funds. I am pleased to announce that a final agreement has been reached with the Commonwealth Government on the funding of schemes under the National Water Resources Programme for 1983-84. I received advice only yesterday from the Federal Minister (Senator Walsh) that Federal funding totalling \$10.355 million will be available for 1983-84. This means that there will be a substantial increase in the works programme for water treatment. Expenditure on metropolitan water filtration is proposed to be \$10.99 million compared to \$7.89 million in 1982-83. Country water filtration expenditure is proposed to be \$6.34 million compared to \$2.839 million in 1982-83.

Overall, the Commonwealth will be contributing \$7.7 million up from \$3.13 million in 1982-83. The overall works programme, subject to Federal funding, is up from \$18.1 million in 1982-83 to \$23.26 million in 1983-84. It is to be broken down as follows: water filtration, \$17.33 million; Murray Valley drainage and salinity, \$2.03 million; River Torrens flood mitigation works, \$2.8 million; water resource

assessment, \$1.1 million. The increase in water filtration expenditure from 1982-83 equals 61.3 per cent. The overall expenditure increase in the National Water Resources Programme in 1982-83 equals 28.5 per cent.

I now intend to turn briefly to the financial results of the 1982-83 financial year which saw the overall net cost to Consolidated Revenue of the operations of the Engineering and Water Supply Department increase from \$43 million to \$45 million. With respect to the various undertakings, the results were as follows:

Metropolitan waterworks, a surplus of \$1.7 million; country waterworks, a deficit of \$24.3 million; metropolitan sewers, a surplus of \$4 million; country sewers, a deficit of \$4.6 million; irrigation, a deficit of \$9.7 million.

Other undertakings which contributed significantly to the overall deficit were:

Water Resources management, \$5.2 million; South-Eastern drainage, \$1.9 million; River Murray works, \$2.9 million; Loxton war service land settlement, \$0.8 million.

Significant trends which are able to be identified in an examination of the financial results are a continuation of the increase in the deficits of country water and sewer undertakings and, in particular, a further sharp increase in the irrigation deficit. With a view to containing the overall deficit of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, an examination of costs and subsidies has continued during 1982-83. For example, the previous concessional price of water to schools has been removed resulting in an adjustment in favour of the department by some \$1 million. This was done with a view to presenting programme budget receipts and expenditures more accurately than previously. These reviews will continue in 1983-84.

I make only brief comment in regard to the points raised, because they should be answered in reply to a question rather than in a statement by me now about replacing programmes. Doubtless, the member for Chaffey is correct when he says that the system is ageing. Certainly, it is a matter that cannot be addressed in one Budget. It is a long-term situation. Certainly, too, it is one that needs to be addressed in the near future.

---

Engineering and Water Supply, \$98 366 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.W. Slater, Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr K.W. Lewis, Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr D.J. Alexander, Deputy Director-General, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr A.N. Killmier, Director, Administration and Finance, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I return to my opening remarks, when I asked the Minister about the Government's policy and what study and research the Department has conducted in relation to a problem that is looming greater every year. In his opening remarks, the Minister did not really cover that area. Can the Minister indicate the sort of funds that will be required to enable the Department to adequately carry out a responsible programme to finance the replacement of the existing assets?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I would only be guessing at an estimate of the money that would be needed to replace the

Department's assets. Certainly, it has been the Department's policy over the past 12 months to look closely at needs in regard to immediate replacement. For instance, in many instances it is cheaper to repair than to replace. I point out that some work has been undertaken in the metropolitan area in relation to sewers, because the Commercial Road trunk sewer was in very bad condition. An amount of \$500 000 was applied for that road. I point out that much of the sewer system that we operate in the metropolitan area is of post-war vintage. Needs will increase as time passes.

We are assessing replacement needs and studies in relation to pressing problems that arise from time to time. The first consideration is the needs of the system in relation to repair rather than replacement. Indeed, we are about to undertake two projects. One is the Stirling/Heathfield augmentation scheme. The Department has also undertaken considerable new work in, I think, Noarlunga South and in the Victor Harbor area. That is new work, not replacement work. Indeed, we are also considering the Darlington to Wattle Park water supply reorganisation. They are just a few of the schemes where an urgent need existed and, consequently, the Government took up the work and maintained the system.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister has still not really answered my question. The Minister's answer clearly indicates that we are still living a hand-to-mouth existence. Information put before me in times gone by clearly indicates that the information that I am seeking from the Minister is available within the Department. The work has been done and it is clearly documented. These assets have reached the end of their useful life, are in danger of collapsing and have virtually reached a stage where they cannot be effectively repaired for much longer. As I have said, the crunch will come. Whether the Minister is still in office when that crunch comes or whether someone else is does not matter, because the crunch will surely come. I think it is an issue that we cannot continue to push to one side and say that we will look at it later, and so on.

Much work has been done, and I believe that information is available within the Department as to the sort of annual input of a capital nature that will be required if the resources for which we are responsible are to be protected.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not believe that the system will collapse, but we must take certain steps to ensure that we provide a service for the public of South Australia. I understand also that the situation has been assessed. The Deputy Director will provide information on the asset replacement studies that have been undertaken.

**Mr Alexander:** The Department has a small internal audit group, which was required by the executive panel of the Department to undertake an asset replacement survey. A seven-volume report was completed early this year in regard to the whole range of assets, including mains, buildings, pumping stations, and other assets. The problem is not as pressing as appeared might be the case a few years ago. The analyses showed that a problem is looming, but it is perhaps five to 10 years away. We are using the internal audit report on asset replacement to prepare a financial programme, which will set out a 10-year prospective and will indicate the sort of expenditure required. The examination showed that we have time to undertake some proper financial planning in regard to replacement.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Is it a case of the longer the delay the more the problem will be compounded? I do not suggest that that problem exists because of the present Minister: a problem has been emerging for many years through successive Governments. The available capital funds have gone into expansion and extension of the existing resource for the benefit of the people of the State. I come back to

the point that everything has a useful life, and sooner or later a big percentage of our assets will reach the end of that useful life and a massive input of capital will be required. In looking ahead, has the Minister considered taking up this matter with the Federal Government to seek long-term financial arrangements, which that will have to be worked out one way or another?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There have been numerous demands in my term of office for an increase of supply in the metropolitan area and particularly in country areas. One must assess quite honestly the needs of those people and apply that situation to the works that are particularly old compared with work that was undertaken since the post war era. There have been considerable capital works over the past 20 or 30 years in South Australia. Indeed, as time goes on, there will be demands in regard to those works.

Over the past 10 to 15 years, a tremendous lot of work has been carried out in regard to water filtration simply because of the source of our water supply. One must consider whether capital can be spent on maintaining that system in order to ensure that it works effectively. I know of no instance where that system is in a state of collapse, but certainly some areas require attention. Those needs are assessed and compared with the requirements of future capital works. An assessment of the capital amount involved and a request to the Federal Government to come forward with the required funds are difficult matters.

I repeat that we do as much as possible within the funding limitations to ensure that the system and supply to the public are effective, and we must address this question over the long term rather than in the short term. I believe that the Department provides a service that is as good as or better than that provided in other capital cities in Australia.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before calling the member for Florey, I wish to advise the Committee that I keep a call list, and I would appreciate members advising me if they would like the call.

**Mr GREGORY:** The Minister in his opening address stated that Adelaide has the lowest per capita water and sewerage rates of any city in Australia. Would he provide the figures to support that claim? What are the rates in the other capital cities?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Even though rates have increased in Adelaide in 1982-83 and 1983-84, Adelaide still has the lowest per capita water and sewerage rates of Australian capital cities. Although rating systems in each capital city are somewhat different, comparisons can be made on the available data, even though there is a variation in the type of service provided and the location of those capital cities. Adelaide has an advantage in respect of sewerage because of the topography and the general flat terrain. That has been a major fact, no doubt, in keeping costs to a minimum.

Figures provided of revenue collected for water and sewerage per head of population indicate that the rate in Sydney is \$175; Melbourne, \$178; Perth, \$192; and Adelaide, \$140. So the situation in Adelaide compares very favourably with the situation in other capital cities in regard to the assessment of water and sewerage charges.

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the Minister give details of the work completed so far on the River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Considerable work is still being undertaken, and we hope to complete the programme by 1988. The scheme was approved in 1981 by the previous Government—and I am always prepared to give credit where credit is due. That was probably one of the good things that the previous Government did.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I would not dare to say that, but I give credit to the previous Government in regard to the

River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme. The scheme commenced on 4 January 1982, with an estimated completion date of June 1988.

Original approval was for \$18.690 million. Revised approval is for \$22.132 million in 1982-83 values. Expenditure to 30 June 1983 has been \$5.51 million. There is an allocation in the Budget of \$3.6 million and expenditure for 1983-84 to 31 August 1983 has been \$576 253. The physical progress of the schemes is such that we have raised the Kangaroo Creek Dam, a project that is now 45 per cent complete. Work package No. 1, which is in the western area of Adelaide, is 95 per cent complete. Work package No. 2, which is also in the Western area, is 90 per cent complete. Further work called work package Nos 3 and 4 has only just started. We have completed about 20 per cent of that scheme, and 5 per cent of work package No. 4. Some difficulties were experienced in the western suburbs in regard to land acquisition, which has been one of the problems encountered. The works programme for the coming year includes the completion of the Kangaroo Creek Dam, of flood mitigation works Nos 1 and 2, and a continuation of work package No. 3.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before I ask the member for Florey to ask his next question, I suggest to the Committee that some of the questions being asked might be better asked under other lines. I notice that although the member for Chaffey's questions were of a general nature and dealt with planning, there are separate lines for flood mitigation and the River Torrens Linear Park which come under the capital programme and appear on page 148 of the financial statement. This comment is made for the guidance of the Committee. The honourable member for Florey.

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the Minister inform the Committee about the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas in the Riverland?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The programme that we have undertaken has been reduced somewhat, as the honourable member for Chaffey would know. However, we intend, and approval has been given, to complete the Chaffey irrigation area, the major programme for this year. Total expenditure will be \$3.3 million, which does not include the cost of other areas of irrigation.

**Mr GUNN:** My first question is of a general nature and deals with the possibility of extending the Department's existing schemes to areas of the State where it has been classified as uneconomical to extend them. I know that this question can be classed as a hardy annual and that it involves a difficult problem, but there are many parts of the State where people have been told for a long time that it is unlikely that they will ever have water supplied by the Department. Is the Minister in a position to give any hope to people in areas such as areas west of Ceduna and various

other parts of the State about the Government's having any long-term policy that will result in those people getting a reticulated water supply, which they honestly believe they deserve? The Minister and his officers are aware of this matter and should establish once and for all whether there is any hope of anything being done for these people during the next five years.

I point out to the Minister that many people feel that they have not had a fair go with this matter because they have seen that Governments have been able to provide large amounts of money to improve the Torrens River (which they do not object to), to spend on the Festival Theatre, to subsidise metropolitan transport, and so on. However, when they ask for capital funds to fund a water scheme for Terowie or west of Ceduna they are told, 'Sorry, it is too expensive and there will not be a big enough return for the amount of money spent.' These people are at a stage where they believe that they should not have to wait any longer. Will the Minister say whether those 30 schemes, particularly the ones in my electorate, have any hope of being implemented, or is he prepared to say 'No' to these people? They were upset that the Commonwealth Government was providing funds to assist in finding water in drought areas at a time when the department would not give approval for those people to bore for water because it was said it was most unlikely that any water would be found. That was unfortunate when the Commonwealth would have provided most of the money involved. Do these people have any hope of these schemes being implemented, or will the Minister say 'No', that they do not have any such hope?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not think that this question is a hardy annual; it is a perennial which has been around for a long time. It worries me because, as the member for Eyre knows, I have had an opportunity of visiting the West Coast where some of these schemes are wanted. Priority comparisons for new water supply schemes are based primarily on financial viability, but there are other factors which we ought to consider and which I regard as special circumstances, such as fire protection, public health, and so on. The cost to implement the backlog of total schemes would be over \$50 million. Here, again, I get back to the priorities that we have to establish with regard to new work or to maintain existing systems. I will give a run-down of what we call the 'priority order' based on financial calculations. What we look at is the revenue return, annual cost, and so on—the whole of the provisions so far as return for the service is concerned. These schemes are rated in their priority order. I have a statistical table relating to this matter and seek leave to have it inserted in the record without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### DEFERRED SCHEME LIST

Appendix D

#### PRIORITY ORDER

Priority Order	Scheme	Capital Cost \$	Revenue Return Year I	Per Cent Return Year I	Total Annual Cost \$	Annual Def/Service
1	Coffin Bay	1 186 000	64 760	5.46	211 000	480
2	Upper Sturt	327 000	9 060	2.77	50 800	670
3	Meadows	570 000	25 190	4.42	105 000	640
4	Greenhill Estate	650 000	32 500	5.00	131 000	490
5	Kingston South 1 (full)	578 000	31 040	5.37	121 000	200
6	Echunga	576 000	19 560	3.39	106 000	900
7	Kingston South 2	251 000	13 420	5.35	58 300	230
8	Port Parham	295 000	9 440	3.20	47 700	375
9	Emu Bay	482 000	6 700	1.39	74 000	650
10	Forrester	103 000	2 920	2.84	21 000	620
11	Hundred Moorowie	595 000	16 720	2.81	93 000	1 900
12	Mount Compass	285 000	10 460	3.67	59 000	890

## DEFERRED SCHEME LIST—continued

## PRIORITY ORDER

Appendix D

Priority Order	Scheme	Capital Cost \$	Revenue Return Year 1	Per Cent Return Year 1	Total Annual Cost \$	Annual Def/Service
13	Southend	545 000	18 860	3.46	116 000	710
14	Carpenter Rocks	270 000	7 570	2.80	58 000	680
15	American River (part)	1 831 000	29 250	1.60	291 000	1 360
16	Mundulla	393 000	10 340	2.63	76 600	730
17	Macclesfield	858 000	27 280	3.18	154 000	1 250
18	Watervale	1 270 000	40 380	3.18	229 000	1 860
19	Manoora-Waterloo	1 460 000	35 480	2.43	252 000	2 060
20	Cox Hill Road	362 000	3 540	.98	60 000	1 850
21	Upper Hermitage	247 000	3 060	1.24	46 000	1 850
22	American River (full)	4 013 000	31 600	.79	640 000	2 570
23	Notts Well	769 000	4 385	.57	116 000	3 200
24	Blanchetown	474 000	9 390	1.98	90 700	2 540
25	Callington-Strathalbyn (part)	3 574 000	48 600	1.36	545 000	4 910
26	Greenhills-Victor Harbor	251 000	4 035	1.61	58 500	2 700
27	Callington-Strathalbyn (full)	6 427 000	89 700	1.40	1 013 000	5 080
28	Keyneton	540 000	9 240	1.71	101 000	4 600
29	Kangarilla	985 000	10 440	1.06	172 000	5 700
30	Denial Bay	512 000	4 820	.94	81 000	6 750
31	Port Kenny/Venus Bay	5 545 000	99 800	1.80	963 000	6 600
32	Ceduna-Koonibba	3 344 000	35 900	1.07	537 000	7 420
33	Mangalo	11 615 000	95 100	.82	1 931 000	10 500
34	Hundred Hooper/Etrick	4 341 000	18 370	.42	700 000	13 800

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Perhaps the Director-General would like to comment further.

**Mr Lewis:** I do not think there is anything further I can say about this matter. We have about 34 schemes about which requests have been received over the years. They are mostly, as are most country water supply schemes, uneconomic in terms of revenue return. There are other considerations, as the Minister has said, in such matters. If one looks at the social responsibility of providing these services and at health issues, and so on, the fact still is that, in looking at all of these schemes when we examine them each year, the funds we have do not meet the necessary priorities to get these programmes approved by the Government.

**Mr GUNN:** What the Minister has said is that it will require Treasury to make a special allocation to the Department for some of these schemes to get off that list. It appears that under the present scheme the Department has not been receiving sufficient money to fund these schemes. It appears to me that Governments, in their wisdom, have found money for all sorts of programmes but not left enough money for what I class as fairly urgent capital programmes.

It appears to me that the Department could arrange to install these water schemes if the Treasurer in his wisdom provided suitable amounts of money above what the Department currently gets. I will not at this stage deal with areas from which money should be cut, but on a future occasion in the Parliament I will go into some detail; I have done it once before. It appears to me that it is another case in which if one lives within 20 to 30 kilometres of the G.P.O. there is plenty of money to keep the multitudes happy, but if one happens to live in an isolated community the Treasurer is not quite so forthcoming with the money. It would appear from what the Minister has said that it is purely a matter of money which prevents these people from getting justice.

I turn to another matter in relation to the provision of water: the Minister a few weeks ago met a deputation in company with other Ministers—Mr Wright, Mr Keneally and Mr Hemmings—to discuss with the Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association the possibility of allowing them to install a reticulated water scheme from a bore which the Department put down some time ago. I understand that a report was to be available in a few weeks. Is the Minister

in a position to give any indication whether the study has been completed and where the Department stands in relation to this project? The Minister would be aware that the current cost of water in Coober Pedy is approximately \$50 per 1 000 gallons. I have not converted it; I was taught to think in acres and gallons. I could go on and list all the other charges which the people are inflicted with up there, but I will leave it there. There is a general view that they are paying too much, but I would appreciate some response from the Minister.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Two questions are involved in the comments by the member for Eyre. The first relates to the uneconomic schemes. He mentioned a special allocation from Treasury. It is not only the capital works, but also the servicing of the recurrent expenses incurred. I point out very strongly that the ratepayers of South Australia are really subsidising country water supplies at present.

**Mr GUNN:** And the transport system, too?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is so, but I am referring particularly to water resources. I use an example in the District of Eyre: the cost to the Department for the supply of water in the system over there is something like \$11 million, and the return is \$3.3 million. So, it is a considerable drain on resources, not only of a capital nature but also recurrent expenditure.

Regarding the Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association, it is true that other members and I met a delegation two or three weeks ago. I gave them an undertaking that we would look at the matters that that deputation brought forward. The report is not yet available, but I expect that it will be available within a couple of weeks.

**Mr GUNN:** I would like a full explanation of the policy of the Government in relation to granting indirect services. I have had this drawn to my attention by a constituent, and I read a portion of a letter that he received:

Government policy does not permit the granting of indirect services within a declared water district unless there is evidence of building . . . and only if it is not feasible to extend the closest water main . . . Acceptable evidence of a building is the approval by the local district council to proceed with the development.

I have a constituent who bought a block of land in Quorn and has now been told that he cannot extend an indirect service because it is one of those 20-acre blocks and he wants to run horses on it. Other people in the close vicinity

of it are doing the same. To put it mildly, he has written me a letter which is not particularly complimentary to the Minister's Department because he feels that he has been hardly done by. I could make the letter available to the Minister, but I would like to know what the general policy is. I do not know whether honourable members have much trouble with getting constituents indirect services; it is a matter that from time to time has caused me some problems. I always try to work them out on a local level if possible. Can the Minister advise me what course of action my constituent can take? He is prepared to provide the pipe and various other things for the water because he wants to be in a position to adequately water the few horses that he wants to run. It does not appear to me to be an unreasonable request in a place like Quorn.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** My policy in regard to indirect services is that it is much better to provide an extension of the mains if that is at all possible. We have always to consider the problem of supply. The honourable member mentioned the town of Quorn and the effect that any indirect service has on other consumers. Not only that: the indirect services where the people supply their own material and put in a particular pipe or whatever it might be usually are not of the standard that the Department would prefer. They sometimes do not get the result that they may have anticipated in the first place. So, the policy is not to encourage indirect services at all, but if at all possible to provide a service by the Department, dependent, of course, on the area and the ability to supply.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I suppose that the Minister would expect this sort of question from me. What steps are being taken to minimise odours emanating from the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works? Can the Minister provide details of these measures and the costs involved? As the Minister would be well aware, since 1979 I have under successive Governments pursued this issue in an effort to reduce the number of complaints from residents in various parts of my electorate. I express my appreciation to the former Minister for his assistance while he was in office.

It is a very contentious issue within my electorate, and one which gives rise to a considerable number of complaints at my electorate office. Perhaps the Minister may be able to elaborate on the number of complaints that have been received at the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works and at other offices because, despite my encouragement through electorate newsletters and local press assistance, I still get complaints in my office and I ask my constituents on those and subsequent occasions to advise the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works when they experience these unpleasant odours. Perhaps the Minister may be able to assist me.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The most persistent complainant, of course, is the member for Albert Park. We get regular letters from him on behalf of his constituents. I would like him to appreciate that the Department does everything possible to minimise the odour that emanates from the treatment works. The Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works was built in the 1930s; at that time, of course, there were no surrounding residences. The area has now become developed, and no doubt the problem is accentuated. Considerable work is to be undertaken at the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works this year (1983-84). Capital works related to odour control will be a digester mixer, which is a replacement of compressors and so on—\$65 000; aeration pipework replacement will total \$87 000; grit removal investigation, \$11 000; minor works, \$18 000; screen replacement, \$65 000; odour control chlorination, \$65 000. They are capital works. Recurrent costs will be involved in odour control tower operation, odour control chlorination repairs to gas-holder and, in addition, some of the capital works that we intend to take on board this year include site beautification

works. Sewage treatment works are never the most prepossessing and beautiful buildings; nevertheless, we try as much as possible in the area surrounding the works to minimise the intrusion into the environment of the area. Some minor works of this nature will be undertaken to total about \$60 000.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The Minister will recall that some time ago I wrote to him about correspondence used by land agents in the West Lakes and surrounding areas to satisfy questions from prospective house purchasers, especially in areas surrounding the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works. Salesmen and developers exhibited correspondence from the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the Department dated 18 December 1979. The second paragraph states:

The Department is undertaking various remedial measures and it is envisaged that once completed the appearance and operation of the works will compare favourably with the Glenelg Treatment Works which has co-existed with residential housing for many years without causing concern to its neighbours.

That correspondence was No. 639676. From my discussions with West Lakes area representatives late last year I was given to understand that they could expect the odour problem from the treatment works would be sufficiently eliminated to reduce complaints from residents of the West Lakes area. Moreover, the company supplied me with a copy of that correspondence, which had endorsed upon it, 'All representatives read and circulate'. Numerous residents have come to me expressing concern over their expectation (rightly or wrongly) that these odours would be eliminated in and around the West Lakes area. I wrote to the Minister and asked whether he would investigate the matter. True, it is a controversial issue, but can the Minister advise me what is the likely outcome? I feel strongly for those people who invested a huge sum in buying properties and land in the area in the expectation that these odours would be completely eliminated. I refer to the amount of industrial and commercial waste that goes into the plant, because it is my understanding that it will continue and, therefore, I would like to know whether the letter has been withdrawn by land agents and people selling properties in the area because, despite the previous correspondence, it is my view, having inspected the Glenelg Treatment Works and the Port Adelaide Treatment Works, that the Glenelg works smell like a rose garden compared with the Port Adelaide works.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, I have already given information of some of the actual physical works that we intend to undertake to minimise the problem. I refer to 'minimise' because some of the odour relating to the treatment works relates to atmospheric conditions, and it was quite remiss of salesmen and developers to indicate to prospective housebuyers that, based on Departmental correspondence, a change would occur. We take every remedial action to minimise odour, but the treatment plant is old. True, it takes a substantial amount of commercial and industrial waste. When the works was first completed and until recently there were no residences within the immediate vicinity. The problem has been accentuated by the capacity of the works, which is an important factor involved in minimising odour. The Director-General may be able to add to my comments.

**Mr Lewis:** We have been doing much work at Port Adelaide to minimise the odour. There are difficulties. We do get some plant upsets from industrial waste, but they are getting less as time goes on. Unless the Government decides to spend a large amount, we will not be able to reduce odour complaints to a point where no-one ever receives any odour from those works, but we have been reasonably successful in the work done to date. We keep a record of complaints at the plant and at my last visit there had been few complaints in recent months. We have those on record and I can pass them on to the Committee if it is desired.

We are continuing with a number of projects which the Minister has listed. Also, we believe these will improve the odour situation at Port Adelaide Treatment Works.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister advise what tests are carried out off-shore in the area where the residue from the treatment works goes into the sea? What tests are carried out to ensure that the area surrounding the outlet is safe for people to swim and fish in? Is it checked regularly? Has there been any occasion when there has been concern for the welfare of people swimming in the area or about any adverse effect on marine life?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** To my knowledge there have been no difficulties. The off-shore effluent as digested sludge is monitored continually not only by our Department but also by the Department for the Environment and Planning.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I refer to page 5 of the Programme Estimates and the statement about the Department's policy 'Issues/Trends' and the paragraph, as follows:

The Department's operating expenditure has declined in real terms in the recent past and is projected to remain constant over the next five years, subject to the achievement of significant productivity improvements, despite increasing numbers of consumers and higher standards of service.

How does the Minister intend to achieve these productivity improvements and what will they actually be? The third paragraph states:

Requirements of the Department present some difficulties in terms of the outlook for available funds, and in overcoming manpower distribution problems in certain areas.

Which areas have manpower distribution problems?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, significant productivity improvements will occur in the area of technology. The Department is always trying to improve the technological aspects of its service delivery. The honourable member also referred to manpower distribution problems in certain areas. One of the Department's problems is the mismatch of skills, particularly in the daily-paid employee area. In overcoming problems the Department is not really able to use its services to the full, simply because of the mismatch of skills in regard to requirements for particular areas of work.

The honourable member is probably aware that the numbers of Public Service and departmental daily-paid employees have been significantly reduced over the past five years. That adds to the problem of endeavouring to utilise fully the manpower available to the Department in certain areas, particularly in country areas. The problem has been somewhat overcome in the metropolitan area, but difficulties still exist in country areas. Mr Alexander will supplement my answer.

**Mr Alexander:** As the Minister rightly said, the main mechanism is productivity improvement through technology. There are a number of areas where this can apply, such as automating plants and computer technology. However, all this impacts on people. There are quite a number of problems associated with it. The general scene in the Department has been one of decline by natural attrition. We have dropped our weekly-paid workforce since August 1978 by about 1 800 and our staff by 163. Because this has occurred through natural attrition there are tremendous problems in relation to the mismatching of skills, an ageing workforce, and so on. However, our only recourse is to pursue technological improvement, achieve more productivity and try to keep the budget on an even keel.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the Minister inform the Committee how many Public Service and daily-paid employees will be affected by the introduction of new technology over, say, the next five years? The Department must have some projections as to what that will cost in terms of human resources.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The budget for this year, as I mentioned in my opening statement, indicates a reduction of 54 for the current financial year. In August 1978 there were 5 234 weekly-paid employees and 1 750 staff employees. In June 1983 there were 3 400 weekly paid employees and 1 587 staff employees. That is a significant reduction. The recurrent budget for 1983-84 is providing for 54 reductions. The total staffing reduction amounts to something like 134.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The rest comes from the Government side?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is correct. As I said previously, we have difficulties in maintaining our workforce because of a number of factors, including the fact that we have an ageing workforce. The average age of departmental employees is, I think, something like 53 or 54 years of age. That creates further problems. We are endeavouring to improve the mismatch of opportunities and skills in relation to our ageing workforce and the loss of employees. I do not think that we have looked forward to the situation in the next five years. Mr Lewis will provide further information in that regard.

**Mr Lewis:** The honourable member can perhaps understand that we have a number of on-going investigations in the Department. One investigation relates to the impact of technology on the Department and on employment levels. At the moment we are conducting an appraisal of the current and future level and use of technology in the Department. As I understand it, that analysis is 40 per cent complete. A departmental survey has yet to be conducted within the total study. We expect to complete the report towards the end of this year or possibly at the beginning of next year. At that point we will be able to relate the information to the impact on staffing and other areas.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I ask the Minister, by way of supplementary question, to give an assurance that the report will be made available to Parliament.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is an internal report. I would need to consider whether the Government would be prepared to provide that information to Parliament.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I refer to page 5 of the yellow book and Agency Overview. I take it that it is the Government's policy to reduce the E. & W.S. Department day labour force, having regard to the statement that appears on that page, as follows:

Reduce day labour construction workforce to a viable size. Does that represent Government policy? Can the Minister inform the Committee what is regarded as being 'a viable size'? What is the present surplus, and I take it from what he has said that the Minister admits that there is a surplus, bearing in mind that there are certain skills where there may not be a surplus?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** A viable size for a workforce depends on the workload. It depends on the money available for both capital works and the running of the Department in regard to maintenance, repairs and all the general programmes that have to be undertaken.

We anticipate that additional work will be carried out, and one of the projects involves the South Australian Housing Trust. The Trust's programme will be more extensive than it has been in past years. It was recently decided that the Department would provide services to all Housing Trust developments, and that will have a major effect on the work force. Such a decision depends on the Department's work load and its responsibility to provide services to the public and to ensure that employees are gainfully employed. Because of the very nature of the change in the construction operation over a period, there was some stress on the work shops at Ottoway, and some employees might be considered surplus. We attempt as much as possible to keep the employees



gainfully employed. Such a decision also depends on the Budget allocation for the work that is currently being undertaken by the Department.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I wish to ask a supplementary question, because the Minister has not answered the question. Surely he has some idea of what is a viable size. I realise that this matter depends on Budget allocations, priorities, and new initiatives, such as an increased Housing Trust building programme. When the Minister was in Opposition, he criticised the then Government severely for trying to bring about a reduction in the day labour work force by attrition—and the previous Government did not sack a single person—because we realised that there was a surplus, especially in the E. & W.S. Department. It has been admitted in the programme papers that there is a surplus, and the Minister has stated that he intends to reduce the day labour construction work force to a viable size.

The Minister must have some idea of what is a viable size. It is intended that the total work force be reduced by 134 for the coming 12 months. I do not ask the Minister to give exact figures because, as he has explained, certain factors must be taken into account, but he must have some idea of how many surplus employees are on the pay-roll.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Let me repeat again that it depends on the predicted work load, which is not easy to determine. In the light of work undertaken over the past 12 months and work that is currently being undertaken, a viable size involves the current number of employees—that is a viable work force.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** It contradicts what is stated in the document.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is your opinion.

**Mr MAYES:** The yellow book (page 50) refers to 'Water Resources Management—Natural Resources'. In this regard, secretarial services will be provided for the Water Resources Advisory Committees and the South Australian Water Resources Council. What are the functions of those bodies, and who are the members?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There are six Water Resources Advisory Committees, and there is one South Australian Water Resources Council. There are 12 members on the Council: the Chairman is the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, Mr Lewis, and the Deputy Chairman is Mr Chip Sawyer, a primary producer, who is involved in the United Farmers and Stockowners Association. The Government and local government make various nominations to that Council, and the members are as follows: Mr Don Barkley; Mr Frank Curtis from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry; Mr Davis, a primary producer; Mr McColl, the Director of the Department of Agriculture; Mr Maynard, who was nominated by the Conservation Council of South Australia; and Mr Phipps, the Director-General of the Department of Environment and Planning. Mr Tauber, the former Director-General of Lands, was a member, but I believe that he has just retired. Mr Wes Thomas was the Local Government Association nominee, but he has resigned for personal reasons and a nomination from the Local Government Association is pending. Mr Bruce Webb was a member, but he has not yet been replaced, and Mr Woodruff from the Department of Public Health was also a member. The Secretary of the Council is Mr Harold Tuckwell, the Senior Administrative Officer of the Water Resources Branch.

The function of the Council is to advise the Minister in relation to assessment, development, conservation, management, and protection of water resources in this State, to establish policies to be followed in relation to the exercise by the Minister of his powers and functions under the Act, and mainly to advise the Minister in regard to matters associated with water resources in South Australia generally.

There are six regional Water Resources Advisory Committees, but I cannot tell the honourable member of the membership of each of those Committees. An additional advisory committee will be created, because recently we proclaimed the Murray Mallee region, where a committee will be established. The process is under way.

**Mr MAYES:** Prior to coming to Government, the Labor Party and I as a candidate for the election made public statements in regard to flood mitigation and the need for provision of flood information. From the yellow book I note that warning and information will be provided in this regard by the provision of flood warning systems and flood information. There will be prediction of flood heights, frequency and duration, and hydrologic information on current and previous floods. I am concerned about the possibility of heavy flooding in the District of Unley. Consequently, will the Minister say what progress has been made within the Department regarding the establishment and collection of flood information and future protection of areas such as the existing and new District of Unley?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The flood management legislation will be reintroduced into the House in the very near future. It is being prepared by Parliamentary Counsel.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** There will be a few amendments?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, but minor amendments. As a consequence, that will empower the setting up of a flood plan management unit of the Engineering and Water Supply Department which we expect to be in operation before next winter. Responsibility for urban flood waters is not necessarily that of the Engineering and Water Supply Department but is mainly the responsibility of local councils. Nevertheless, the Flood Management Bill will give councils greater power and will also give the Department an opportunity to prepare flood plans for the councils and this may then minimise the risk of flooding.

**Mr MAYES:** I turn to the water filtration programme and direct the Minister's attention to page 40 of the programme papers and particularly to the treatment of water supply and provision of new filtration works. What progress is being made with water filtration in the southern suburbs of Adelaide?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Happy Valley project has been commenced. It will be accelerated by the fact that we have had some additional Commonwealth funding. Actual expenditure on the Happy Valley filtration plant last year was \$2.092 million. Total proposed expenditure for the coming year is \$6.69 million, which will really accelerate work on the plant. There are other factors that I think I should bring to the Committee's attention. This is a large project that will take some years to become operative. I think that the total estimated cost is in the vicinity of \$37 million. It will probably cost more than that by the time it is completed. I am satisfied that we are making substantial progress with this project. I believe that it is important that part of Adelaide should be supplied with filtered water. I say this because of the number of complaints we receive about quality and appearance of water in certain areas.

I point out that the Happy Valley filtration plant will supply about half of the metropolitan area of Adelaide, so members will appreciate the size and dimension of the work. Work has been undertaken to establish a departmental depot at Happy Valley, as well as the filtration plant. This is an extensive project that I hope will be completed by near the end of this decade, in about 1988 or 1989.

**Mr EVANS:** I will follow up on the point made by the member for Eyre in relation to indirect supplies or extension of mains. Will the Minister say which method is used to establish the cost, when the Department is estimating the cost of extending a main that in many cases the client is



expected to pay for? In other words, is the cost of material, plant on site plus a cost for overheads, included in the total cost? I know of a case where a person wanted a 200 metre extension to a main and the price quoted for such extension was close to \$5 000. If one priced the pipe involved and the person involved dug the trench with a pick and shovel, or teaspoon, the cost would not be that high. Therefore, with modern equipment the price should be lower and I consider that that cost of \$5 000 was exorbitant. I know of another case involving 50 metres of main where the price quoted for installation was \$3 000. Will the Minister say what bases are used to arrive at the cost of extending a main for which a client is expected to pay? Are such costs used as an indirect method of fund raising by the Department?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The honourable member mentioned in his example 200 metres of main being installed. One of the considerations is whether that person was the only person to be connected to that service.

**Mr EVANS:** He was.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** If other people were to be connected to that service, no doubt that cost of \$5 000 (which would be the actual cost of providing the service, the work, pipe and all other material) would be less, because the cost of a service is based on the number of people who will be connected to that service. Did the honourable member refer that matter to me?

**Mr EVANS:** The first one I did.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** This is a difficult matter because we have to make sure that such extensions are cost effective. This is difficult in the Hills area, in particular, because of the general topography. One of my officers may be able to supply information about this matter, but it is of concern to me that such an amount has to be charged for a service. However, such costs depend on the service to be provided and how much it costs the Department.

**Mr Lewis:** I do not recall the particular proposal, but there are a number of Government policies in respect of what the contribution will be in such cases. If a service is supplied to a subdivision, the subdivider normally meets the cost of the extension. If an extension is being sought, we normally work on a revenue deficiency basis. A whole range of policies is involved in this matter. In some circumstances the person receiving the service will pay a guarantee for a period of time to cover the cost of providing that service. In some cases this involves a period of about 5½ years.

In other situations the Department, in implementing Government policy, will call for a capital contribution. I presume that that is the situation to which the honourable member refers. Our costs are based on the estimated cost of carrying out the work, which includes, I think quite properly, overheads associated with normal construction within the Department.

**Mr EVANS:** Will the Minister consider allowing individuals to do this work themselves? We must remember that in most cases these applications are made by young people attempting to establish a home. If they dug the trench themselves and supplied the material, even if the Department retained the right to install the main, the cost would be cheaper. I ask this question because Governments nowadays are exempting young couples from stamp duty, making special loans available to them and giving them help to establish their first home. Yet here a cost is imposed on them because they are forced to go to a department (which claims overheads, perhaps quite rightly) and pay a cost for construction. That includes costs for workers who are entitled to many benefits and, if those people had the right to do the job themselves, or to employ a small contractor with

less overhead to do it, the cost of installing that service would, in many cases, be halved.

In the case of the \$1 000 to \$3 000, I made an approach to the Department, asking for the size of the pipe, the depth of the main, and the depth of trench to extend the main. It was not in hilly country: it was in soil where the Department had already dug a main past to put in a low pressure main, and it would not allow the occupant to connect to a high pressure main. So, the Department knew that the terrain of the country was good and that there were no problems with digging. Will the Minister consider making representations through the Department to allow for a private contractor or the individuals themselves to carry out the work?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I certainly will have to give that a lot of thought because the departmental work has to be to a particular standard. It would be pretty risky to set a precedent with people providing their own services by digging trenches and laying pipes. Here again, we might run into some difficulty with the local council. The member shakes his head and says "No". But certainly I am prepared to give it some thought depending, of course, on departmental advice as to whether we can do this. In this instance, the honourable member is using a particular case for a general application, about which I have some degree of apprehension, because the Department has the expertise, knowledge and ability to provide a particular service, which is a quality service and which we have a responsibility to maintain. Nevertheless, I am prepared to consider it, without giving any commitment.

**Mr EVANS:** In a similar area, what cross-checking is done as regards the amount of water provided to an area as against the amount of water which is recorded as being used? It has been brought to my notice that if one wants a free water supply for the major part of the day it is a simple process for those who have woken up to it to turn off the tap at the main side of the meter, to take the meter out altogether by undoing the connections each side of the meter, and put in about half a metre of copper pipe, having cut it to measurement, and during the night one waters one's garden, fills the swimming pool or whatever one has to do, then gets up in the morning and replaces the meter, and there is no record of it going through the meter. It is a simple process. I am told that more and more people are becoming aware of it. Is there any method of cross-checking the amount of water that is supplied to an area as against that which is recorded as being used?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** More and more people will now be aware of it because it is on public record. It is a technical question that I am not aware of. There is no doubt that people from time to time take advantage of the system, and it may be that they get a free water supply, but if they do it and are caught it carries a very substantial fine. Mr Killmier would like to give the member for Fisher some more detail.

**Mr Killmier:** The incidence of people interfering with their meters and doing what the member for Fisher has explained to us, while it has certainly been happening for many years, has certainly increased within the past couple of years. Meter readers are instructed, when they come across this situation or become aware that that sort of behaviour may be being carried out to try to save on paying for water, to get the police immediately. If possible, sufficient evidence is prepared and a recommendation is made to the Minister, and provided that we have adequate evidence prosecution takes place. The Crown Law Office endeavours within the provisions of the Waterworks Act to prosecute and obtain convictions. The penalties under the Waterworks Act at present are quite low. However, the Government is currently considering a range of amendments to the Act,

and included in the legislation are proposals to significantly increase the penalties under the Act.

However, of course, the difficulty is, first, to prove that it is happening. We have plenty of instances of where, when the meter reader comes to read, he finds the joining piece there; by the time that he comes back with the police officer or another senior officer the meter is back in place and the people concerned know nothing about it. We attempt to look at the usage on the property: usually, extensive gardening is going on in the backyard which is evidence of large water usage and yet the readings that we have had over a time do not seem to match with the apparent usage.

We will continue to try to stamp out the practice because, clearly, those people are obtaining an unfair advantage over the remaining ratepayers. There is, however, no mechanism whereby the Department can match, say, the quantity of water used within a street against individual meters. That would be just far too expensive. The nearest that we come to that is matching the total volumes that leave the reservoirs against the total consumptions in particular areas, but by the time one takes into account the individual accuracies of various meters and the whole range of factors that apply there is no way that one can add it all up.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is true that the Government is considering a number of amendments to the Waterworks Act and the Sewerage Act. The penalties associated with tampering with a meter and other factors are substantially low. For the information of the Committee, some of them have not been changed since 1929; so, we are somewhat out of date. The problem that we have is that we have relied on people's honesty to some degree, but we are concerned, as Mr Killmier has said, at the number of matters coming to our attention. It appears that the practice is increasing, and the Government will take steps to endeavour to at least increase the penalties and to improve our methods of investigation.

**Mr EVANS:** I am pleased to see that the Government is looking at penalties because I know that it is much more prevalent than it used to be. As a comment (not a question), I hope that someone invents a device by which the connecting link from the mains to the meter will be such that if anyone tampers with it the Department will have an idea because it has a form of seal or something. There is an opportunity for an invention to solve that problem.

**Mr GREGORY:** Will the Minister tell the Committee what steps are being taken to reduce salinity in the Murray River?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Only last week we announced a scheme for reducing salinity in the Murray in the Lock 2, Lock 3, and Woolpunda areas. That, of course, will be only a feasibility study; it is the initial investigation. I think that the amount involved is \$1.6 million. I also point out that the Noora scheme is approaching completion and, indeed, that the Rufus River scheme is completed. Perhaps one of my officers could give further information to the honourable member.

**Mr Lewis:** As the Minister has pointed out, Cabinet has approved approximate \$1.6 million to carry out the pre-construction investigations necessary to have a final design

for the Lock 2 and Lock 3 groundwater interception scheme, which we expect to remove approximately 80 000 tonnes of salt from the river per year. As the Minister also said, the Noora scheme is substantially completed, and we hope that it will be completed in this financial year.

Finally, we expected that the Rufus River interception scheme would have been completed by now. That scheme, of course, has been funded by the three States and the Commonwealth through the River Murray Commission with shared costs. We hoped that that scheme would have been completed before now.

Fortunately (or unfortunately, depending on which way one looks at it), we had a high river come down. We have a high river at present and we had to withdraw some of the pumping equipment which was due for testing and which is part of the design of the scheme. Final testing and commissioning will occur after the river has gone back to its normal level.

**Mr GREGORY:** I understand that the Victorian Salinity Committee is presently in South Australia. Can the Minister advise what it is doing here? Can he see any long-term advantages for South Australia in adopting a co-operative approach in regard to salinity?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** True, the Victorian Salinity Committee is presently in South Australia. Today, it is visiting the Riverland, and it was here yesterday. I am a great believer in the need for greater co-operation between New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. The committee is looking at a number of matters associated with salinity in South Australia. I am pleased to advise the member of that programme. The Chairman of the committee is Mr. Bill Fogarty. The committee was appointed by the Victorian Parliament to inquire into not only the salinity of the Murray River but also problems associated with northern Victoria, where most of our problem arises.

I hope that we can encourage the committee to report favourably on the problems that we have in that regard in South Australia. Its terms of reference include the effect of salinity in South Australia; the effectiveness of controlling salinity techniques; financial, legislative and administrative arrangements associated with salinity control; the opportunity for further co-operation between State and Federal Governments; and the allocation of water from the Murray River for competing uses and the management of water rights. The committee will be here for three days, that is, yesterday, today and tomorrow. As I said, the committee is visiting the Riverland area today, and it will inspect major irrigation areas and certainly the current control schemes in operation in South Australia.

**Mr GREGORY:** Can the Minister advise the Committee if there have been variations in the water consumption in the Adelaide metropolitan area in the past five years?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, there have been consumption variations. I said earlier that water consumption last year was somewhat down. I have a comprehensive table of a purely statistical nature, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

METROPOLITAN-ADELAIDE WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM  
CONSUMPTION (in megalitres)

Year	July	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	Totals
1961-62	4 819	5 287	7 237	12 788	13 225	16 120	17 152	13 734	13 188	10 311	6 024	5 292	125 177
1962-63	5 083	5 260	7 187	7 651	13 556	15 257	13 288	14 211	14 056	9 797	6 174	4 796	116 316
1963-64	4 842	5 315	5 974	11 475	13 729	17 371	17 089	15 743	14 539	8 751	6 546	5 755	127 129
1964-65	6 074	5 946	6 324	7 437	10 979	13 970	18 934	17 753	16 261	9 174	7 110	5 351	125 313
1965-66	5 728	5 669	6 892	13 793	13 438	18 198	19 889	15 352	13 816	10 329	6 360	5 115	134 579
1966-67	5 141	6 469	6 928	9 665	15 148	13 275	17 443	16 975	14 361	11 911	8 574	6 592	132 482
1967-68	5 905	6 501	7 001	10 592	14 029	14 798	15 930	15 379	11 997	8 697	5 905	5 301	122 035
1968-69	5 627	5 358	6 484	7 915	9 324	16 103	20 296	13 013	13 014	9 884	8 144	6 105	121 267
1969-70	6 451	6 311	6 058	14 137	16 430	16 727	17 503	21 008	16 226	9 451	6 117	5 616	142 035
1970-71	5 806	5 965	6 141	10 695	17 050	19 199	22 015	21 114	16 893	12 928	7 632	6 301	151 739
1971-72	6 498	6 764	6 846	9 868	11 698	18 617	17 402	19 128	20 028	12 979	9 744	8 998	148 570
1972-73	6 413	6 832	8 501	13 855	18 084	24 263	25 202	16 978	15 894	11 443	7 311	6 704	161 480
1973-74	7 121	6 949	7 327	10 613	16 189	21 224	22 579	15 967	20 582	9 552	7 919	7 466	153 488
1974-75	7 547	7 798	8 058	9 113	17 029	23 492	22 761	24 980	16 611	11 468	9 423	8 056	166 336
1975-76	8 135	7 902	9 141	9 271	17 470	28 547	26 148	23 630	20 003	13 902	10 713	7 975	182 837
1976-77	9 210	9 569	11 514	12 631	19 916	24 244	24 508	24 738	20 221	11 235	10 543	7 877	186 206
1977-78	8 877	10 778	11 097	16 635	21 839	27 026	23 833	24 790	23 055	12 941	9 814	7 916	203 601
1978-79	7 923	7 755	8 349	13 453	18 356	21 361	28 120	22 433	20 311	11 180	8 924	7 958	176 123
1979-80	7 874	8 114	7 801	10 181	17 758	23 961	24 413	26 132	23 077	15 706	9 573	7 858	182 448
1980-81	8 010	8 931	11 825	12 586	18 837	24 247	28 332	24 870	15 099	16 982	11 477	8 004	189 200
1981-82	8 165	8 149	10 151	14 120	17 621	24 037	27 277	22 893	18 419	12 584	8 913	8 179	180 508
1982-83	8 447	10 528	12 138	15 521	25 078	26 042	24 718	24 838	12 264	8 553	8 476	7 790	184 393
1983-84	7 986	7 975	8 290										

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The totals over the past five years are as follows:

Year	Total megalitres
1979-80	182 448
1980-81	189 200
1981-82	180 508
1982-83	184 393

This indicates that consumption has not increased greatly in the past four or five years. The member should remember that last year was a significantly drier year than previous years. Consumption in 1979-80 was 182 448 megalitres and it increased to 184 393 megalitres in 1982-83. We had a substantial drought. Consumption has not increased dramatically, and it is not anticipated that we need to build any new reservoirs. The present growth and demand does not indicate the need for constructing additional storages, although it is estimated that the need to construct further storages can be delayed until the turn of the century. At least in regard to capital works for water catchment and storage areas, we are well able to cope with present storages until a fair way into the future.

**Mr GREGORY:** Does the small fluctuation in total water usage over five years indicate that the campaign for people to have dry native gardens has succeeded?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is due not only to the water conservation campaign but also to the important question of the price of water. People are more conscious of usage if it goes into additional water charges. It relates to two matters: probably a greater awareness of water use in South Australia and the cost applied to individual consumers for water usage. The Department will have another water conservation campaign which will start earlier than did last year's campaign. Indeed, we expect it to start in a few weeks, so that the impact of the programme will fall not in the middle of summer but earlier. In fact, a pamphlet will be sent out with accounts within a couple of weeks. We will be having radio and television commercials encouraging people to save and not waste water. The person doing the commercials will be the same person as last year, the well-known naturalist, Harry Butler.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I thought that you would be the model.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I know my limitations. I do not intend to be up front in regard to the save water campaign. As I have said, it involves two things: first, the public is becoming more aware of the need to conserve water from a general point of view. Certainly, in relation to cost, people want to conserve their finances by avoiding additional water charges. The honourable member should recall that 60 per cent of water used is based on the 'user pays' system. Allowances have also gradually decreased slightly. As a consequence, people are not wasting water because of the cost factor involved to the individual.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I am still somewhat concerned about the replacement of the capital assets. Mention was made that a study was completed into the area of long-term funding required. Will the Minister provide the Committee with a copy of the study so that members are aware of the long-term capital commitment and the magnitude of the costs confronting the State in relation to the overall replacement programme?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** As I mentioned previously, it is an internal document. I would certainly want the opportunity to discuss it with my departmental officers. We do not want to hide anything, but at the same time I would like to be reassured. It is an internal audit situation and we ought not to be too hasty in making it a public document. Things change from time to time. I have no objection to making the study available to the member for Chaffey on a personal basis and not through the Parliamentary system. I ask the member for Chaffey to direct a letter to me seeking details. I am certainly prepared to give him that opportunity to have access to the information on that basis.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I have a supplementary question. The process outlined by the Minister greatly limits the value of the document. I do not think that the Government should have anything to fear or hide from in relation to the report. It is of great importance because I believe it involves the expenditure of vast sums of money. I think it is important that Parliament should be aware of the sort of funding that

will be required in the not too distant future. Not only will the present Government have to grapple with the problem but also any incoming Government in the future. I think it is important that Parliament should be totally aware of the situation. I can see no political problem whatsoever.

I think it is a matter of the Minister facing up to reality. Much of the existing distribution system will have to be replaced in the not too distant future. I think it is important for Parliament to know the details of the replacement programme. The Minister has offered to make the report available to me, virtually on a confidential basis, but that will not assist the rest of Parliament to appreciate what the State has to face up to. I ask the Minister whether he will make the report available to Parliament so that all members are aware of the situation?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am prepared to rethink the situation and consider the matter in discussion with my departmental officers. Certainly, we have nothing to hide. I want to ensure that the information sought by the honourable member is not used in a political sense. I am prepared to consider the matter and advise the honourable member accordingly.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Referring to the irrigation rehabilitation scheme mentioned earlier by the member for Florey, the Minister is well aware of the problems that have arisen as a result of the deferring of work in the Chaffey Division of the irrigation area. That work commenced in the early 1970s and four of the five components of the scheme were completed. Then, unfortunately, the Minister of Lands at the time decided that the plant should be shifted to another site and that the scheme would not be completed. I am sure that the Minister recognises that the scheme cannot work in its present state and that the growers are worse off regarding their water supplies than they were before the rehabilitation work started.

An almost identical situation has been created in the Cobdogla Division of the Cobdogla irrigation area. In the early stage of rehabilitation of the whole of the Cobdogla area, the new pumping station was built and a rising main constructed to the surge tower on a high point at Loveday. In order that the old pumping station at Cobdogla could be removed, a pipe had to be laid from the surge tower back to the old Cobdogla Division so that the water could be delivered into the old open channel system in the Cobdogla Division. I am satisfied that the pipe designed by the Department as part of the total scheme for the rehabilitation of the Cobdogla Division has adequate capacity so long as the scheme is completed; that is, when the pipelaying is completed and the old open earth channels and the concrete channels now in the Cobdogla Division are replaced by pipes.

The decision to stop at this stage in the Cobdogla Division has created a position similar to that which has existed in the Chaffey Division over the past eight years: the scheme cannot work properly unless it is completed. The real problem is that the loss of water from the open channel system, especially the earth channel system in the Cobdogla Division, is far greater than had been anticipated by the Department, because the Cobdogla Division is on the flood plain of the Murray River with clay loam soil about 1 m deep, which is overlain on a coarse permeable sand. The open earth channels in the Cobdogla Division are built on top of this great sand resource, which is under the clay loam. Over the years, yabbies in particular have perforated the earth channel to such an extent that holes of about 4 cm in diameter have appeared. The quantity of water required to maintain those channels at full capacity without using water for irrigation

purposes is considerable. This can be seen at the old evaporation basin at Cobdogla where there has been tremendous seepage from one of the main earth channels.

The pipeline laid from the surge tower at Loveday does not have the capacity to supply the required number of streams because of the enormous seepage loss from the existing poor distribution system in the Cobdogla Division. The Government has left the Engineering and Water Supply Department with a difficult engineering problem, because, since the pipeline has been completed and delivering water into the open channel system, one of the old existing pumps from the Cobdogla pumping station must be used in conjunction with the new system to deliver sufficient water to provide the required number of streams. What does the Minister intend to do to solve this engineering problem? It will not be possible for the Government to decide arbitrarily that fewer streams will be available in the Cobdogla Division, because that would have a devastating effect on fruit production in that part of the irrigation area.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** When the present Government came to office, it set up a budget review committee, which has considered two schemes: Cobdogla, where \$16 million is required to complete the work referred to; and Moorook, where the cost is about \$4 million. The schemes referred to by the honourable member have been deferred, not cancelled. I appreciate the problems of the area. It is only the cost, especially at Cobdogla, that has been the factor that has deterred our putting the work on this year's programme. Minor works, costing \$443 000 this year, are planned for the Cobdogla system. I will ask the Engineer-in-Chief to give details of the engineering problems in the area.

**Mr Lewis:** I cannot shed much light on this problem in detail. I have heard that there is difficulty regarding distribution and that this is being investigated by our Investigations and Technical Policy Branch, but the detail has not yet been referred to me. If adjustments have to be made in order to reticulate water to satisfy the requirements of the irrigators, they will be referred to the Government with recommendations as to what should be done.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The original system was developed in about 1918, and we are now confronted with a situation that is almost identical to the problem that developed in the Chaffey area where a scheme was designed. I believe that the total design, if implemented, will work satisfactorily.

This is another example of where one cannot undertake an engineering exercise but only go half way through it and then cut it off. If two streams are to be lost in the Cobdogla Division, the irrigation turn-around time would be such that there will be considerable damage and loss of crops. The Department has been battling with this problem for the past few months in an endeavour to make up for the tremendous losses that occur through earth channels. I see no alternative but to retain the Cobdogla pumping station, and one of the electric pumps in that facility will have to be used to supplement the shortfall in irrigation water that cannot be provided from the new pumping facility.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I can only repeat what was said previously. If necessary, we will have to take some action, but at present I am not aware of it and certainly further investigations are required to assess the situation and to see what rectification is required, if necessary.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I call on the honourable member to ask a third question.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Mr Chairman, I wish to ask further questions on the Cobdogla Division. My previous question was a supplementary question.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member has asked two supplementary questions—this will be the third question.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** It may take a considerable time, but I am still trying to get an undertaking from the Minister that he will ensure that there is no reduction in the number of streams available in the Cobdogla irrigation area. If I cannot get that assurance from the Minister, I will have to ask further questions on this topic. With all due respect, Mr Chairman, I am referring to the same subject.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair will be tolerant.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** If I get an assurance from the Minister that he will ensure that there is no reduction in the number of streams traditionally made available to meet the requirements in the Cobdogla Division, I will certainly refer to another subject.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** To the best of our ability, engineering-wise, I give that assurance.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Problems have occurred in the distribution system throughout the State particularly in relation to the control of *naegleria fowleri*. To what extent was the *naegleria fowleri* amoeba active in the distribution system, to what extent was it detected last summer, and what additional action did the Government or the Department take in an endeavour to control the problem? The Minister would be well aware of the comments made and the attitudes expressed in the House of Assembly some three years ago by the now Chief Secretary about the Department when, unfortunately, a lad at Whyalla died from the effect of *naegleria fowleri* organisms.

Has the Government taken steps beyond those that were considered adequate at that time? To what extent, if any, has the manpower at the State Water Laboratories been increased? Government members when in Opposition were very critical of the personnel available in that area to undertake studies in relation not only to *naegleria fowleri* but also trihalomethanes and intraviruses.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** *Naegleria fowleri* has been detected widely throughout the system.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** In the past summer?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes. It is monitored constantly by the State Water Laboratories. I do not have details of areas where the amoeba has been detected, but I can obtain that information if the member so desires. The Department works in association with the Health Commission. There is a full complement of staff at the State Water Laboratories.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Has the staff complement been increased?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It has not been increased.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** That is not in keeping with the comments made by the now Chief Secretary three years ago.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I received correspondence from the Minister earlier this year in relation to a matter that I took up on behalf of 14 constituents who live in units on Sportsmans Drive, West Lakes. The Minister, in response to my correspondence, stated:

Further investigations have revealed that there had been a transposition of meter information in the records of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Unfortunately, the consumption from a meter located at a different property had been incorrectly recorded against your constituent's assessment from the time the meter was fixed, that is, 26 January 1979 until 23 June 1981.

The meter located on your constituent's property was also fixed on 26 January 1979, but was not recorded against this assessment until 23 June 1981, when the entire 9 719 kilolitres registration was recorded against this assessment. This reading obviously relates to the period from 26 January 1979 (the date the meter was installed) to 8 April 1982, and was incorrectly shown as having been used in the 1981-82 consumption year.

As this consumption is far less than the aggregate allowance of 14 693 kilolitres for the financial years 1979-80 to 1981-82, inclusive, it is reasonable to assume the allowance would not have been exceeded in any one year and accordingly no additional water rates should have been levied. Arrangements have therefore been made to credit the assessment with \$1 165.44, being the

total additional water rate charge for 1981-82. In addition, an amount of \$15.00 previously paid for a meter test fee will be refunded.

On behalf of my constituents, I would like to go on public record to thank the Minister for reconsidering the matter, because discussion had continued over a period and previously no satisfaction had been received. Reconsideration was justified, as it turns out that the wrong water meter had been read. Will the Minister say how many people whose properties are connected to E. & W.S. Department meters have appealed against assessments for consumption in the past 12 months? How many people have received rebates in that regard? How many people have been found to have interfered with their water meters?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is a simple question to answer generally because we receive a multiplicity of inquiries from the community in respect to water usage recorded on meters. There is always the opportunity for an individual to ask for a meter reading. If I recall correctly, the fee for that service is \$5. The specific case to which the member for Albert Park has referred I can recall because the people complained over a period of time about additional use of water from a common meter connection for a number of units. This shows that we are not infallible and that people do make mistakes because we finally picked up the fact that a meter had been hidden under a bush and, as a consequence, the meter reader was reading the wrong meter. Nevertheless, the matter was corrected. It is difficult to say how many people actually use excess water.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am sure the public would like to know.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** How many people use excess water?

**Mr HAMILTON:** No, how many people have appealed against their assessment?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I cannot tell the honourable member offhand, but I will get that information for him.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 103 of the Auditor-General's Report under the heading 'West Lakes Scheme' it states:

Expenditure on current works was \$352 000 for 1982-83, and \$464 000 was received from West Lakes Limited as the company's contribution towards cost of completed works. Rebates of \$217 000 were paid to the company by the Department, in relation to allotments becoming liable for rating.

Can the Minister provide any information about how much more development will take place in that West Lakes area and what expenditure is envisaged by the Department for laying water and sewerage mains during the coming 12 months?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not have those specific details here. I will get this information for the honourable member.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I have lived in the north-western suburbs since 1968 and have spoken to many friends and residents about the effect of the salt content in the soil on water mains and connections on private property and whether it has increased the tendency of such mains to burst. Will the Minister advise me whether this problem is peculiar to the north-western suburbs because of the high salt content in the soil? Does the E. & W.S. Department offer information or advice to contractors and builders about the type of water piping that should be installed in this area? For example, whilst copper piping would be ideal it is an expensive proposition for a person building a home or replacing water piping. If the Minister does not have this information, can he obtain it for me and tell me what sorts of recommendations the E. & W.S. offers to home builders and private contractors about this matter?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not sure that the north-western suburbs are the only ones with this problem or whether it is a problem in the whole of the Adelaide metropolitan area. The member is asking whether the salt content

in the soil contributes to corrosion of water piping. There are a number of factors that contribute to corrosion, but I do not know whether salt content of the soil is the major problem. Perhaps one of my officers can give further information about this matter.

**Mr Lewis:** I do not know whether we have any statistics which demonstrate whether pipes of various types corrode more quickly in the north-western suburbs than in other suburbs. I do not think we would keep that information because it is not really our responsibility to give advice to people about this matter. Most people who ask for such advice are told that copper piping is the most permanent type of internal water piping system. Obviously rigid P.V.C. and other plastic material can be damaged if they are not placed below areas being cultivated or otherwise worked on a property. That piping is cheaper, but there are risks associated with its use. In our experience there is more internal corrosion, particularly with galvanised iron pipe, than external corrosion. I think that it is generally understood that the galvanising of modern pipes is not as good as it was in earlier manufactured galvanised iron pipes. In the early days our Department used galvanised iron pipe for service connections, but has now standardised on copper pipes for connections.

**Mr GUNN:** I want to pursue the matter I raised previously relating to a person wanting an indirect service, as the Minister did not give a satisfactory reply to my question. I will read a little more from the correspondence, as follows:

Further, indirect services have an adverse effect on water quality due to the lack of constant flow . . . also have very little fire fighting capability, the latter being of some considerable interest to the district council of Kanyaka-Quorn.

I turn now to another quote, as follows:

380 metres of 100 mm A.C. Class D pipe would be required to extend the main to section 212, costing \$17 000 approximately. This would require an annual return by way of rates of some \$2 500 for the rest of this financial year and for a further period of five years, when normal rating would again apply. This does not appear to be feasible in the circumstances but, should you desire in the future to erect a home on the section, a reapplication for an indirect supply would probably receive favourable consideration.

I could read my constituent's comments at length. I could make them available to the Minister if he wants them. My constituent is at a loss to know why he cannot have an indirect service to supply water for his horses. He made an arrangement to get an easement through an adjoining allotment and for someone then to say, 'Sorry, you cannot have it,' is not very satisfactory. I point out to the Minister and those concerned that I have come from a part of the State where there is a shortage of water and understand what it is like not to have an adequate water supply. My constituent has lived in Quorn for a considerable time and has bought this block. As there have been other blocks subdivided the people who purchased those blocks are going to be in the same position. I have been informed from time to time of other problems of this nature and I would like to be in a position to inform my constituent what reasonable course of action he can take to get water on his block.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I think that I made the point earlier that indirect services depend on a number of factors such as their effect on other users and the ability of the service to supply a sufficient quantity of water. Nevertheless, on the basis of the letter and the information that the honourable member has received from his constituent, I am happy if he will give me the information again so as to get the Department to reassess the matter and see whether some arrangement can be made.

**Mr GUNN:** I understand that at present there is drilling for water in the Maralinga lands and that the Department of Mines and the Lands Department have been involved

in the survey. Has the E. & W.S. Department been looking for adequate supplies of permanent underground water of suitable quality and quantity which would supply permanent settlements?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Not that I am aware of. The Mines Department, of course, has activities in the Maralinga lands. I am not aware that the E. & W.S. Department has any involvement in that matter at this time.

**Mr GUNN:** I asked the question because I knew that the Mines Department had been involved and I wondered whether the experience of the E. & W.S. Department had been sought, as it is normally regarded as the authority on water in this State. The high cost of water at Coober Pedy has caused considerable concern to my constituents. Is the Minister aware that at present a substantial quantity of water has been purchased from the private operator up there who, it appears, can produce and supply the water at a cheaper rate than the Government operation and, therefore, the operation of the E. & W.S. Department has not been fully utilised?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am aware that a private plant (reverse osmosis) is an identical one to the one operated by the Department in the area. As I said this morning, we have had a deputation from the Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association. I am waiting on a report. The proposal that the Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association is putting to us is that we have a bore (E.L. 11) some distance from Coober Pedy, which supplies the water—some 80 kilometres from the source. The Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association wants not only to utilise the private plant but also increase its capacity so that it can undertake reticulation. That is a matter which needs very careful analysis and consideration. I promised that we would give them a report; that report is being prepared and, as I said this morning, it should be available in the next couple of weeks.

**Mr MAYES:** Referring to page 17 of the yellow book, under the heading, 'Programme Sector—Preventative Health Services', I see that funds are set aside for sewage treatment programmes in the metropolitan area. Can the Minister give details of some of the major works being undertaken in this area?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes. I referred this morning in reply to a question about the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works to some of the undertakings that we have exercised and will exercise this year. In addition, there are a number of categories regarding improvements to the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works and the upgrading of a sludge lagoon at Hahndorf and sludge disposal at Christies Beach. In total, the works amount to \$1.8 million. Besides this, there are a number of minor works, additions and alterations to upgrade treatment plants which bring the total to \$2.029 million.

As I said previously in regard to the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works, the Department is conscious of the difficulties that the public has in regard to odour from sewage treatment works. Members might recall that only a few weeks ago there was a report in the press from a number of people who lived as far apart as the northern Adelaide Plains and Hallett Cove, claiming that the treatment works was responsible for this odour. That was investigated not only by the E. & W.S. Department but also by the Department of Environment and Planning air quality control unit, which on investigation found that the source of the problem was rotting cabbage weed at St Kilda beach. The Bolivar Treatment Works got the blame for an odour for which it was not responsible.

I also point out that we minimise the problems as much as possible, but are still subject to atmospheric conditions, and from time to time we still have difficulties. But, we are spending some \$2 million on sewage treatment works in

the metropolitan area to bring them up to standard and to minimise problems of the community at large by odour control.

**Mr MAYES:** This may be supplementary to the question that I raised this morning in regard to water filtration plants, but I think that it is a new question. I refer again to page 40 of the yellow book. Regarding the water filtration programme, I asked particularly this morning in relation to the development for the southern regions, which directly affect my electorate, but I would also like to direct a question to the Minister in regard to the Little Para water filtration plant and what the construction programme for that is, currently.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Little Para is being built by a civil contract. There have been some difficulties in the past in regard to the completion of the plant. Currently, my information is that of the two contracts, one is complete except for minor repairs. The concrete work is 81 per cent complete and likely to be completed by March 1984.

There is still some substantial work to be done. Expenditure in 1983-84 will be \$4.2 million and the likely total cost of the whole project, which includes the dam and the mains water filter component, is likely to be \$47 million. I expect my departmental officers may assist in this; that work and the commissioning of the Little Para water filtration plant will probably be in early 1985. I will ask the Director-General to give further information.

**Mr Lewis:** In regard to Little Para, there has been much industrial disputation at that site between the contractor and his employees and, consequently, the project is significantly behind our original schedule. My last information is that we hope to start commissioning that plant in about October next year.

**Mr EVANS:** In regard to future planning and development, has any further consideration been given to extending the capacity of any other existing reservoirs in lieu of Kangaroo Creek, which was mentioned earlier? Mount Bold reservoir was increased to double its capacity in about 1962 or 1963. Is the Department considering providing further storage capacity either by extending Mount Bold or going on with Bakers Gully reservoir, which was in the planning stage? I believe that exploration tunnels were built some years ago to pick up a catchment of water below Clarendon. In years like this after heavy rain much water flows out to the sea, and will continue to flow out to the sea although it could be used for reticulation in the metropolitan areas in lieu of pumping, especially in dry years, and also bearing in mind that we are attempting to attract many tourists through the development of hotels, casinos and other facilities.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is always a continuing assessment of further reservoir capacity. I stated earlier that because of current consumption, which has not shown a great increase in the past four or five years, there is not an urgent need for greater storage capacity in the metropolitan area. We must always look to the future and, as a consequence, there is a continuing assessment of what needs may develop in the future, but presently there does not appear to be any need for the provision of further large reservoirs or storages in the Adelaide Hills catchment area. The honourable member raised the extension of current capacities. That matter needs to be addressed, and perhaps one of the officers can give the Committee further information.

**Mr Lewis:** It is several years since we completed a major study released publicly called the Metropolitan Water Resources Study, which looked into the future and the expected demands and the ways in which they could be met. At that time neither the Clarendon reservoir nor the Bakers Gully reservoir came into consideration, as I recall, until about the turn of the century. The precise timing of

those would be determined certainly later when we know just how trends in demand are going. I would not expect that the Department would be recommending to the Government the construction of additional reservoirs in the Adelaide Hills, either at Bakers Gully or Clarendon, within the next 10 or 15 years.

**Mr EVANS:** In regard to the same area of development, I follow up the question of the member for Unley in regard to flooding in the metropolitan area. In the mid 1960s Governments and departments found it desirable, and it proved successful, to build the Sturt Creek flood control dam, which has been a blessing to the people on the plains below. I am sure that there must have been an assessment made by the Department that similar dams could be built on other streams flowing into the metropolitan area, especially those which in flood times cause many problems; for example, Waterfall Gully and Brownhill Creek. Earlier today the Minister said that the Government was looking at legislation to give more powers to local government to control streams within local government areas.

Is the Government looking to give councils control over streams owned by private individuals? Will local government be able to tell individuals what to do about such streams? Will local government itself have to accept responsibility in regard to its control over streams? Will the Government itself accept responsibility and take the necessary action where it has control over such streams? I am talking about flooding, and I give some examples. Most streams, before the white man was interested in the land, could become blocked and cause floods in steep areas without doing any harm. On the plains, if a stream blocked, it would redirect its path until it cut a new stream and again blocked and was redirected, but it still did not affect anyone. Since the white man has built on the plains, streams now block mainly through the negligence of those controlling the streams, whether they be individuals, local government or the State Government, because the streams are not kept free of debris such as dead trees and other material.

I refer to Waterfall Gully and the recent floods which caused damage to many properties. Trees and debris blocked that stream because they were allowed to remain in it. I have written to the Minister about Sturt Creek just above King Neptune on South Road at Darlington. The creek is considerably blocked with reeds and waste material which is now building up. Eventually the creek will run over into a reserve and towards houses. If the same blocking happens further down, there will be flooding at Sturt, even below the control dam. I raise the point that we have placed obligations on landholders over the years to control noxious weeds and pests, but one of the biggest problems in regard to flooding is negligence by those who have control over streams. They must ensure that streams have a free flow. First, I ask about the flood control dams and whether the Government will build any more and, secondly, whether we are making sure that everyone—be it the State Government departments, or individuals—keeps the streams free of obstruction, whether it is man made or created naturally?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Most of the matters referred to by the honourable member are contained in the proposed flood management Bill, which will be before the House in the near future. Certainly this matter is a problem, but it is basically in respect of council responsibility for suburban flooding. The areas that are most affected include the eastern suburbs and to some degree the area around Brownhill Creek. I have had personal experience in my district over the years in regard to creeks in the eastern suburbs and certainly on some occasions as a result of neglect (not necessarily by individuals but by some responsible councils) or ineffective and inefficient maintenance.



The stream that readily comes to mind as an immediate problem is First Creek, about which I have received a deputation from Kensington and Norwood Council. It wends its way to the Torrens through the suburban area and finally through St Peters and Kent Town. Over a period of years people have built on top of the creek and, as a consequence, they are suffering severe difficulties and problems in regard to the control of that creek in times of heavy rain. Kensington and Norwood Council has not the necessary wherewithal to tackle the problem, despite the provision (as the member for Torrens would know) by the Department of Transport of grants to councils to assist in stormwater drainage matters through the Highways Department. Unfortunately, the amount available is limited and it is really a problem that we ought to redress. The flood management will not redress the financial requirements involved in this particular matter. It will give councils some jurisdiction, greater powers and greater responsibility to ensure that creeks can take that amount of water without being inhibited by blockages that are sometimes caused as a result of negligence.

**Mr EVANS:** In the same area but referring more to water that is to be potable, what amount of copper sulphate is being used in each of our reservoirs to control the enrichment of water by nitrogenous material (and I think it is described as eutrophication)? What is the cost of the material and, if the information is available, what is the cost of putting that material into the water to control the eutrophication?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is variable, because we do not use it all the time. I suppose it depends on the circumstances. Unfortunately, we do not have the information to hand at this time. I ask the honourable member to repeat the question later.

**Mr EVANS:** I am happy with that, if I am permitted to ask another question now. I refer to a local matter. Why has the rate of progress in the provision of sewerage facilities in the Bridgewater/Aldgate area been reduced compared with what was originally planned? Will the programme be accelerated so that people living in the area who are badly in need of sewerage facilities for health and environmental factors will be able to live a better lifestyle than is the case at the moment because of the stagnant water that flows out of septic tanks? Can the Minister indicate what form the programme will take and whether it can be speeded up from its present snail pace?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not sure that is the case at all. We are doing as much work as is possible in the area. As a matter of fact, an augmentation scheme is under way in the Bridgewater/Heathfield/Stirling area at the present time. As a consequence, the amount that we will be spending in the area this year is considerable. There has been no reduction in the rate of progress of the programme at all. We are doing as much as possible to satisfy needs in the area.

**Mr EVANS:** I have a supplementary question. When will the Aldgate and Bridgewater areas be completed? Will it be before the turn of the century? Some of the people in the area are becoming quite old, and I hope it is completed before they pass on.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** In other words, the honourable member would like it completed before they die. We have a programme of capital works in 1983-84 values. It is a priority category known as 'Stirling/Aldgate/Bridgewater—Stage II, Sewerage of Bridgewater'. Collective expenditure on that programme to 30 June has been \$2.259 million. Expenditure on the programme for 1983 amounts to \$929 000, and it will be \$640 000 for the following year. The essential completion will occur in 1985-86. If the honourable member's constituents can hang on until 1985-86, they will see the completion of the sewerage programme.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to page 50 of the yellow book, which provides details of the conservation and control of water resources in South Australia. I note that the Minister recently declared most of the Mallee area a proclaimed region to conserve underground water while detailed studies are undertaken by his Department on the extent and availability of the resource. However, articles in the *News* of 30 August and in the *Advertiser* of 31 August referred to a South Australian based company that is seeking to develop an extensive plantation of jojoba beans in the area. The firm, Jojoba Holdings Limited, has issued a prospectus seeking to raise \$750 000 to develop the commercial venture without making any reference to water restrictions.

Considering that the proposed development area is within the proclaimed region, can the Minister advise the Committee whether or not the company will be allowed to withdraw additional underground water? If the answer is 'No', has the Minister done anything to inform South Australian investors that the company has no guarantee of obtaining additional underground water?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** A number of matters are associated with this question. First, the Government declared the Mallee region a proclaimed area under the Water Resources Act. The Government is in the process of setting up a Water Resources Advisory Committee. In the interim period, Jojoba Holdings Limited issued a prospectus seeking a considerable amount of money to develop up to 800 hectares of jojoba beans and other crops in the area. I have written to the Chairman of the company, a Mr Turon, and I have also had discussions with one of the directors, Mr Evans. They claim that the amount of water involved in the growing of jojoba beans is not as extensive as was first thought. I am seeking advice on that matter.

It may be that the company will be allowed to withdraw further underground water. The advisory committee and my departmental advisers will ensure that none of the other landholders in the immediate vicinity is affected by the withdrawal of excessive amounts of water. The situation has not yet been determined, but I understand that I will receive a report shortly. There is no doubt that arising from the report the company should be able to obtain a certain amount of underground water in the area. It will be based on volume metric measure, which will be sufficient for the company to maintain a crop. The extent and size of the plantings will depend on whether the amount of water desired by the company is sufficient for its needs.

The whole purpose of declaring a region under the Water Resources Act is to protect the underground water resources. A classic example of that in the past 10 or 12 years has been the Northern Adelaide Plains. If we allow unlimited growth and production in an area where there are limited underground water resources, in a short space of time the resources become unavailable to everyone.

So, we want to ensure that the Murray Mallee, where there is a great increase in production, can function for some time into the future with the resource and that we determine how best that can be arranged. I am awaiting a report on Jojoba Holdings Limited and, when I get that report, I will make a public statement. I was concerned that the company had contacted us to ensure that it would get sufficient water to grow the crop that it had indicated, in the public advertisement, it would grow. The matter is still under review, and I expect to receive a report within a few weeks. The best proposition is for us to issue the company with a quota of water and for the company to plant according to that quota.

**Mr HAMILTON:** A draft report entitled 'Wet land resources of the South-East of South Australia for conservation and recreation use' was recently released by the Minister. Can he assure members that the public will have

sufficient access to copies of the report and adequate time in which to make submissions?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes. The draft report was released jointly by the Minister for Environment and Planning and by me. The South-East Wet Lands Committee submitted the report, which is available both to individuals and to local government in the South-East. We have given people until 31 December to respond to the report.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister say how much treated effluent water is used in the Salisbury, Virginia, and Two Wells area each year and on what types of crop it is used? Some time ago I was informed that there was a problem in this area dating back to 23 December 1977 and that gardeners had been complaining about a raw deal. I was told of the need to use the effluent water from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works, and I was shown a picture of Mr Bob Saunders drinking from a bottle of Bolivar effluent water and challenging someone else to drink it.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We use the treated effluent water extensively on pastures such as lucerne and other crops.

**Mr HAMILTON:** What about vegetables?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** To my knowledge at this time, some might, but it is not used extensively for that purpose. An allocation of the effluent water is made.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I was given to understand that there was a problem about the use of effluent water on certain types of vegetable crops. Can the Minister say whether problems are associated with the use of this effluent water and, if there are, what they are?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will get that information for the honourable member.

**The CHAIRMAN:** At this stage, I will give the member for Todd an opportunity to ask the Minister a question.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** For some time I have been conducting correspondence with the Minister about the installation of equipment to protect some of my constituents in the case of bushfire. I have written to the Minister requesting that a petrol or diesel motor be installed at the pump at Houghton to ensure that there is no repetition of what occurred in the disastrous fires of February last when, as soon as a fire started, the electricity wires were burnt down and no power was available to work the electric pump, with the consequence that water was not available to fight the fire at Paracombe, Houghton and Inglewood. The Minister has twice told me that I would be told what the Government would do about this problem, and his last letter indicated that I would receive an official answer in six weeks. However, I have not received that answer, so I ask him what the Government is doing to provide protection for residents in the event of fire in the area to which I have referred.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am told that the report is almost ready and that it will be available to me perhaps in a few weeks. The member has written to me about this two or three times, and I am sorry that the report has been delayed. However, this problem is not easy to solve because the installation of auxiliary pumps in case of emergency is one thing, whereas the ability to be on the spot to operate them in circumstances such as those of the Ash Wednesday bushfire is another. As the assessment of the situation is taking a long time, I ask the honourable member to be patient for another couple of weeks, and I should be able to give him the information then.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** It is not necessary to have someone on the spot because engines are available that would switch on automatically in the event of power failure. In other words, a diesel or petrol pump would not need a person to start it: it would start automatically once the electric power failed. So, there is no need to come to a temporary arrangement.

The Minister has asked me to be patient. I can be patient, but I am not sure that the residents in the fire area want to be patient much longer. We have had a wet winter and the grass is long. I do not doubt that within the next few weeks, with more dry weather, the grass will dry off and the trees will sprout again. In other words, a fire hazard is developing. There will be a major problem because of the potential fuel that exists for bushfires. The Minister said that it might be a couple of weeks before he got a report and even longer before a decision was made, but we shall then be right in the middle of the bushfire season before action is taken. Can the Minister ensure that the report is in his hands in a matter of days, not weeks, and that a decision is made immediately, because this is a serious problem for my constituents?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I cannot add any more to what I have already told the honourable member the report will be with me within a very short time and we will make an assessment on the basis of that report. I appreciate the remarks about the danger of fire in the area referred to, but that danger applies in other areas as well. We are looking at the provision of auxiliary pumps that will operate in the event of power failure. I will within a few weeks give the honourable member the information that he requires.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Referring to page 54 of the yellow book, under the heading 'Assistance to rural industries', I ask whether the Minister has granted the irrigators along the Murray River use of additional water without their incurring additional water charges. If he has, for how long will this concession apply?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Owing to the high flows in the river, originally there was an extension of three months during which the irrigators were granted the use of extra water without incurring additional water charges. Thus, they had the opportunity to leach their land and reduce soil salinity before the next irrigation season. The first period expired at the end of September but, because of the high flows in the river, it was extended to five months until the end of November, during which no further penalty charge would apply. At that time, the Department will read the meters to help irrigators plan their resources for the remainder of the financial year, based on normal allotments.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The yellow book refers to the fluoridation of the Adelaide water supply. I am a great believer in fluoridation but, for the benefit of the doubting Thomases in the community, in regard to the collecting and testing of samples, will the Minister advise whether overdosing of fluoride has occurred? What checks and balances are in place to ensure that there is no over-fluoridation of Adelaide's water supply?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I can give an assurance that we do not overdose the system. We consistently monitor the doses of fluoride, and the correct proportion is one part per million. I assure the honourable member that the system is foolproof: we cannot overdose the system with fluoride. It is an almost automatic process.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Supplementary to that, I do not doubt what the Minister says, but it has been drawn to my attention that problems can occur. I would like to assure my constituents as to the checks and balances undertaken.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The system is continually monitored, and consequently there is little opportunity for error. It is a completely automatic system. I have viewed the plants at Hope Valley, Ansteys Hill, and in other areas, and I was impressed by the efficiency of the operators.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** It is a fail-safe system?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I believe so.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I do not believe that.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The question referred to fluoridation, and I am pretty sure that there is no margin for

error in that regard, although I cannot give the absolute assurance for which the honourable member has asked. I should think that there was no justification for the complaint directed to the honourable member, and I can give an assurance that there is no over-fluoridation in the system.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The Minister stated that \$5.1 million has been expended on the Linear Park project to date. Does that sum involve flood mitigation work?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Secondly, does the arrangement still stand whereby the Department of Transport's north-east busway team will be responsible for the busway route along the Linear Park?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, the agreement still stands.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The \$5.1 million to which the Minister referred is the sum expended by his Department, to which must be added the \$4 million or \$5 million that has been expended by the Department of Transport.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is correct.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** How much of the Linear Park work does the Minister expect to be completed by 1986?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The first priority is flood mitigation.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Has that work been completed?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Not quite: that work is about four-fifths completed; it is practically completed. Some work must be completed on the Kangaroo Creek dam and other flood mitigation works, but I expect that 75 per cent of the Linear Park work is involved. The western suburbs is the priority area, and I expect that work in that area will be completed by 1986. The remainder of the Linear Park work will be completed by 1988.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the Minister provide a detailed breakdown of the work that will be completed by 1986 and the subsequent dates of completion of work in other areas?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, I am prepared to provide that information.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The previous Government entered into certain agreements with local government bodies and councils. Discussions were held with the River Torrens Improvement Committee. Has the Minister met with local government bodies and that committee, and have the arrangements in regard to the purchase of land, responsibility for maintenance, and so on, been varied?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There has been no variation that I am aware of in regard to the councils' commitment. Under the original arrangement, once work is completed, areas will be handed over to the respective councils for maintenance, and there has been no variation to that arrangement.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Has the Minister received submissions from councils in any other regard?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No, not that I can recall. Some councils have tentatively flagged their apprehension about the maintenance costs, but we will plant trees and grasses that we hope will minimise the maintenance costs to councils. There has been no variation to the arrangement and I cannot recall any approach by individual councils to vary the arrangements.

**Mr EVANS:** Does the Minister have a reply to a previous question I asked?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No, but that information will be provided.

**Mr EVANS:** My question is in furtherance of the one asked by the member for Albert Park relating to effluent water from the Bolivar treatment works and the northern plains water resource. I noticed from his answer that the Minister was unsure what crops could be grown using water

from the Bolivar treatment works. I am led to believe that that water cannot be used for salad vegetables but may be used for root vegetables. Also, I think that it cannot be used for grazing fodder as it causes beef measles. However, it has been used for lucerne for baling, for one vineyard and some rose crops. Gardeners in the area are concerned about their water supplies and have asked the Department to make more water available. The Government put a high price on that water and imposed a condition that gardeners had to pump it for miles to water their gardens in the Virginia area. The result of that happening was that during the recent dry year many of the growers had to use excess water from their bores. The Department charges growers if they go over quota from their bores. Will the Minister tell the Committee how much revenue the Government will obtain in excess water charges for bore water used in the past two years by these growers?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Last year was an exceptional year because of seasonal conditions. The information I have is that only 7 per cent of people who are allocated water on the northern Adelaide plains used more than quota last year, so there was a small number of people who used in excess of quota during an exceptional year. I turn to the member's remarks about my not being sure about what crops can be grown using the effluent water from Bolivar. My information is that that water is mostly used for pasture and lucerne growing. There is some apprehension about it being used for root vegetables and not for salad vegetables. I am not sure of the situation and will check it for the honourable member and supply him with the relevant information.

**Mr EVANS:** It appears that there is some doubt about using this water from the Bolivar treatment works. I received an assurance from the Hon. Des Corcoran, I think it was, that water from the Heathfield treatment works could be used without risk, that it would not affect marine life in the stream in which it flowed, and that people could use it to grow vegetables as it was perfectly safe. I am sure that the waste disposed of in Stirling is of better quality than that which flows through the Bolivar treatment works. If the Minister is implying that there is more hygienic waste coming from Hills dwellers than from plains dwellers, then that is to their credit. I have a personal interest in this matter because mine is the first property below the treatment works that can use the water from that works for irrigation. However, I am fearful that my family or my neighbours are at risk because this water is unsafe for root or salad vegetables, or for any other normal irrigation purpose. Will the Minister say whether the water treated at Bolivar is less safe than that treated at Heathfield?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, there is a difference. The Bolivar treatment works water is not chlorinated and disinfected, whereas the water at the Heathfield treatment works is.

**Mr EVANS:** I wish to pick up an area that the Minister just fleetingly mentioned earlier when he was talking about the treatment works down in the direction of the District of the member for Albert Park, who has the benefit of knowing that it is there through odour, although others do not. The Minister mentioned some landscaping and beautification taking place on that site. Can he indicate how much it costs the Department to maintain the gardens and landscaped areas around the various tanks and establishments that the Department has in the metropolitan area? I will stick to that without going to the country if it can be kept separate.

I realise that there has been a downturn in the amount of work that has been done in maintaining these areas in the past two or three years by cutting out the amount of lawn or irrigated area and going to more of a native type

of garden to reduce the amount of manpower used to maintain them. I do not think that it has detracted from them much. Can the Minister give us some indication of how much it is costing per year to maintain the beautification around the various departmental projects, as a total?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The member for Fisher has probably answered his own question. The Department's policy is to provide a low-cost native-type of garden, which means that there is a minimum of maintenance. I am not aware of the total cost; no doubt, we will be able to get that information for the honourable member. There has been a reduction in costs because of the policy that has been pursued in relation to native trees, providing non-grassed areas, wood chips and things of that nature, which not only require low-cost maintenance but have a water conservation aspect as well, and the Department sets an example to the community at large by not using water for that purpose. We will obtain the costs per year of maintenance if it can be obtained. I suppose that it is a separate item; if I can get the information for the honourable member I will be happy to provide it.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 5 of the yellow book under 'Corporate Management Objectives', it says:

Provision of water related services to the extent and standards established by Government in consultation with the community.

Can the Minister elaborate on the consultative process within the community? What groups are consulted? What process is adopted? What opportunities are given to the public at large, whether in metropolitan or country areas, to make submissions to the E. & W.S. Department? Is it a normal process of just writing to the Minister and/or the agencies of the E. & W.S. Department, or what is the consultative process? What redress, appeals, etc., are available?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is no specific consultative process with the community. It is a continuous process whereby we are responsive to the needs of the community. There is no consultation as such. When we provide services to the community to the standards established by the Government it is done without specific consultation, but we are certainly aware of the needs of the community. As I said, it is a process which is undertaken all the time.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 9 of the same document under 'Water Resources—Water Resources Management', it says:

Assessment of the quantity and quality of the State's water resources; planning for the management of the State's water resources for conservation, development and use; water resources conservation and control.

Regarding the announcement made recently by the Government on the Porter Bay project at Port Lincoln, what assessment of the quantity of water will be available for that project in the various stages of development? As I understand it, there will be a considerable influx of people into that area. What water resources are available for that area around Port Lincoln, and specifically on Eyre Peninsula?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There are two sources of supply for the area referred to at Porter Bay: one is the Uley South basin and the other is the Lincoln basin. Currently, there is sufficient capacity to supply the project referred to. It is a private development; as a consequence, the developers will pay the cost involved in the supply of the water, but there are sufficient capacities and current resources to provide adequately for that project.

**Mr HAMILTON:** As a supplementary question, has the Minister got any idea of the amount of money that would be involved in that area? I know that it is only in the planning stages at present. I do not want to hold him to any figure, but has he any idea of the amount of money involved and the amount of work which would be available for workers in that area as a result?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** My information is that the total development of Porter Bay is about \$10 million. In specific

regard to the cost involved in the water supply, I have not got information available (it would only be a guess) and perhaps we can do an analysis to try to obtain that information.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to page 16. Perhaps the Minister can enlighten me about what is involved in smoke testing of sewers. I am unaware of what takes place. What is involved in the maintenance of television units and the operation of those units? What role do these television units play in the metropolitan sewerage programme? I refer specially to the preventive health services programme as set out on page 16.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The smoke testing of sewers is to check in regard to illegal connections to the system, storm water drains and so on. The operation and maintenance of television units is a rather new and sophisticated process through which the department can check for chokes and broken pipes in sewers by placing a unit within the pipe. It can check and visually assess whether the choke or pipe needs replacement or maintenance. It is a television camera in the pipe that reflects on the monitor.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** My question to the Minister relates to the 22 per cent increase in the price of water in the coming year. At page 105 of his Report the Auditor-General states:

There is a surplus of \$1.7 million for the metropolitan waterworks last year.

As there was a surplus of \$1.7 million and as there is a 22 per cent increase in the price of water, what is the anticipated surplus in the metropolitan area?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The anticipated surplus in the metropolitan area will be \$5.54 million.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I refer to the 28 per cent increase in the irrigation area. Can the Minister indicate to the Committee what investigations or studies were undertaken to determine that 28 per cent increase, and whether those studies indicated that the industry could cope with the increase? I make reference to page 111 of the Auditor-General's Report where he indicates the deteriorating situation in regard to outstanding water rate accounts. He points to the fact that in the past financial year the outstanding amount has increased by a further \$371 000. This tends to indicate that people involved in the irrigation industry in South Australia are having much difficulty in meeting their water rate commitments. I am interested to know what research the Government has undertaken to determine whether or not the industry is capable of meeting an additional 28 per cent on top of that, because we are talking about an increase to the average irrigator of between \$500 and \$1 000. The financial situation of irrigators can easily be determined from information readily available from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

If that study has not been undertaken, is the Government willing to do it? As a result of this action, the Government is going to force an ever increasing number of irrigators and families not just from their properties but from their homes. That is a serious situation and, if the Government has not taken that into account, it should do so. I do not regard it as a laughing matter because it is serious indeed. What studies have been undertaken in this regard?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The member referred to page 111 of the Auditor-General's Report and the increased water rates outstanding at 30 June 1983—an increase of \$371 000. If the member reads the next paragraph he will see that this was referred to in the Auditor-General's Report from the previous year. The member would also appreciate that legislation which he supported in the House in regard to penalty charges—

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** That has nothing to do with my question.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Just a moment. The member asked his question and should let me answer it in my own way. That legislation came into operation on 1 July 1983 and provided for increased penalty interest charges, and the member supported that legislation. We have to look at the overall picture of the whole Riverland; over a period, action must be taken. Actually, the cost of water is only a small part of the costs faced by irrigators. From my information, it comprises between 7 per cent and 10 per cent of such costs. Over the past four years the deficit on irrigation and drainage has amounted to \$29.6 million.

I point out that the member's Government, and he as Minister, increased charges by 12.5 per cent, 18.5 per cent and 15.6 per cent over a three-year period. The revenue declined as a proportion of the total cost largely because of the extensive capital works in the Riverland leading to improved services. A large proportion of the increased charges merely cover inflation. I must say this: no-one likes to increase charges for services to the community. I make the point that, if one looks at the revenue return and the cost involved, what the Government did last year and is doing in this coming year is that we are subsidising the Riverland irrigator by about \$4 200 a year. Over the past four years the amount has been about \$19 400 for each irrigator. We are actually recovering 26 per cent of the total cost of the services provided. The expected deficit to irrigation in this coming year will be about \$10 million.

I fully appreciate the difficulties that some people in the Riverland face on their properties. The member will remember that I received a deputation consisting of Murray River citrus growers, representatives of various groups from the Riverland and U.F.G. representatives only a few months ago when this matter was raised. I undertook to the member for Chaffey, at his request, that I would refer the matter to the Premier, who requested the Director of State Development, Mr Keith Smith, who had some association with the industry, to make an overall review of the situation in regard to the Riverland. I am waiting for a response from the Premier.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** How long will you wait?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** He is not in Australia at the moment, neither is Mr Smith—they are overseas.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** They only just left.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I gave an undertaking and I am waiting for a response from the Premier.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** You said one week.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I did not say one week. It is a difficult area to assess because some of the irrigators are no doubt in a difficult financial situation. However, that is not only because of the cost of the supply of water. Other factors are involved and, in fact, there is a multiplicity of factors. In determining water rates for this year we considered the Government's position in regard to revenue return and we considered the position of persons in the Riverland, some of whom are experiencing some degree of difficulty. It was not an easy decision to make. Although the report has yet to be made public, the River Murray Over-view Study is in my hands and it is being considered by the Physical Resources Committee, which is a subcommittee of Cabinet. We are looking closely at an overall review of the Riverland in regard to water charges and other factors. As I have said, a combination of factors is involved as to why some Riverland irrigators are in difficulty.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** That is absolutely no answer whatsoever to my question. I asked the Minister whether a study has been undertaken to determine the industry's ability to pay, not whether the Government will alter the level of payment. The Government has not had the brains even to undertake a study to determine whether or not the industry has the ability to meet that payment. That has either been

done or it has not been done. It appears from listening to and guessing from the Minister's remarks that no such study has been undertaken. I suggest to the Minister that he cannot get blood out of a stone: if money is not available you will not get it. In that situation you will only put more people out on the streets, increasing the social security problem and the community welfare payments that have to be made as a result of high-handed decisions similar to this one.

If the industry had the ability to pay, well and good. I am well aware of a number of people, week by week, who are forced off their properties and the families who are forced out of their homes. I recognise that other communities are in a similar situation and that the Riverland community is just one community in difficulty. It is absolutely appalling that the Government has not even considered conducting a study in relation to the situation. In effect, the Government has said that it does not matter how the scheme is operating, it is purely up to the people involved in the industry to pick up the tab. Those people have no say in the level of the operation in the area or in relation to manpower.

Ratepayers have a real say each year at the annual general meeting of the Renmark Irrigation Trust. If they are not satisfied with the way that the Trust is being run they can replace the board of management. However, irrigators under the Government scheme are not in that position. I also point out to the Minister that the rates charged by the Renmark Irrigation Trust are somewhat similar to the rates charged in the Government irrigation area. Irrigators not only have to make ends meet, but over a 40-year period they must also make repayments to the Government on rehabilitation. They have been through rehabilitation at a similar level as is occurring in the Government areas: they are doing it at the same rate. Irrigators have to show a profit and they must also meet their commitments. I appreciate the fact that the Minister has been prepared to make adjustments to repayments this year to assist them. I am quite confident in a 40-year period that, as a result of assistance from inflation over a period of time, the commitment to repay the Government will become easier. I also appreciate the fact that the Department provides additional services, and so on, of a general nature to the industry.

Once again, the irrigators themselves have no say about the level or magnitude of the operation and the manner in which it is conducted. Some irrigators under private schemes pay similar amounts of money. Their operations are virtually breaking even, yet the Minister keeps ramming it down our necks that irrigators are only meeting 23 per cent of the cost. That is the same figure, if not marginally more than private irrigators, who have to meet 100 per cent of the cost. I think that highlights the fact that there should be a closer look at the industry. It is beyond belief that the Government can turn around and say that it is virtually not prepared even to consider the situation that applies in the industry, which must bear an increase of 28 per cent.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Does the honourable member wish to ask a question?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I think I have, Mr Chairman. I pointed out to the Minister that there are certain areas where the irrigator has no control whatsoever because he is in a Government irrigation area. Will the Government reconsider its decision and undertake a study to determine the ability of the industry to meet the higher payment? If the Government forces more irrigators off their properties that will not solve the problems facing this State.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** What specific studies were undertaken by the previous Government to assess water charges during its three-year term? The previous Government increased water charges, not by 28 per cent, but at an aggregate level of something like 36 per cent over its three-

year term. The problem in the Riverland did not arise over the past 12 months. As I have already said, it is a complicated and complex situation. No-one likes to increase charges when people are in difficulty. Nevertheless, we have a responsibility to the community of South Australia at large.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** You also have a responsibility to keep in mind the industry's ability to pay.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The honourable member is quite right. However, I ask the honourable member when his Government was in power what specific studies were undertaken in relation to the capacity of people in the Riverland to meet higher payments? People in that area are in a disastrous position, but that has not come about over the past 12 months: it has occurred over a period of time. The problems in the Riverland stem from over-supply in the face of falling demand. Low water prices by themselves will not assist people in that situation.

I am aware that the member for Chaffey lives in the area and, therefore, probably has a more basic knowledge of the situation than I as Minister, because he has been representing the district for a number of years. The honourable member would certainly know that the problem has not come about in the past 12 months; it has been an ongoing process for many years. The problem has arisen as a result of a combination of factors, not only because of increased water charges. The Government reluctantly increased water charges 28 per cent because, as I have said, we have a responsibility to the community at large and to the Department.

The Auditor-General has referred to the deficit in respect of irrigation and drainage charges. This problem has not arisen overnight: it is due to a combination of factors, the most basic being over-production. I will undertake whatever studies are required to help the growers as much as possible, but we need to look not just at the price of water but at all the problems of the Riverland.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister said that the increase over the previous three years had been 36 per cent, but I thought it was an annual increase of 15 per cent, slightly higher than the inflation rate. However, we are considering double that increase in one year, and that at a time when the economic situation has deteriorated dramatically over the past 12 months. I realise that that deterioration has nothing to do with the present Minister or the present Government, but I point out that unemployment in the Riverland has increased by 100 per cent over the past 12 months, which speaks for itself. Certainly, the increase in the water rate is not the only factor contributing to problems in the Riverland, but to impose an increase of 28 per cent (almost double the previous average annual increase of 15 per cent over the past three years), at a time when the economic situation is deteriorating so rapidly, is ludicrous to say the least.

**Mr HAMILTON:** At page 100 of his most recent report, under the heading 'Findings and Comments', the Auditor-General states:

The following matters were referred to the Department, along with a number of suggestions to improve system controls—

- deficiencies in processing controls and procedures operating in relation to pensioner remission entitlement;
- weaknesses in processing controls and clerical documentation for the new general ledger system.

What are the deficiencies referred to by the Auditor-General? At page 27 of the yellow book, under the heading 'Delivery Mechanism', the following appears:

The Engineering and Water Supply Department provides administrative support to the Department of Community Welfare in providing remissions to pensioners on Engineering and Water Supply Department rates and to local councils for pensioners eligible for council rate remissions.

At page 28 of the yellow book there appear the following details of activity in respect of concessions granted to certain

consumers: estimation of remission requirements; liaison with Department of Community Welfare and Treasury on budgets; determination of pensioner eligibility; calculation of deduction from water and sewerage rates; and recovery of allowed remissions from Department of Community Welfare. Can the Minister say how many people enjoy the remissions referred to and how much must be provided by the Government annually by way of remissions? In no way do I deny eligible people their remissions, but I wish to know how much South Australian taxpayers are called on to provide for these disadvantaged people.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The total remissions are shown under the Department of Community Welfare line. The Engineering and Water Supply Department administers the scheme, but the costs are borne by the Department of Community Welfare, except for the amount included in the Engineering and Water Supply budget for administration (\$230 000). Mr Killmier will give members more information on the controls in force in respect of pensioner remission entitlements.

**Mr Killmier:** The cost of pensioner concessions in respect of water and sewerage rates for 1982-83, which is shown on page 65 of the Auditor-General's Report, is \$7.887 million; for local government rates, \$8.455 million; for electricity, \$2.260 million; for land tax, \$6 000; for transport concessions for the unemployed, \$2.055 million; making a total of \$20.663 million.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is the responsible administrative authority in respect of pensioner remissions. Pensioners who desire to obtain a remission of water and sewerage rates or council rates must apply through the Revenue Branch of the Department. About 70 000 eligible pensioners enjoy remissions and the turnover rate is extremely high: about 15 000 people are added to the list each year and another 15 000 are left off.

The Department maintains liaison with the Department of Social Security whereby we are provided with information as to who is entitled to fringe benefits, because the concessions are available only to those people entitled to those benefits. Therefore, when applying, applicants must be checked as to ownership of property. An applicant may be only a part owner or the ownership of the property may be with his children and he is only the occupier.

Many checks need to be carried out and, as far as possible, they are made by computer through the common property file back to the Lands Department. However, because of the sheer volume of the task the procedures operating need fine tuning, and the Auditor-General has drawn to our attention possible ways of improving our methods. As a result, certain improvements have been made. The Department works extremely well with the Auditor-General: we encourage the auditing staff to make constructive suggestions and, wherever possible, we implement them as soon as practicable.

Regarding the second question, the new general ledger system has been one of the success stories of the Public Service. The Department now has a computerised general ledger system which is on line to the regional offices throughout the State, so managers throughout the State can have instantaneous access to the financial information of the Department.

In installing any computer system such as this, it is necessary to ensure that it is impossible to manipulate it. The Department endeavoured to produce procedure manuals and documentation on processing controls that were as tight as possible. The Auditor-General was able to make a few suggestions as to further improvements over and above the work already done. The matter was considered and it was agreed that that would suffice. The manuals were implemented and I believe that the Auditor-General is totally



satisfied with what we are doing. The systems that are in place in the E. & W. S. Department have been adopted by the Public Service Board for introduction in a large number of other departments as part of the ongoing implementation of computerised ledger systems over the next two or three years.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Government will undertake a complete review of concessions, because it is believed that there are some anomalies in the system. That review is likely to be undertaken and completed early in the new year. As I said, there are problems associated with concessions for water and sewerage rates. Under the Rates and Taxes Remission Act, eligible pensioners who own their own property that is occupied as a principal place of residence are entitled to a maximum annual remission of \$75 for water rates and \$75 for sewerage rates. That arrangement has not been altered for a considerable time, and there has been some pressure in regard to that matter. That is a matter for the review committee to examine and then for decision by the Government.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I note from the yellow book that boat owners are not charged for use of disposal stations along the Murray River and that a proposal to control industrial waste waters discharging to comprehensive draining schemes is current. Investigations into the need to control industrial waste water discharges for the protection of water resources are continuing. How many boat owners use these disposal stations? Is the Government considering levying a charge on the boat owners who use the disposal stations and, if not, why not? Will the Minister say what controls of industrial waste the Government is considering in relation to the drainage schemes adjacent to the Murray River?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Boat owners are not charged for use of the disposal stations along the Murray River. A number of such stations have been established, mainly to minimise the effect of pollution in the river. Private and commercial operations would use these stations. To date, the Government has not charged in this regard, because it believes that it is preferable to provide a free service rather than allowing the river to be polluted. Mr Lewis will comment on the control of industrial wastes.

**Mr Lewis:** It is current Government policy to control industrial waste water discharge. However, a number of industries discharge into the comprehensive drainage systems, and I refer to Berri Fruit Juices, the Berri Co-operative Winery and Distillery, and other companies. We are concerned that corrosion and odour problems will occur in the Noora disposal system. As some members would know, there is already an odour problem in the Berri area as a result of discharges to the Berri evaporation basin. At present, in spite of negotiations with the companies, a successful conclusion has not been achieved, and there has been a degree of reluctance on the part of local government to push very hard for elimination of wastes from the drainage system.

Therefore, it was necessary to ensure that the pipeline to the Noora basin, particularly the pumping equipment, was protected from corrosion. That will involve dosing the pipeline with chemicals to protect it from the corrosive effects of industrial waste. The Government will determine a system of charges in that regard. Some industries in the State discharge wastes into important water resources, and negotiations are continuing between the Government and the industries to eliminate wastes from lakes in order to reduce the pollution and the environmental degradation that is caused.

**Mr HAMILTON:** What is the present situation in regard to pollution of the Bremer River from the Brukunga pyrites mine? Considerable concern was expressed some time ago in that regard. Is pollution of that river still occurring and, if so, who pays for the control and maintenance of the

mine? Does the Government provide moneys for that maintenance? Secondly, what is the nature and extent of discharges into the Port River? What action has been taken by companies and/or the Government to overcome the pollution of the Port River, if disposal of waste is allowed?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Brukunga pyrites mine is not presently operating, but acid drainage from waste dumps is causing concern. If the honourable member looks at the papers he will see that we spent \$134 305 in 1982-83 and that proposed expenditure in 1983-84 is \$139 000. This matter has come to our attention from time to time. People living in the area have some degree of apprehension as to whether this dump is causing difficulty with the Angas/Bremer River. We monitor this matter closely and intend to continue monitoring it to ensure that leaching or washing of material into the Angas/Bremer River is reduced. We have received a number of complaints from people in the area, as this problem is causing some concern. There has been some minor improvement to control seepage. An amount of \$139 000 is provided this year for maintenance and \$40 000 for capital works. I cannot answer the question about discharge into the Port River as this is not applicable to my portfolio.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister advise me why the Government picks up the tab for maintenance of that mine?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I understand that a history is associated with this matter, and I will ask the Director to supply that information.

**Mr Lewis:** This matter goes back a long way. The Brukunga pyrites mine became uneconomical and the company decided to close down. At that time agreement was reached with the then Department of Mines to accept a capital contribution and for the Government to take over responsibility for future disposal of waste from the mine. It is not so much waste from the mine as waste from the dump and excavation around it that is involved. These are highly acid wastes. That decision was taken by Government close to 10 years ago. At the time the Department of Mines had that responsibility for the mine but its experience with waste treatment plants was not extensive and it called on our services to assist in design of such a plant. The cost of the plant was more than the capital contribution made by the company when it wound up its operation. Our Minister was subsequently requested by the Minister of Mines to take over the operation and to get allocations from Treasury to operate this mine. That is how this situation has developed. The cost of operation, maintenance and improvements to the acid neutralisation plant is now carried by the Minister of Water Resources' portfolio.

**Mr GUNN:** It was announced some time ago that the Wudinna depot would be closed and its operations and responsibilities shifted to Minnipa. I now understand that the Minnipa depot is to be closed. Will the Minister say why it is necessary to close either of these depots? It appears to me that the same people will have to drive unnecessary distances when the people at Wudinna could service the area in an easterly direction and the people at Minnipa could service Minnipa and the area in a westerly direction. A number of people in the area fail to understand why the department wants to get rid of one of the depots when those depots are set up and appear to be operating effectively.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is obvious that the member has not received my letter of yesterday about this matter. I think that three employees are involved here. This is more a matter of cost effectiveness, and nobody will be disadvantaged, to my knowledge. It is just a question of whether or not we can operate just as effectively from one depot as we can from two. Mr Alexander may be able to give further information on the background of this matter.



**Mr Alexander:** This is one of a number of rationalisation projects around the State. We are trying to optimise our operation. A number of reports have been prepared on this matter, which was taken up strongly by the Public Accounts Committee. It is an exercise in efficiency and effectiveness.

**Mr GUNN:** Are the Minister's officers operating in accordance with the Government's plan to inflict upon the Public Service compulsory unionism which is under the guise of preference to unionists and which can only be described as compulsion? I understand that heads of departments are required to provide to union officials the names of persons who will not apply to join unions. It appears to me that heads of departments are becoming nothing more than collectors of union fees and, in some cases, are doing work for union officials. How many people in the Engineering and Water Supply Department have declined to join unions and have had to be counselled by senior officers before taking up union membership?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not able to answer the question with regard to the number of people who have declined to become members of unions and have then been pressured, as the member put it, into becoming members of a union. The Government's policy is preference to unionists and that is the policy we pursue in the E. & W.S. Department.

**Mr GUNN:** The Minister is saying that any person currently employed at any level in the E. & W.S. Department or a person who wishes to obtain employment there must agree to join an appropriate union or his employment will be terminated. Is that a fair assessment of the situation? The first point that comes to mind is what happens if a person who is counselled to join a union refuses to do so? Obviously, the departmental head is operating under instructions from the Premier or the Minister about this matter. What action is taken if a person exercises what I believe the overwhelming number of people in the community regard as a democratic right of freedom of association to decline to belong to any organisation or any society? Will that person jeopardise his or her employment and future promotion within that organisation?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is a responsibility of respective organisations, associations or unions to encourage people to become members of their organisations. The Department does not interfere with that. I would not like that to happen. I repeat that Government policy is preference to unionists. That policy is pursued by our Department along with every other Government department.

**Mr GUNN:** As a supplementary question, what happens if the person declines to join the union under which the category of work in which he is involved is covered?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Preference goes to the person who accepts to join the union, but I do not know of any individual case where that has occurred. If there is a specific case that the member can cite we can certainly determine the answer, but he is dealing with hypothetical situations rather than real ones.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I would like to ask a constructive question. Page 26 of the yellow document says, 'Acceptance of waste at Bolivar Toxic Waste Site'. Can the Minister, for my edification and perhaps for that of some of the members of the Committee, advise me what sort of treatment and disposal takes place for the acid and alkali wastes and for the treatment and disposal of cyanide wastes? These are, as we all know, very toxic chemicals. What are the current treatment and disposal processes? Also, what other forms of treatment and disposal are they investigating to perhaps become more efficient and less costly?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Certainly, the Department accepts waste at the Bolivar toxic waste site. The treatment and disposal of these wastes is by the process of evaporation

and disposal as much as is possible; they are stored and treated. I do not know whether there is any degree of expansion relating to these problems because it is difficult for Government and local government. Over a period of years there has been a greater emphasis on the difficulties involved in toxic wastes. Our plant at Bolivar accepts the waste, treats it and disposes of it. Perhaps my Department can give more specific details of the method that we apply to dispose of this toxic waste.

**Mr Lewis:** The Bolivar toxic waste site started as a result of requests by some waste disposal contractors, as well as by the Department of Environment and Planning, which was very concerned about the way in which some toxic wastes were being disposed of and about the paucity of sites around the city. The Department had at Bolivar two fairly large lagoons built; these were temporary sludge lagoons, which were used when the Bolivar plant was being put into commission and before we finished our digestion tanks where the sludge is now dealt with. Because they are water-tight (being built in clays), they provided a very cheap and convenient way in which we could deal with acid and alkali wastes. The Committee of Inquiry into the Environment recommended that these lagoons be used for that purpose. As a result, we were subsequently asked by the then Department of Environment and Conservation (now the Department of Environment and Planning) to continue the operation of those lagoons with a view to acids and alkalis being placed in separate lagoons, and evaporated at those sites to give safe disposal.

The Department of Environment and Conservation, as it was then, also requested that we deal also with cyanide wastes, which the member has indicated are very dangerous waste chemicals. They are treated by oxidising into cyanates, which are no longer a toxic material. That system is going on and will continue. Other sites are operated as well by private contractors, but this is one which the Department of Environment and Planning would want us to continue. Eventually, sites of this nature will be taken over by the Waste Commission and we will more or less operate in a registered site at Bolivar under those arrangements.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am very interested in the information provided by the Minister and Mr Lewis because that was my next question in relation to private contractors. It was my observation some years ago that these wastes were disposed of around Wingfield. I noticed that with a great deal of interest. I understand the response was that these will be taken over by the Government in the very near future (there was some conversation here on the left; so I did not properly pick that up; perhaps it could be elaborated on again in a moment).

Returning to the Brukunga mine, I would like the Minister (I know that he probably does not have this information with him) to say how much it has cost the taxpayers of South Australia to maintain it from the time that the Government took over the control and maintenance of that mine, because if it closed down in 1979 or thereabouts and we are looking at something like \$50 000 a year—it may well be more than that—or if it was \$100 000 a year, the taxpayers of South Australia certainly paid dearly for that. It is perhaps a good lesson for this Government and future Governments to ensure that in future better securities are given by companies which decide to develop mines of that type. So, it concerns me that the taxpayers of South Australia are, and have been, called on to pick up a Bill which could be now perhaps running into \$500 000, \$1 million or perhaps even more. I await with a great deal of interest the information that the Minister may be able to provide me with in relation to that matter in the future.

Finally, on page 25 of the document the target for 1983-84 is the same as for 1982-83; that is, in relation to the

winery waste disposal in the Barossa Valley, using consultants. As a former railway man, I can recall on many occasions going through Nuriootpa and noting very quickly the stench that emanated from those ponds. Can the Minister give me any sort of programme as to whether consultants have already been employed, when they are likely to be employed and when this matter can be finally addressed?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, I am happy to provide the information asked for by the honourable member regarding the total amount involved in regard to the Brukunga mine. I also point out that the conditions which applied at that time in regard to mining certainly do not apply today. As a consequence, that problem is not likely to be repeated.

In regard to the Barossa area wineries, we have just received a consultant's report. It is being analysed at present, and that assessment will be considered.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Finally, can the Minister say what tests are carried out on the West Lakes waterway, and on what basis are they done?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** My departmental officers are better equipped to give that detail.

**Mr Lewis:** I am not sure what the current monitoring programme is and who is responsible for its funding. I have a feeling that we do work on behalf of the Woodville Council, and to some extent Marine and Harbours does so as well. I will have to check out those precise details.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I have one final question on this section. If one looks at the total figure in regard to this section one sees a proposed payment this year of \$98.36 million compared with \$103.19 million spent last year. I appreciate that the figure was higher than the estimate last year as a result of the high figure for power required to pump water to metropolitan Adelaide but, even allowing \$5 million from that power figure, we are still looking at a proposed figure for this financial year of about what it would have been last year, without the significant increase in power cost. In real terms we are looking at a significant reduction to the Department. What effect will this reduction have in real terms on the Department's operations and its ability to carry out its responsibilities?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It will not mean any significant reduction in relation to this work. I mentioned earlier that we have not included in this Budget work which the Housing Trust will be doing in increasing its activities this year, and which will provide an opportunity to maintain our workforce. I also referred to the \$4 million from the Federal National Water Resources Programme, which should also improve opportunities to maintain our workforce and spending. I do not believe that the figures referred to by the member will have any significant impact on the Department's work or our programme for this year.

**Mr EVANS:** Has the Minister material available to show what it costs to put copper sulphate into our reservoirs to stop eutrophication, that is, enrichment by nitrogen which I believe in the end kills the water as it becomes stagnant if copper sulphate is not administered. What is the cost of the material added, what quantity is involved, and what is the cost of applying that material to the water supply?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am going to disappoint the member: I do not have the cost, but I do have the tonnages.

**Mr EVANS:** Perhaps the Minister will seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* all his available information on this matter.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not object to that. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* information in regard to copper sulphate dosing of water without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### COPPER SULPHATE DOSING OF WATER

Total copper sulphate tonnage used in metropolitan and country areas over the past 20 years has been between 80 and 100 tonnes per year—with peak dosages of 150 tonnes.

In the past three years:

	Metropolitan	Tonnage
1982-83	.....	71
1981-82	.....	152
1980-81	.....	90
	Country	Tonnage
1982-83	.....	10
1981-82	.....	7
1980-81	.....	12
Total figures since 1959:		
1959	.....	100
1960	.....	75
1961	.....	80
1962	.....	90
1963	.....	120
1964	.....	100
1965	.....	85
1966	.....	70
1967	.....	60
1968	.....	100
1969	.....	100
1970	.....	150
1971	.....	125
1972	.....	100
1973	.....	110
1974	.....	140
1975	.....	100
1976	.....	160
1977	.....	60
1978	.....	90

Rate of dosing is between 0.2 and 2 parts per million, depending on algae species and physical dimensions of reservoirs—also depends on concentration of algae.

Reasons for high dosage depend on seasonal variations, associated factors being levels of nutrients, hours of sunlight, temperature and water turbidity (light penetration).

We have improved our monitoring techniques, our technical understanding of algae reaction to copper sulphate, and increased mixing of water from the watersheds and the Murray River.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I apologise to the member that I do not have the cost details. Algae occurs mostly in summer and can create problems in regard to taste and odour. The injection of copper sulphate plays an important part in ensuring that a better quality of water in Adelaide's reservoirs is maintained.

**Mr EVANS:** What is the cost of a household meter to the Department? How much labour is involved in installing a meter? An average figure must be established. How much of that cost does the Department recoup in charging people for installation? The Department seeks from people who have water mains extended to enable them to get a supply the total cost of that mains extension. Does the Department seek to obtain the total cost of installing the water meter when the application is made? How much does it cost the Department for a sewerage connection? Is the applicant charged the total cost of that connection?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The member has asked a series of questions about costs. I understand that a meter costs the Department \$26. A number of other questions were asked. I will obtain information and supply it to the member.

**Mr EVANS:** Can the Minister obtain information on the number of connections made in the metropolitan area in each of the past four years? How much revenue has been received by the Department for each of those connections, separating water connections from sewerage connections? Can that information also be provided?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have no objection to that. We can supply those figures.

**Mr EVANS:** Finally, in regard to Brukunga mine, because the Mines Department or the Government obtains a substantial sum each year from the mining industry for the re-establishment of worked out mining areas and for the beautification of areas that have been affected by mining, will

the Minister take up the matter with his Ministerial colleagues to ensure that costs now incurred by his Department in regard to the Brukunga mine and the effect of pollution on the Bremer River is met by the Department of Mines and Energy or through the fund contributed to by mining interests, which is the right and proper place in lieu of the Department?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I understand that the situation has occurred over a period of time. In the past, the cost was cross-charged for the Department of Mines and Energy from our Department. That exercise some years ago did not take place and, as a consequence, the cost now comes from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I am certainly prepared to take up the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy. The cost is coming out of Government resources anyway, whether from Mines and Energy or Water Resources. There is a history associated with the cost involved. I will obtain the details and advise the member accordingly.

**Mr EVANS:** I have a supplementary question. I am aware that, if there is a need for the mining industry to pay slightly more on an ongoing basis per tonne to compensate for restoration, and so on, Parliament and the Government will have to look at that. Because it is a mining matter, I believe that that is where the burden should apply. I believe that significant amounts of money have been available in the fund on an ongoing basis. In his discussions with his colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, will the Minister emphasise that there is an opportunity to ask the mining industry to pay a slightly higher proportion (although I do not think that is necessary) of their monetary gain from mining towards the fund to help in this instance or in other instances that might arise or already apply?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am prepared to do exactly that.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I notice that the Minister's salary is included under the Water Resources line and not under Recreation and Sport. On that basis, are the Ministerial staff salaries paid under this line or under the Department of Recreation and Sport?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not have Ministerial staff as such in the Department of Recreation and Sport. It is paid through the Engineering and Water Supply Department line.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the Minister tell us the names of his Ministerial staff, including any that are seconded from the Public Service, and what are their salaries?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** A similar question was asked by the Hon. Mr Burdett. The answer will appear in *Hansard* shortly.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** On that basis, Mr Chairman, I withdraw the questions.

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

Works and Services—Engineering and Water Supply  
Department, \$60 700 000

**Chairman:**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold  
The Hon. Peter Duncan  
Mr S.G. Evans  
Mr R.J. Gregory  
Mr G.M. Gunn  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr M.K. Mayes  
The Hon. Michael Wilson

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.W. Slater, Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr K.W. Lewis, Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr D.J. Alexander, Deputy Director-General, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr A.N. Killmier, Director, Administration and Finance, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I refer to the work that the Department is doing on behalf of the River Murray Commission, particularly in relation to the Rufus River Interception Scheme. I believe that the scheme is nearing completion. Page 148 of the Estimates of Payments indicates that only \$37 000 is proposed this financial year. When will the scheme become operational and what is the annual diversion of salt inflows into the Rufus River that will be diverted? In other words, what benefits will accrue to South Australia from a tonnage point of view? Is there any estimate of the reduction in e.c. units under a controlled flow situation that will indicate what reduction will occur in e.c. units?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Under that scheme, it will amount to something like 37 000 tonnes per year. I understand that the scheme will be completed early next year, although it is operational at the moment.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Does that involve diverting water from the tube well section to the evaporation basin?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Mr Lewis will supply those details.

**Mr Lewis:** The situation with the Rufus River Interception Scheme is that it would have been completed and fully operative now if it had not been for a high river. Because we have a high river at the moment all the pumping equipment that was about to be tested, subsequently commissioned and accepted from the contractor had to be taken out because of the high-flow condition of the river. The scheme is not operating at the moment. As soon as the river goes down the pumping equipment and control equipment will be put back in place, as was always intended. It will then be tested and commissioned and the scheme will commence operating immediately that occurs. The scheme has been delayed because of the high river at the present time.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Is the design of the scheme such that every time there is a high river it will be necessary to pull out all the pumping equipment?

**Mr Lewis:** That is so. It is designed to be like that. That is the quickest and most economic way of doing it.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Page 148 of the Estimates of Payments details \$688 000 for 'Other works' under the River Murray works vote. That is a fairly large figure compared with the total amount. To what does that figure relate?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I understand that it is the South Australian Government's share of the River Murray Commission's capital works programme along the river.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** It is a dramatic increase over last year.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, it is quite a considerable increase over last year. Mr Lewis will provide further details.

**Mr Lewis:** In a number of regulatory structures along the Murray River, particularly the Loxton barrages, certain elements are reaching the end of their economic life. We are going through a rather large replacement programme progressively replacing, for example, gates and beams at the barrages. We are also replacing all the valve systems in the locks and there is provision this year to begin the progressive replacement of all of the cranes on the locks and to increase their capacity.

Those cranes, estimated to cost about \$400 000 each, are expensive. We are concerned about the continued use of

the present cranes because they would not meet certain requirements of the Department of Labour, so the River Murray Commission has decided to proceed with that programme. That is one of the small jobs that would be included in the \$688 000.

**Mr EVANS:** I believe that the Department is hiring some of its equipment to other departments at present. When this occurs, does the Department charge the full cost of the hired machine, including the administrative cost to the Department, or the normal Government hire rates that the Government itself would pay to private contractors?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** This matter has been raised previously by the honourable member and I have given him information by way of letter. Basically, we occasionally provide plant and vehicles for use by other departments. The Deputy Director-General (Mr Alexander) can give details on this subject.

**Mr Alexander:** Not much equipment goes to other departments. When it does, we charge them the standard hire rate that has been developed on the usual costing procedures. The Department's fleet of heavy machinery has decreased considerably over the past few years: in 1978, we had over 500 heavy machines, but that number has fallen to 380; in 1978, we had about 2 000 motor vehicles, but that number has fallen to 630. So, we now have a fleet commensurate with the amount of work to be done and there is little capacity to hire out. Rather we are hiring plant from private industry at present.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions? I now call on the member for Morphet.

**Mr OSWALD:** At page 148 of the 1983-84 Estimates of Payments, the sum voted for motor vehicles in the Engineering and Water Supply Department in 1982-83 is shown as \$1.876 million; actual payments for 1982-83, \$2.753 million; and the vote for this financial year, \$3.5 million. Is that increase based on the number of vehicles to be replaced? If not, why is the increase so large?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I believe that those figures are incorrect. The correct figures are as follows: for plant and machinery, \$2.164 million was voted in 1982-83; \$2.04 million was actually spent in 1982-83; and \$3.055 million is proposed for 1983-84. For motor vehicles, \$2.15 million was voted for 1982-83; \$2.361 million was actually spent in 1982-83; and \$2.482 million is proposed for 1983-84. The totals are \$4.314 million, \$4.365 million, and \$5.537 million. The reason for the discrepancy concerns the definition of 'vehicle'.

**Mr OSWALD:** Under 'Motor Vehicles', what is the actual expenditure for 1982-83 and the vote for 1983-84?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The actual payment in 1982-83 was \$2.361 million, and the vote for 1983-84 is \$2.482 million.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Do the sums for plant and machinery and for motor vehicles add up to the same amount?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes. There is an error of transposition.

**Mr Killmier:** The introduction into the Estimates of a line for motor vehicles first took place in 1982-83, with the idea of providing information on the cost of light motor vehicles. However, the information provided varied from department to department because, in some instances, the heading 'Motor Vehicles' implied light motor vehicles in some departments, and all motor vehicles in other departments. The problem was recently pointed out by the Public Accounts Committee to the Under Treasurer and I understand that he is considering clearly defining a 'light' vehicle within the Government's criteria for replacing a light vehicle after 2½ years use or 50 000 km travel, because trucks, for instance, would last much longer.

The Treasury is also considering how best to show the information in the Estimates of Payments so as to ensure that all departments provide the information on a common basis. As a result of inquiries and the apparent increases referred to by the honourable member, an impression has gained credence that a significant increase in the purchase of motor vehicles has taken place when, in fact, in physical terms the purchases this year are fewer than those of last year. The whole matter is being studied by Treasury officers and, before next year's Estimates are called for, the departments will no doubt be told what procedures are to be adopted and information will be provided uniformly in accordance with those instructions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I call on the member for Mallee.

**Mr LEWIS:** From the total sum provided under the heading 'Irrigation and Drainage', could a small amount be provided to enable a salinity-reading station to be established at Swan Reach so that the information gathered by that station could be transmitted to Adelaide to be read out on the *Country Hour* with the salinity readings from other river centres? It is enormously difficult at present for people in the Swan Reach community to get that information as they are at the distinct disadvantage of having no regional radio station and no local newspaper and they are miles away from the delivery point of the daily newspapers, the *News* and the *Advertiser*.

It would be of great assistance to those people if that information could be provided in the *Country Hour*. Will the Minister consider providing funds in the Estimates for the equipment?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am prepared to consider the matter. The point made by the honourable member is quite valid, and I will do what I can to ensure that people in that area are assisted.

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

---

Works and Services—South Eastern Drainage Board,  
\$220 000

**Chairman:**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold  
The Hon. Peter Duncan  
Mr S.G. Evans  
Mr R.J. Gregory  
Mr G.M. Gunn  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr M.K. Mayes  
The Hon. Michael Wilson

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.W. Slater, Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr K.W. Lewis, Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr D.J. Alexander, Deputy Director-General, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr A.N. Killmier, Director, Administration and Finance, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The yellow book refers to the replacement of weirs and other works. Does that involve

the major regulators that were being installed to make adjustments to the water table in the South-East by regulating the height of the water in the drains, that is, to retain water in the drains so that the water table is maintained throughout the year to assist pasture growth?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Annual Report of the South Eastern Drainage Board will be tabled in Parliament probably next week, but I will make that information available to the honourable member, if I can obtain it.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Does the South Eastern Drainage Board, with the support of the Government, have an ongoing programme for major regulators? Have the regulators that have been installed to date been of benefit to people in the South-East?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes.

**Mr LEWIS:** Regarding the South Eastern Drainage Board, given that the extent to which the South-East is now drained has caused a great deal of concern in that area in regard to the level of the water table, on which industries, particularly the agricultural industry, depend a great deal, does the Minister view with some concern the risk of losing the Dilwyn aquifer, which is replenished from elsewhere in the South-East? If work goes ahead at Kingston, it may thereby further reduce the area of land that can be irrigated for agricultural production.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** If it had not been for that project, none of the South-East area would have been developed effectively. I do not quite follow the honourable member's thinking. It depends on seasonal application. In the past two or three years there have been variable seasons. There was considerable rain in 1981, which was advantageous to the people in that area, but last year the situation was reversed. Again this year the system has been very effective in draining properties. I am not quite sure of the basis of the honourable member's question.

**Mr LEWIS:** By way of clarification, the gist of the question is simply that many of the people in the South-East do not question the value of the drainage system (and I support that view, because I am not in the least critical of the Board or the role that it has performed in the past and will continue to perform in the future); the thrust of my question relates to the real concern about the risk to the remaining water supply, especially from the artesian Dilwyn aquifer.

I suppose that that matter has very little relevance for the Board, other than in respect to the fact that some of the water that once saturated the land now flows to the sea. Those people do not want the Kingston coal project to proceed if it means losing the Dilwyn aquifer. Does the Minister share that concern about the risk to the Dilwyn aquifer from the proposed lignite mine at Kingston?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Some people in the South-East are concerned about the proposed lignite mine at Kingston, and that concern is somewhat justified. Nothing firm has been established to date: it is a proposal. The Department has had an input into the reports and the determinations. Certainly, I would want to be absolutely sure that the people in that area are not disadvantaged in regard to that aquifer and the source of water that is important to their livelihood.

**Mr LEWIS:** What I really seek from the Minister is an assurance that the Government would not allow that lignite mine to go ahead if there was any risk whatever to the Dilwyn aquifer, because of its value to the irrigators.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not know whether I as the Minister of Water Resources can give that assurance on behalf of the Government, because other considerations and other Ministers are involved, particularly the Minister of Mines and Energy. I as the Minister of Water Resources would want to be assured that any action did not affect significantly the underground water resources if that mining proposal was to take place. I can give an assurance that I

as the Minister would want that sort of guarantee before I supported it, but there again it is for the Government to decide and it is not a decision for me, the Minister of Water Resources.

**Mr LEWIS:** Does the Minister share my view that the use of water from Eight Mile Creek would be and is extremely valuable for the development of an agricultural industry in South Australia that has the capacity to employ hundreds of people and to be worth millions of dollars? Rainbow trout could be produced: the fish could be caught in fresh water and then put into seawater for fattening over three or four months.

In this month's issue of the *Fisheries Industry Journal*, produced by the Department of Primary Industry, that prospective industry, and details of its scientific and technological feasibility, are outlined. Eight Mile Creek is in the unique position of having large volumes of useful fresh water readily available at low cost to the operator of the hatchery. There are high levels of oxygenation caused by wave movement on a rugged coastline making it ideally suited to fattening operations. Will the Minister ensure that anything done at Eight Mile Creek will not hamper the prospective development of this industry and will he do anything he can to encourage this project?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** About six months ago I visited Eight Mile Creek. I noted that there was already an aquaculture established there in the form of a fish hatchery. This is an industry which is important to South Australia. I am not entirely familiar with all of the details of this matter, but I think that this land is leased from the Department of Lands. Eight Mile Creek is a significant part of the environment in the South-East and I would certainly support any industry associated with it. Indeed, quite a number of local farmers rely on it for their water supply for their crops. These are mostly dairy farms. I believe that this area should be developed as much as possible.

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

---

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous, \$1 600 000

**Chairman**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold  
 The Hon. Peter Duncan  
 Mr S.G. Evans  
 Mr R.J. Gregory  
 Mr G.M. Gunn  
 Mr K.C. Hamilton  
 Mr M.K. Mayes  
 The Hon. Michael Wilson

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.W. Slater, Minister of Water Resources.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr K.W. Lewis, Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department.  
 Mr D.J. Alexander, Deputy Director-General, Engineering and Water Supply Department.  
 Mr A.N. Killmier, Director, Administration and Finance, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I refer first to the cost of controlling water hyacinth in New South Wales. Last year \$10 000 was voted to this line and \$7 500 expended. This year the amount allocated to the line has been reduced to \$5 000. Is this an indication that the water hyacinth problem in New South Wales is largely under control, thereby allowing the level of expenditure to be significantly reduced?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I think Mr Lewis would be better able to answer that question than I. It appears that we make a contribution to New South Wales, as no doubt does Victoria as well, to control water hyacinth. Whereas an amount of \$10 000 was voted in 1982-83 only \$7 500 was spent. The vote this year is \$5 000. I expect, because of those figures, that there has been some reduction in the contribution required to control water hyacinth in New South Wales.

**Mr Lewis:** I understand from people in New South Wales that the programme they undertook to control this infestation in the Gwydir River area has been remarkably successful. The programme now is to ensure that there is no reinfestation and to monitor and protect that area from this water weed.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I note that there is no provision for dredging and desnagging the Murray River provided for 1983-84. Does this indicate that the Government is of the view that no further dredging is required to maintain a navigable channel and that all the snags causing problems for large tourist vessels using the river (snags which have sunk in the river in the past 40 or 50 years since the previous river-boat era), which were previously in danger of being holed as a result of these snags, have now been removed? I can recall that there was a problem of this kind across the border in New South Wales because of a restriction in the area of Higgins Cutting. There was discussion about whether New South Wales should clear that cutting or whether it was in South Australia's interests that it have the cutting cleared to enable its tourist vessels to travel upstream. What are the Minister's comments on this matter?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** As the honourable member has so rightly said, there is no provision in the 1983-84 Budget for desnagging and dredging of the Murray River. We anticipate that we will not be required to provide funds for this purpose in the current year. In the past it has been necessary to provide such funds but last year actual payments were slightly above the amount voted for this purpose and I believe that that is the reason no amount is proposed this year. We will certainly have to assess the situation if a need arises in this area during the year.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** What is the current situation in relation to Higgins Cutting, and what is the Government's attitude to this matter?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have no knowledge of Higgins Cutting. I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I see that there is no provision for monitoring of the Murray River mouth in this year's Estimates. It is my view that the Murray mouth should be the responsibility of the River Murray Commission. I believe that it is unrealistic for that Commission to accept responsibility for the river only as far as the barrage. What steps has the Government taken in an attempt to hand this responsibility to the Commission? I think that this is properly a cost to be borne by that Commission because what happens at the mouth of the river is very much a result of the total management of the Murray-Darling system. If no further action has been taken by the Government in an endeavour to hand this responsibility to the Commission, is it the Government's intention to do so?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The honourable member has asked two or three questions at once. First, there is no provision in the Budget for monitoring the Murray River mouth

because, as a result of high river flows and actions taken by the Department in this area, according to latest information, the Murray mouth is some 300 metres wide, so there is no problem now. That is not to say that there will not be a problem again in the future. We have made no provision for this matter in the Budget for this year. We have established a Murray Mouth Advisory Committee, a matter about which the member for Chaffey would be well aware.

It provided a report and also monitored the river mouth since that committee was appointed. The other question that the honourable member raised is the responsibility of the River Murray Commission in regard to this part of South Australia. I would certainly seek also to diminish and minimise the cost of Government in regard to that monitoring and investigation. Perhaps it might be appropriate for me to ask the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who is South Australia's representative on the River Murray Commission, his views on the question in regard to the Commission's having responsibility for that matter.

**Mr Lewis:** Within the new River Murray Waters Agreement there is no bar to any River Murray Commissioner raising matters for which he believes the River Murray Commission should take responsibility. That would certainly apply to the Murray mouth. Whether the other Commissioners would be agreeable to the Commission's taking responsibility or whether they would be persuaded by arguments that we might put before them that the Commission should take responsibility for this is open to question.

I draw attention, however, to the fact that should the South Australian Government request the River Murray Commission to do so in South Australia it may place South Australia in a less advantageous position for similar requests which may be made by the upstream States in respect of maintaining and protecting from erosion certain parts of the river which are affected by river regulation and which to this stage the Commission has steadfastly considered are the responsibility of the respective States. This really is a very similar situation and it may be less profitable for South Australia to take the responsibility for the Murray mouth, which hopefully will not close again for many years to come, if ever, on the basis that it would not then be in a position to argue that it did not have to contribute to other expenditure in the other States.

**Mr GUNN:** This line gives me the opportunity to raise the matter of deregulation. I note in the yellow book that the Minister is responsible for administering 22 Acts of Parliament: perhaps one could say, 'The best of luck to him.' In that are a number of regulations, boards and committees. I note that four or five Acts of Parliament refer to the Torrens River. Has the Department carried out any inquiry into deregulating as much as possible and getting rid of any Acts of Parliament which are not needed today; in particular, to streamline the operation, cut out red tape and repeal any regulations which are not necessary? I understand that under the previous Administration this programme commenced, and I am wondering whether this Department is looking at this matter, as the Premier advised me that he was not continuing with the deregulation unit as such, but that each department would carry out its own investigation into this matter.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I suggest that the 22 Acts that have been referred to by the honourable member are certainly not obsolete. He talked more of regulations: there is always an opportunity to review those. There are some proposals in hand to deregulate some of the regulations, particularly in regard to the Waterworks Act and the Sewerage Act. I am advised that some Acts are superfluous and out of date; so, we will look at those. If they are out of date, obviously there is no purpose in having them on the Statute Books.

**Mr GUNN:** Which Acts is the Department looking at? I regard this as an important area. I can see no point in continuing to fill up the Statute Books with unnecessary Acts of Parliament. In my judgment, we have too many regulations and controls affecting our everyday life now. If we can get rid of some, we will have the support of the overwhelming majority of the public.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is a review of some of these Acts. One of them brought to my attention is the Pyap Irrigation Trust Act, which may be included in the Irrigation on Private Property Act. Let me assure the honourable member that if it is necessary we will certainly look at the consolidation of regulations as well.

**Mr EVANS:** My question relates to the Torrens clean-up programme. I have noticed—in particular this year because I have been endeavouring to run around that part of the city once a fortnight, with some difficulty—that when the Torrens Lake was drained, even though there may be some clean-up of larger objects in the main part of the area that is exposed, around the edges there is a mass of junk and trash. I believe that the lake is under the control of the Adelaide City Council and not the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but seeing that it is a waterway and that the general clean-up programme has taken place in other parts of the Torrens, can the Minister take up with the Adelaide City Council and also his other Ministers—perhaps with the Minister of Works—whether some people who are unemployed (in particular, next year when the lake is drained) could be used to carry out a general clean-up of the high water mark of the lake? To be quite frank, any person travelling around the lake at this stage, even though it has only just been refilled after drainage, would have to admit that any tourist coming into this city and having a look at the Torrens Lake and walking around it would be disgusted at the mess that exists. Can the Minister use his good resources to take it up with the other authorities, because it is probably a joint responsibility, if not Ministerial then publicly, between the Adelaide City Council and the Minister?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, the line to which the honourable member is referring is 'Protection and improvement of Torrens River, purchase of land, subsidies to councils, administration and other expenses', which is not quite related to the matter that he has raised; but he is right in that the Adelaide City Council has responsibility for the Torrens Lake in its council area.

The matter that the honourable member has raised is the responsibility of the Adelaide City Council. I would not like to interfere with that jurisdiction, but I can request the council to give attention to the matters that are raised by the honourable member. This provision of \$25 000 relates to certain subsidies to councils, and the River Torrens Committee which assists our Department with advice in regard to the Torrens River. There is also the River Torrens Improvement Committee, which comprises a number of councils involved with interests in protecting the environment and improving the Torrens River. The specific reference that the honourable member has raised is not in my jurisdiction, but I am prepared to use what I might call 'my good offices' with the Adelaide City Council on the matters that the honourable member has raised.

**Mr OSWALD:** In regard to metropolitan drainage maintenance of south-western suburbs drainage funds, under this item or elsewhere in the Budget has money been set aside and approved for the upgrading of the regulator gates of the Patawalonga? In view of the time constraint, perhaps the Minister can give just a 'Yes' or 'No' answer.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is not in this line. The sum is likely to be made available through the capital works programme.

**Mr OSWALD:** It is available in this Budget?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes.

**Mr OSWALD:** My next question relates to the upgrading of Keswick Creek. Is it the responsibility of the Minister's Department to plan for the upgrading of that creek to provide a new stormwater drain or is it now going to become the responsibility of the Department of Local Government? At what stage are we in the planning of that upgrading?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not aware of that matter. I will obtain information and advise the honourable member accordingly.

**Mr LEWIS:** My question relates to the Murray Valley League and I commend the Minister for picking up the tab for this League from the Department of Tourism. Does the Minister agree with me and the League that the use of the Murray River be extended beyond the mere necessity for it to provide potable water to the Adelaide metropolitan area and outlying areas of the State and various localities and irrigators to provide facilities in which people can undertake a variety of recreation activities over and above straight-out water supply for domestic and irrigation purposes?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, the honourable member is right. Formerly the line for the Murray Valley Development League was handled under the Department of Tourism, but we have accepted the responsibility and it is proposed that \$10 000 be forwarded this year to the League. As the honourable member has said, I believe the river should be used for multiple uses, remembering always that its major usage, particularly in South Australia, is in regard to irrigation and supply of water as well as for use by the community in regard to water usage generally. Certainly, there is nothing to stop people from using the Murray River. The important thing is the assurance that in future it is not polluted by persons who use it for recreational purposes.

We need to ensure that, as much as possible, people who use the river for pleasure and leisure activities do not add to the existing problems. I do not object to the multiple use of the Murray River, as that is a purpose that we should be pressing but always remembering that our major consideration should be water quality in regard to water stored in the metropolitan area and for irrigation purposes along the Murray River.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of this vote completed. I express my appreciation to the witnesses for their assistance and to the members of this Committee for the co-operation they have given the Chair.

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

**The CHAIRMAN:** I advise that the required notice of discharge and substitution of members has been given, as follows: Mr Ingerson in place of Mr Gunn, Mr Oswald in place of the Hon. Peter Arnold, and Mr Klunder in place of Mr Gregory.

Recreation and Sport, \$1 907 000

**Chairman:**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

The Hon. Peter Duncan  
Mr S.G. Evans  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr G.A. Ingerson  
Mr J.H.C. Klunder



Mr M.K. Mayes  
Mr J.K.G. Oswald  
The Hon. Michael Wilson

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.W. Slater, Minister of Recreation and Sport.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr L.G. Watson, Senior Administrative Officer, Department of Recreation and Sport.

Mr B.J. Taylor, Acting Director of Recreation and Sport, Department of Recreation and Sport.

Mr P.T. Tregoweth, Finance Officer, Department of Recreation and Sport.

Dr D. Scafton, Acting Permanent Head, Department of Recreation and Sport.

Mr P.J. Morrissy, Secretary, Betting Control Board.

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

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** My first question concerns administration. This Government has now been in office for over 12 months, and early in its period in office the Government set up the new Department of Recreation and Sport, which I applauded. The Department of Recreation and Sport is still under the direction of the permanent head of the Director-General of Transport, as it was when I was Minister. As I understand it, no Director has yet been appointed to the Department of Recreation and Sport. Why has it taken so long for these very important administrative arrangements to be made?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is a reorganisation of the Department, as the member has said. The first step in that reorganisation is the appointment of a Director of the Department. The member will appreciate that that appointment requires a panel, which has been appointed by the Public Service Board. Applications were called for in July this year, and 43 were received. Interviews have been conducted, and I am currently awaiting a report from the panel, through the Public Service Board, regarding the appointment of a Director. When that appointment is made, the reorganisation and structure of the Department will then take place.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am aware of the information given to me by the Minister. I still say that a period of 12 months is an inordinately long time for such administrative arrangements to occur. If the new Department was to remain a Division within the Department of Transport, that is fair enough. But, it is not: it is a separate Department. I am extremely critical of the Government over this long delay. It has caused great uncertainty, not only to the sporting community but also, I imagine, within the Government itself. If the Department of Transport is to lose a Division, which obviously it is, officers of that Division have still been administering it in a titular fashion for over 12 months. It is deplorable that this decision has taken so long.

I refer to page 72 of the Programme Estimates and would like an explanation of the financial details contained therein. The Programme Estimates state:

Total expenditure for the Department for 1983-84 is expected to be \$5.223 million compared with the 1982-83 expenditure of \$5.8 million. This represents an increase in recurrent expenditure of \$681 000 and a decreased capital expenditure of \$466 000.

Will the Minister or his officers explain where in the Budget the recurrent expenditure increase of \$681 000 occurs and where the capital expenditure reduction of \$466 000 appears?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The figures are not entirely correct. Total expenditure for the Department for 1983-84 is expected to be \$5.115 million, compared to the recurrent expenditure in 1982-83 of \$5.8 million. This represents an increase in

recurrent expenditure of \$681 000 and a decrease in capital expenditure of \$574 000.

For 1983-84 the Department was given priority to expand the majority of its programmes, which are beneficial to a wide section of the community. We were able to achieve this despite a relatively small increase in the total proposed expenditure for the year by utilising the Recreation and Sport Fund, which involves revenue derived from Soccer Pools. This year it is proposed to spend \$661 000 from that fund for programmes, whereas in 1982-83, of the \$619 000 expended, only \$21 000 was related to these programmes. In addition, some capital and other recurrent funds would also be used for programme purposes.

The major programmes in this expenditure are as follows: the sum for community physical fitness went from \$81 000 to \$130 000, an increase of \$49 000; the 'Life. Be in it' programme from \$18 000 to \$33 000, an increase of \$15 000; recreation development grants from \$29 000 to \$59 000, an increase of \$30 000; sports coaching \$118 000 to \$198 000, an increase of \$80 000; administrator's salary subsidy—sport, \$143 000 to \$210 000, an increase of \$67 000; administrator's salary subsidy—recreation, \$40 000 to \$80 000, an increase of \$40 000; recreation camps, \$111 000 to \$132 000, an increase of \$21 000; and competition assistance went from \$110 000 to \$160 000, an increase of \$50 000.

In addition, the Government has increased from \$139 000 to \$380 000 the allocation to the South Australian Sports Institute. The Government will also expend funds to construct an aquatic centre at the Adelaide Swimming Centre. An accurate estimate of costs for the project has not been prepared and is not provided for in the Budget papers. In summary, the increase we are talking about relates to utilising recreation and sport funds from the soccer pools.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I still cannot see where the Budget figures on pages 126 and 127 of the Estimates of Payments match up with the statement that this represents an increase in recurrent expenditure of \$681 000. If one looks at the recurrent expenditure on pages 126 and 127 of the Estimates of Payments, it is very hard to come to any conclusion, because last year's figures are buried in the transport lines. It is extremely difficult.

The Minister has admitted that the figures in the yellow book are incorrect. In fact, the Minister has already brought to the fore the point which I made in my last question and which I was going to explore in my next question. I refer to the fact that the Government is using the Recreation and Sport Fund (or the Soccer Pools Fund, as it is commonly known) to prop up departmental expenditure.

It seems likely that funds from this source are being used in both the recurrent and capital lines. When in Opposition, the present Minister asked me, especially during the passage of the soccer pools legislation, whether I would give an undertaking that moneys from the Recreation and Sport Fund would not be used as an excuse by the Treasury to cut back on normal funding. I submit to the Committee that that is exactly what has occurred in this case.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The honourable member is incorrect. It does not appear in the capital lines at all; it comes from the Recreation and Sport Fund.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Is the Minister saying that no money has gone from the Recreation and Sport Fund into the capital lines?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is correct.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** If the money is to be used for an aquatic centre it is coming from capital.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No determination has been made in that regard. When the Budget was framed negotiations were still proceeding with the Adelaide City Council in regard to the proposal for an aquatic centre at North Adelaide. That does not appear in the Budget. What I referred

to previously were various programmes by the Department that would assist recreation and sport in a substantial way.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The Minister did not answer my question.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** For a start, it is not in capital.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Forget about the capital lines. As a supplementary question, does the Minister deny that funds from the Recreation and Sport Fund (or the Soccer Pools Fund) are being used to prop up the Recreation and Sport budget?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Funding from that source is not being used to prop up the Recreation and Sport budget at all. That funding is for the use of the Department in whatever way the Government and I as Minister believe it can be best utilised. I point out again that we are using those funds in the interests of recreation and sport in South Australia and not necessarily just to prop up the Budget, as the honourable member suggested. That funding is being utilised to the best advantage possible. I thought that the Recreation and Sport Fund was there to support recreation and sport; that is what it is being used for.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I believe that the Treasury is screwing the Department by using its dedicated fund to save it having to pay the usual moneys to the Department.

**Mr MAYES:** I refer to page 126 of the Estimates of Payments and the line 'Recreation Officers, Administrative, Clerical and General Staff'. The Minister previously indicated that he intended to appoint a women's recreation and sport officer to his Department. Has provision been made under this line for that position and, if so, what are the details?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** In the reorganisation of the Department it is proposed to appoint a women's recreation and sport officer. I have already said that on a number of occasions in the House. It is Government policy to appoint such a person, who will be the focal point for the co-ordination of important initiatives in the field of recreation and sport for women. I have had representations made to me as Minister by a number of women's organisations that see great merit in such an appointment. It might also be worth pointing out that the previous Labor Administration had a women's recreation officer.

In the course of the reorganisation of the Department, I will be looking to the appointment of a women's recreation and sport officer as a priority appointment. I aim to introduce the position to help increase participation levels of women in sport and recreation, to increase the quality of programmes available to women, and to assist in the development of organisations responsible for sport and recreation programmes for women. However, provision for the appointment is not necessarily provided in the Budget. The appointment is in line with the reorganisation of the Department, which will take place in the near future.

**Mr MAYES:** Under the same line, I refer to a further announcement made by the Minister in relation to appointing an Aboriginal sports development co-ordinator to his Department. Again, is there provision for that appointment within the Estimates, and can the Minister give details of the progress of the appointment?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is provision in the lines for the appointment of an Aboriginal sports development officer for the Department. The total cost of providing the officer, including the funds for establishing the various programmes, will amount to an estimated \$65 000 in a full year. I think honourable members should remember that the officer is likely to be appointed towards the end of the year and, therefore, the cost for the remainder of this financial year will be about \$39 000. Half that amount will be provided by the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and the balance will be met from funds that have been provided in a number of Department of Recreation and Sport pro-

grammes. The funds are not identified separately. For example, \$8 000 will be provided this year to assist Aboriginal sporting groups in the purchase of equipment for funds, and that allocation appears under programme 2. I believe we will place considerable emphasis on the appointment of an Aboriginal sports co-ordinator as a departmental officer.

**Mr MAYES:** I refer to page 73 of the yellow book and 'Employment—average or full-time equivalents'. I refer to the proposed figures for 1982-83 and 1983-84 and note a slight reduction of staff numbers in the Department's overall programme. Where are the changes occurring and what areas, if any, will be affected by the reduction in staff that is anticipated?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** As I have said previously, a plan for reorganisation of the Department is proposed. A minimal reduction in staff numbers will occur in the reorganisation. I point out that the programmes include provision for a number of casual employees employed in camps and at the conference centre and contract staff currently employed as recreation officers in the community fitness field.

During 1982-83, a reduction of two weekly-paid employees was achieved in the area of camps and walking trails. During 1983-84, it will be necessary to reduce one contract position in the community fitness area. Until the reorganisation is completed, it is not appropriate for me to identify any other area of reduction. However, the reduction is only minimal (0.5).

**Mr EVANS:** The Minister said that the sum expected to be spent in 1983-84 was \$5.115 million and that the sum spent last year was \$5.008 million. Yet, there is an increase in current expenditure of \$681 000 and a decrease in capital expenditure of \$466 000. Do those figures definitely relate to the sum of \$5.115 million?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes.

**Mr EVANS:** If that is so, the difference between \$681 000 and \$466 000 is \$215 000, yet the difference between \$5.115 million and \$5.008 million is \$107 000. Therefore, there seems to be \$108 000 not accounted for. Where does that \$108 000 come from?

**Mr Watson:** There is a difference of \$107 000 between \$5.115 million and \$5.008 million, and that variation is made up of the following increases: operating \$34 000; community physical fitness \$49 000; 'Life. Be in it' \$15 000; recreation camps \$21 000; recreation development grants \$30 000; sports coaching \$80 000; accommodation charges from Public Buildings Department \$182 000; Betting Control Board \$16 000; Royal Life Saving Society \$1 000; Surf Life-saving \$2 000; competition assistance \$50 000; South Australian Jockey Club \$8 000; South Australian Sports Institute \$241 000; publications promotions \$40 000; salary subsidy for sport \$67 000; salary subsidy for recreation \$40 000; loan facilities from capital funds \$83 000; Commonwealth (for the Aboriginal Sports Development Officers) \$35 000; purchase of motor vehicles \$32 000; Public Buildings Department recurrent charges \$5 000; sinking fund \$13 000; trust account ('Life. Be in it') \$10 000; and deposit account \$2 000. The total of those increases is \$1.056 million.

The reductions are as follows: research programmes \$5 000; South Australian Cricket Association \$20 000; aquatic centre (expenditure incurred last year) \$598 000; grant to Olympic Games \$25 000; equipment \$6 000; Public Buildings Department capital \$85 000; salaries \$30 000; and office services (Public Buildings Department) \$18 000. The total of those reductions (\$949 000) must be deducted from the total of the increases (\$1.056 million) to give a variation of \$107 000.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is not much difference between last year's actual expenditure and this year's proposed expenditure, except that \$598 000 was spent last year on the proposed aquatic centre in Hindley Street in con-

sultancy, design and documentation fees. The Budget provides no such expenditure this year.

**Mr EVANS:** I am happy with the officer's figures and with what the Minister has said. However, my figures seem to show that the Government expects to spend \$107 000 more. The overall total is \$5.115 million, yet, taking into consideration the increase in recurrent expenditure of \$681 000 and the decrease in capital expenditure of \$466 000, another \$108 000 does not appear to be shown to cover the proposed expenditure; there is a difference of \$108 000. If the Government is to increase recurrent expenditure by \$681 000 and to decrease capital expenditure by \$466 000, there is a difference of \$215 000. The amount that has been budgeted to increase the overall expenditure is \$107 000, so the sum of \$108 000 to be found is not shown in the overall figure expected to be spent this financial year.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Mr Watson has explained the difference in expenditure. I could ask him to clarify the matter further.

**Mr EVANS:** I take it that the total amount to be spent this year is \$5.115 million.

**Mr Watson:** That is correct.

**Mr EVANS:** I also take it that last year \$5.008 million was spent, making a difference of \$107 000. Yet we are decreasing the capital expenditure by \$466 000.

**Mr Watson:** The decrease is \$574 000.

**Mr EVANS:** So the statement on page 72 of the book is not accurate?

**Mr Watson:** The correct statement in paragraph 1 on page 72 of the yellow book should be 'a decreased capital expenditure of \$574 000'. The difference is \$107 000.

**Mr EVANS:** I am satisfied. The figure in the documents that we were given is wrong, and the amended figure is correct. On page 72 of the yellow book, the following statement appears:

In general terms, the Department has planned to expand its programmes in order to implement high priority Government policies, and in the main this will be achieved by utilising Soccer Pool revenue.

What are the 'high priority Government policies' to be promoted? Which policies does the Government consider to be low priority policies, and will they be demoted or left at a standstill?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Government has already implemented a number of increases. One of the priorities that we have is with regard to the South Australian Sports Institute. I have increased the Institute's allocation this year from \$139 000 to \$380 000. All of the other programmes that I have put to the Committee previously are ones that I regard as having priority, even though the ongoing commitments are made over a period of time. It is important that we utilise the soccer pool revenue to improve opportunities for recreation and sport in South Australia. Soccer pools have maintained a level of return to the Department, the average return being \$17 000 or \$18 000 a week. As a consequence, we are able to confidently assume that money will be available to fund the programmes that I have mentioned previously. Indeed, some of this money may be utilised for other programmes that the Department, or the Government, sees as having priority in the future.

**Mr EVANS:** The Minister, during the sitting of the last Parliament, moved a resolution that in the opinion of the House the Federal Government should do something about its sales tax on sporting goods. In other words, he said that it was unfair for there to be a sales tax on sporting goods. One of the big burdens on sporting organisations in this State, particularly when they are trying to provide for young people to be trained in team and individual sports, is this high Federal sales tax. The Minister was adamant and strong in saying that this tax was unfair, should be abolished and

that the former State Government should take all necessary measures to encourage the then Federal Government to change its policy on sales tax on sporting goods, particularly for groups in the amateur sporting field. Has the Minister made representations to the Federal Government in recent times asking it to abolish this shocking and iniquitous tax that penalises sporting people, particularly juniors, and, if he has not, will he make such representations in the near future?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is no doubt that sales tax on sporting goods is an inhibiting factor so far as sport in South Australia is concerned. This applies not only to South Australia but throughout the Commonwealth. I do not resile from the philosophy I expressed when moving that motion. I have not made representations to the Federal Government, but I am informed that my predecessors from both sides of politics have, in the past, made approaches about this matter. I will certainly make such an approach, even though it may fall on deaf ears. I think that we ought to ensure that opportunities, particularly in amateur sport, are used, because some of the more professional sports have opportunities that smaller amateur sports bodies do not have. I support the philosophy that I expressed on that occasion and am happy to make the representations.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 75 of the programme papers under the heading 'Support Services Category' and the sub-heading 'Administrative and Clerical Support', an amount of \$309 000 is shown as expenditure for 1982-83 and an amount of \$488 000 is shown as proposed expenditure for 1983-84. In light of the slight reduction in overall staff numbers that is proposed for 1983-84, will the Minister explain the increase in that allocation?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Of the \$179 000 increase for 1983-84, an amount of \$136 000 is Public Buildings Department accommodation charges, an amount previously shown in inter-agency charges. The balance of \$43 000 relates to a small Ministerial expense provision, increased automatic data processing costs, workers compensation, and services and supply charges. In addition, the salary allocation has been increased by \$14 000, which includes a further provision of \$3 000 for terminal leave payments. It is proposed that this additional expenditure will be in the area of financial control.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 71 under the heading 'Implications for Resources', it states:

The ever increasing demand for recreational and sporting opportunities will place pressure on available resources in both manpower and funds. New sources of revenue, such as sports lotteries, will be explored to attempt to gain additional funds.

Will the Minister advise the Committee what progress has been made in introducing a sports lottery? Is such a lottery likely to be introduced in 1983-84 and, if so, what is the estimated revenue from that source?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I answered this question in part in answer to a question asked by the member for Hanson in the House. It is proposed to initiate a sports lottery which will be conducted by the South Australian Lotteries Commission. The actual format of that sports lottery has not yet been determined. The Government certainly has a commitment to the introduction of a sports lottery. It is intended that the money derived from this lottery will be placed in a fund similar to the soccer pools fund, the Recreation and Sport Fund, which will be available to the Department in a similar manner. The Acting Director and I have had discussions with the General Manager of the Lotteries Commission and the Chairman of the Commission about this matter in order to determine some plan regarding the introduction of this lottery in 1984. It is hoped that the lottery will start early in that year.

It will be necessary for amendments to be made to the Lotteries Act and perhaps to the Lottery and Gaming Act to provide the necessary legislation for such a change. The lottery will then be implemented. I think that it is important to realise that the total revenue collected by the Department of Recreation and Sport (and I think that it is important for the Committee to know this) and agencies under my portfolio will be \$13.1 million in 1983-84. Out of that total sum only \$780 000 will be available to the Department for expenditure on recreation and sport. This is an estimated return from soccer pools. Therefore, I am anxious to initiate this sports lottery, which is part of Government policy. I believe that such a lottery will work. However, we need to establish a formula with regard to this lottery. I am hoping that we will be able to do that in the near future and that, as a consequence, it will come into operation early in the new year.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The Government has initiated the creation of a new Recreation and Sport administration centre. Can the Minister advise the costs for this, and are they provided for in the 1983-84 Estimates?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No, they are not provided for in the Estimates. As I said before in regard to the aquatic centre, when the Estimates and Budget were framed the decision to shift the administration centre from Goodwood Road to the corner of King William and Sturt Streets had not been taken. The cost of commissioning the new centre will be \$150 000, which will be met from existing departmental resources. It is expected that the sale of the property at 67 South Terrace will offset that cost to a very great extent.

For the information of the members of the Committee, the Department has property at 67 South Terrace, which is a very old building and not worth anything, but we anticipate that the land is worth something like \$100 000, and arrangements have been made to offset the cost of the commissioning of the new Recreation and Sport administration centre to a very large extent from the sale of that property. Additional rental will be incurred in providing additional space for a number of recreation organisations as well as additional sporting organisations. It is very important to recreation and sport that we upgrade the level of administration, and the additional costs involved are outweighed by the advantages that we will have in providing further opportunities and facilities for other sports and recreational groups to have an administration headquarters. I hope that we will be able to move into the new building in early December.

It has additional parking. The problem that existed at Goodwood Road was mainly in relation to parking and limited space. The parking available in the new centre will be adequate: 36 spaces are available for parking on site.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Morphett.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I think that I have had only two questions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think that you have had three. The member for Morphett.

**Mr OSWALD:** Going back to the aquatic centre, the original cost of the aquatic centre as was planned by the former Government was in round terms \$7.5 million. I notice in the estimate in a press statement by the Minister that it is now proposed that it will be \$4.75 million, which is a reduction of some \$2.75 million. I also am of the opinion that there is a dollar-for-dollar Commonwealth Government subsidy, and I assume that that still applies. Out of that saving of \$2.75 million, of which the Commonwealth had set aside as a commitment by the former Fraser Government-

**An honourable member:** The Fraser Government promised \$3.75 million.

**Mr OSWALD:** Regardless of how much the Fraser Government promised on a one-for-one basis in real terms, there is about \$1.25 million that has not been committed but was promised by the Federal Government. Will that money be made available to your Department for distribution elsewhere to that sport or to another sport?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The answer is 'Yes', but let me first comment on the previous project for an aquatic centre in Hindley Street. The estimated cost of the project at the time of the completion of the detailed drawings was \$11.67 million. The current proposal to cover and upgrade the North Adelaide Swimming Centre (the actual cost on present-day figures—and it is not firmed as yet) would be \$4.75 million.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is what we are talking about. They are on current figures in October this year. No doubt, there will be an inflationary factor. As I said, it has not quite firmed up yet, but is in the process. Half of that will be available to us from the Commonwealth. We have already done a small one, and that was the roller skating at Parks Community Centre, which I believe is a very good project. So, whatever moneys are available to us after the aquatic centre is completed will be available for other sports as long as they fit the criteria in regard to an international standard facility.

**Mr OSWALD:** Based on what the Minister said then (that the cost to the Government is \$4.75 million, of which the Commonwealth is picking up half the tab), that leaves \$2.375 million that the State Government is paying. The Minister said earlier that because of the planning process he has not provided for any money in the present Budget. He may have explained earlier, and I may have missed the point, but in his press release he said that work on the centre was expected to start in April and end by 5 October, 1984. So, he is planning to finish it this financial year, which means that he has to pay contractors. If he has not provided the \$2.375 million in the Budget, can he give some indication of where the money is coming from to pay the contractors?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It will not be completed in the current financial year. Some costs will be involved; no doubt, some construction costs. We are currently negotiating with Treasury to what extent it will be funded during this year even though it is not provided for in the Budget. The member for Torrens should be the last person to laugh because he made such a mess of the last operation of an aquatic centre. Nevertheless, there is still money available to us in the Recreation and Sports Fund which we can utilise if we desire. Indeed, as I mentioned previously, the introduction of sports lotteries will also make money available to us for whatever projects we believe are necessary and important to us in our priorities.

**Mr OSWALD:** On a totally different subject, the Government is considering a casino in South Australia. My question relates to what studies have been carried out by the Minister into the impact of the casino in South Australia on the racing industry and, in particular, on T.A.B. receipts. In the event of an inevitable fall in the T.A.B. turnover, will the Government be prepared to increase the T.A.B. payouts to the racing codes to avoid the clubs having to reduce their stake money?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, the casino legislation passed both Houses early this year, and the Casino Supervisory Authority has to go through the processes of determining where the casino will be located and who will be its operators.

Once that decision is made, the building of the casino must then occur. I commented in the House in the casino debate on my fears and apprehensions of what might happen to other forms of gambling, not just racing. The Department

administers small lotteries which may or may not have an effect on sporting clubs. We can only guess at the result. I believe that in the Northern Territory bookmakers turnover fell considerably (the Northern Territory does not have a T.A.B.) for the first year of the operation of casinos in Darwin and Alice Springs but it climbed back to a level after 12 months. I would not like that to happen here. Currently, the South Australian T.A.B. is doing exceptionally well, having had a record year with a record profit. It is important that that is maintained because of the importance of the funds going to the racing industry, as well as the trotting and greyhound industries. I share the member's apprehension about what may occur. Unfortunately, we can only guess at the result.

The reason for the success of the T.A.B. in the past 18 months has been a combination of factors. The T.A.B. has been innovative. I supported 'after race' payouts, which was a bone of contention for some time, plus other innovations. Good management has also put the T.A.B. in that position.

It is not only the T.A.B. that could be affected but also the Lotteries Commission, which is not under my jurisdiction, but there are certainly some smaller lotteries and other gambling aspects in South Australia. It is only an estimate and I cannot say with any certainty what may or may not occur.

**Mr OSWALD:** I have a supplementary question. I thank the Minister for his answer thus far, but he did not answer my question. In the event of a fall in T.A.B. turnover, will the Government be willing to increase T.A.B. pay-outs to the racing codes to avoid the clubs having to reduce their stake money? There is no casino in operation at present but the racing codes now are vitally concerned about the matter of stake money. The Minister will recall the discussions on the 11½ per cent for country clubs, which is relevant because, until we determine how the stake money will be derived, all formulas vary.

Even today the racing industry is justified in asking what is the Government's attitude in the event of the stake money being reduced because there is a reduction in T.A.B. pay-outs. The Minister quoted the Northern Territory. I submit that the problem is real in Hobart, and it could flow to South Australia. As a matter of policy, will your Government be willing to increase T.A.B. pay-outs to racing clubs to avoid the clubs having to reduce their stake money?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Presently the pay-out, as the member described it, is based on the percentage of investment in each particular code. Presently, it is about 69 per cent to the racing industry, 21 per cent or 22 per cent to the trotting industry and between 11 per cent and 13 per cent to the greyhound industry. When one talks about increasing the pay-out, it is not my intention to change the distribution formula. Certainly, the Government would support, and I would support it as Minister, further innovations by the T.A.B. rather than straight Government assistance to counter the effect of what may occur with the advent of a casino in South Australia. That is the important thing we have to consider.

If we do it for the racing industry, as I said before, we must also consider what effect it may have on other sporting clubs and groups where it is just as important in regard to their fundraising activities and the like. The member for Fisher has raised this matter in the House. Sometimes their only source of revenue is through a small lottery or bingo. If we are going to advocate a cast-iron guarantee to the racing industry through T.A.B.—if turnover diminishes—I do not think I can give that guarantee, except to say that I will be doing everything possible to assist them in whatever way possible to counter the effects of a casino in South Australia.

**Mr INGERSON:** The Minister commented that he would be looking forward enthusiastically to the moneys that would come from soccer pools. I note from page 72 that we expect to obtain \$100 000 less this year than was received last year. That seems to be surprising enthusiasm for a considerable smaller sum. The problem that I note in the whole area of recreation and sport is a lack of capital, particularly in regard to clubs and facilities for the aged. Right through the Budget is a comment of reduction in capital expenditure. Therefore, will the Minister talk quietly and confidently to the Minister of Labour to see whether job creation scheme funds can be transferred to sporting and recreation 'capital' facilities, because the capital area is the major area of concern for all these clubs and recreation groups?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am pleased that the member has raised this matter. He is so right. One of the big problems that sporting clubs have is raising sufficient capital to either build or expand their premises. Over a period Governments have administered the capital facility development programme, and the member would probably realise that in the last few months or six weeks I made an announcement about the allocation of funds to various sporting groups and other activities in South Australia. One of those dealt with aged people in the district of the member from Bragg; that is, the War Veterans Home at Fullarton, which is building a recreation room for residents. We had to assess (and this happens every year) on the basis of money available what priority is afforded to each and every application.

But, there is never enough money to go around. I will not delay proceedings by going through the list of applications given the nod this year. I changed some of the criteria. It was important that we spend most of our money on areas of participation, rather than buildings, as buildings are a costly exercise and costs increase continuously. I reduced the amount available for a grant to a third of the total amount. An amount of 50 per cent was available previously, but not many facilities received that grant. It is very difficult to allocate a limited amount of money. The total applications received this year amount to \$7.5 million, whereas applications totalling \$15 million were received last year, so it is down, but demand is still there.

The honourable member also related his remarks to the community employment programme of the Commonwealth Government. We are negotiating with that Government and there are five applications for programmes under that scheme. I am hopeful that those programmes will be approved. I understand that a joint announcement will be made by the Minister of Labour and the Federal Minister concerning those five schemes probably next week.

**Mr INGERSON:** There is concern in the racing industry about the appointment of Chairman to the Racecourses Development Board and Chairman of the T.A.B. Can the Minister advise when these appointments will be made?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There are three separate groups of the Racecourses Development Board. The Acting Director is Mr Taylor. The racing codes have two appointments to each code. The Chairman of the T.A.B. passed away a few weeks ago. I have made a submission to Cabinet regarding his replacement. I am not at liberty to tell the Committee who that person is as it has to go through Executive Council tomorrow.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Would it be a former member of the House?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Tomorrow afternoon I will be able to tell you who it is. Under the terms of the Racing Act I can only appoint a person only for the remainder of the term of the Chairman, which expires in February 1984.

**Mr INGERSON:** On page 76 of the Programme Estimates it comments, 'Implement the recommendations of the report on "An Approach to Sports Development in South Aus-

tralia". What is happening in that area and what are the recommendations?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The report was prepared internally by officers of the Department. Some recommendations in the report have been implemented. The report concerns facilities that we have talked about before, and some of those initiatives have been undertaken. One initiative is the international softball facility at West Beach, which will cost \$400 000. The other initiative is the South Australian Small Bore Rifle Association headquarters at West Beach, which is an international facility and will cost \$100 000. This facility will be built with \$45 000 from both the State and the Federal Governments over two years and \$10 000 from the Association.

**Mr INGERSON:** Can the Minister supply us with a copy of that report?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** This report is an internal document prepared by officers of the Department. I will consider that request and advise the honourable member accordingly.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Recently I understand that there has been a change in the shareholdings of Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd. Can the Minister inform us of the companies involved and give us any other information he has on this matter?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There has been a change in the shareholdings of Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd. Under the Act it is necessary for the soccer pools to advise the Minister that this will take place. The company wrote to me last month seeking consent to the change, which had previously been proposed but was delayed. The changed shareholding advice indicated that Vernons Pools (U.K.) had 33⅓ per cent interest, Y.V. (M) Nominees Pty Ltd (which is a nominee company of News Limited) had 150 000 shares and a 33⅓ per cent interest. The additional shareholder is Consolidated Press Holdings, an Australian company, with 150 000 shares and a 33⅓ per cent interest. So, the change will result in Australian interests controlling two-thirds of the capital of Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd. With the additional expertise of a new shareholder we hope to build sales in South Australia. I am advised that the company is about to undertake an extensive promotional campaign in the near future, the aspects of which I am not familiar with.

**Mr HAMILTON:** What additional funds has the Government provided to the Racecourses Development Board and from what sources? Have grants been made by the Board using these funds?

**Mr Taylor:** The Government legislated to provide additional income to all the racing codes from unclaimed fractions and dividends. That occurred from 1 August 1982 when the Racing Act was amended so that unclaimed dividends relating to T.A.B. betting would be equally shared between the Government and the racing industry. Previously, that money had been paid into Government revenue. Those funds were made available to the Racecourses Development Board in proportion to the percentages of turnover of T.A.B. betting.

In 1982-83 the total amount made available to the Board from this source was \$694 362. In a full year it is estimated that that amount may be about \$761 000. Some decisions have already been taken in relation to the disbursement of those funds. Announcements have been made in the press in recent weeks about that funding. One announcement of particular interest indicated that \$400 000 per annum will be allocated from the Board to the S.A.J.C. That money will be made available to the S.A.J.C. as a club and not as a controlling body for the repayment of principal on a loan in relation to the Morphettville Racecourse grandstand. That repayment of \$400 000 a year will be reviewed annually.

It is expected that the application of those funds for the repayment of the loan will considerably speed up that repayment and, in fact, it should be repaid in about 1989. The other implication of that is that interest payments will reduce correspondingly. In turn, the S.A.J.C. should be able considerably to increase its stake money. Moneys made available to the trotting code have been applied to stake moneys: recently, \$55 000 was announced for the Sires Stake Series and another \$22 000 for stake money for other lesser races. In the greyhound code, funds have been made available over a whole range of grants and no one major grant has been made.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Additional moneys have also been made available from the Racecourses Development Board to assist country racing.

**Mr Taylor:** Funding in that area amounts to about \$200 000 per annum.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to the Budget papers which show an increase for the South Australian Sports Institute of \$241 000 this year compared to funding for 1982-83. Will the Minister clarify the source of the additional funds and what benefits does he expect to gain from the increased expenditure? What revenue has been paid into the Recreation and Sport Fund, what money has been expended, and what is the current level of receipts?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will not get any benefit out of the South Australian Sports Institute or the moneys that have been allocated. I do not think that I qualify for a scholarship. Nevertheless, there are many elite sportsmen who will benefit from the additional funds and who will gain from the increased expenditure in this area. I am appreciative of the efforts of the previous Minister in establishing the South Australian Sports Institute. I think that was a great initiative. Indeed, it has proven itself and it has obtained results.

Only a few weeks ago I took the opportunity to visit the National Sports Institute in Canberra, which has received a tremendous amount of taxpayers' money. I believe that it is unfortunate that that institute is not sufficiently utilised to justify the money spent on it. However, I believe that the South Australian Sports Institute certainly justifies the expenditure allocated last year. In view of that, the Government decided to provide additional money to the institute this year. In 1983-84 the additional support for the institute amounts to \$241 000 provided as follows: \$161 000 from the Recreation and Sport Fund and \$80 000 from the Loan Account.

The \$80 000 was provided from the Loan Account to honour a commitment made by the previous Minister. The present Government does not go back on its word. The previous Minister's Government made the decision for us in that respect. I understand that the previous Government decided to supplement the base figure of \$139 000. The difference is quite considerable, although it is not quite as much as the Opposition pretends. I believe that the institute has already made a substantial contribution to the development of top level sport in South Australia. The scholarships are divided practically equally between male and female recipients. I think it is generally known that, in addition to the previous members of the board, I have appointed two other women in the persons of Eyvonne Hill and Margaret Ralston. It was a great initiative. We need to give our top athletes every opportunity to improve their performances. I believe that the Sports Institute is going exceptionally well and it has obtained results.

**Mr EVANS:** I refer to page 71 of the yellow book, as follows:

To create within the community an awareness of, and a positive attitude towards the variety and scope of all forms of recreation



and sport as a contribution towards the fulfilment and well-being of South Australians;

I think that that is an excellent statement. Has the Minister's Department or the Government in another Department considered the benefit of attempting on an ongoing basis to convince communities or organisations, before they make final application for sporting grants (whether under the job creation scheme or under various allocations for projects), about the benefit of voluntary contribution in the development of sporting projects?

I pick up the point that the Minister made to the effect that this year the Department has moved (I take it through Government direction) towards spending more money on playing arenas and playing surfaces than on buildings. If we are to create jobs, it is important to build as many buildings as possible and encourage voluntary work in their construction. The money saved in the use of voluntary labour creates many more job opportunities down the line in the supply and cartage of materials. The creation of playing surfaces, and so on, does not have the same result and, quite often, it involves specialised work that cannot be performed by voluntary labour. If we conducted an education programme through sporting organisations and community groups in relation to the benefit of voluntary effort, there could be an overall benefit to the Government in relation to the distribution of funds, particularly for buildings. A building is beneficial because when it is completed it can be a revenue raiser. Therefore, there is an ongoing benefit to offset the capital expenditure by the voluntary effort from individuals and groups.

We would thereby achieve much more as a community than we do at present. I am aware that the Government (to a degree quite rightly) is directing more of its money to communities that claim to be disadvantaged. Indeed, the records of certain departments show that there are many disadvantaged people. However, a direction has never been given to the leaders of such communities to use the money by means of voluntary effort, although they may be just as dedicated as leaders in other communities who may be more motivated because of the existing social structure.

Has encouragement been given to providing greater voluntary effort? We are providing courses for administrators of sporting and recreation clubs to give them more expertise in their role and we are also providing courses to provide sports trainers, sports coaches, and recreational advisers. There is a tendency for such people to go into the community, to do work and to ask for a payment, whereas at one time they would work voluntarily. So, while the Department is increasing the expertise of these people in administrative and coaching roles, there is a greater need for money to maintain clubs and organisations. Therefore, I believe that we are creating a problem for this Government and for future Governments by not trying to emphasise the benefit of a voluntary contribution whereby we might even say to these clubs and groups, 'Where there is a voluntary effort there will be a greater Government contribution than where there is little or no voluntary effort'. If we do not do something like this and if we are not cautious about this trend, we are heading for disaster.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The theory is exceptionally good, but practical problems may be associated with the theory of grants being provided on the basis of voluntary contribution. In using the term 'voluntary contribution', does the honourable member advocate that clubs provide the labour to build clubrooms and such capital items? That task requires expertise such as architectural advice. Even now some clubs and groups, depending on the persons in charge of their administration and on the ability of members, do something on their own behalf in that regard. So, the suggestion works

occasionally, but I see practical problems for the Government if grants are to be based on voluntary labour.

Concerning programmes to develop capital facilities, we usually ask the club applying for the grant to provide a substantial amount of capital for the facility. This depends on the ability of the club or group to provide a sum to match the grant from the Department of Recreation and Sport and a contribution from local government. I would like time to consider the honourable member's suggestion.

**Mr EVANS:** All I ask of the Minister is that he consider whether we can move in that direction and encourage that sort of voluntary approach. Either on his accession to office, or shortly afterwards, the Minister received a report on Mickey Mouse clubs in hotels: that is, social clubs that are set up in hotels which run on minor licences and operate such amenities as bingo machines, envelopes and beer tickets. The idea is that the customer drawing the ticket from the machine can obtain goods such as bottled beer. Concern has been expressed by the Australian Hotels Association that some licensees have not always been perfectly honest in the operation of their social clubs, and difficulty has been experienced in tracing some of the money raised. In fact, I believe that legal action was undertaken in one case but abandoned through lack of evidence as to what had happened to the money involved.

Hotels often use this form of club by encouraging sales as the club shows a profit. For instance, the hotel may provide a free meal for members of the club, but the hotel has paid for the meal from the profits of a lottery run by the club in the hotel. The effect of these practices on some clubs has been disastrous. I do not ask that the opportunity to run minor raffles in hotels be abolished, but I ask the Minister to consider the report which was made to him and which should cover this aspect. In conclusion, I ask the Minister how long it has taken to fill the most recent \$1 million lottery and when it is likely to be drawn so that I can benefit from it. Will further lotteries of this kind be held in future?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I cannot answer the questions about the \$1 million lottery because that is run not by my Department but by the Lotteries Commission, which is not under my jurisdiction. A working party set up by the previous Minister has reported to me on the activity of hotel social clubs. I did not accept all the recommendations in the report, although I accepted 95 per cent of them. Indeed, I believed that a couple of recommendations needed further consideration. The report has been with me for some time and I have considered it thoroughly. I wish to discuss with representatives of the working party the recommendations in which I do not concur.

There is agreement about the fact that some hotel social groups operate in a way prejudicial to the intent of small lotteries, which were designed to provide sporting and social clubs with the chance to raise funds. One of the unfortunate things that has occurred is that instant bingo and beer ticket machines tend to become monopolies controlled by hotel social clubs, and that has been prejudicial to other groups of people wanting to operate such innovations, especially in a hotel. When a decision has been made in this matter, action will be taken to ensure that everyone who desires to obtain a small lottery licence will have an equal chance to raise funds.

**Mr EVANS:** There is a need in this State for an equestrian centre of national and international standard. I am led to believe that a proposition has been floating around for some time for a Government Department, with the support of those involved in the sport (a sport with a large following), to repossess approximately 5 hectares of the land acquired by the Housing Trust from the Cheltenham racecourse people



to help the South Australian Jockey Club out of its financial difficulties by developing it as an equestrian centre.

The idea was for there to be a development of stables in the middle of the Cheltenham racecourse, those stables to be made available to members of the public so that they could stable ponies for seniors and juniors. This proposition would be ideal for people in the north-western area of Adelaide. I think that such a centre would be an important adjunct to sport and recreation in this State. Will the Minister say how far this proposal has progressed, and whether we will see it implemented within the next 12 months?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not aware of any proposal for an equestrian centre as described by the member for Fisher.

**Mr EVANS:** You have had no approaches about it?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There have been numerous approaches from the equestrian fraternity over a time for varying degrees of assistance, but I am not aware of any special proposal such as the one described by the member for Fisher.

**Mr EVANS:** Not even at Cheltenham?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No.

**Mr HAMILTON:** It would be remiss of me, after the magnificent win by West Adelaide at Football Park on Saturday, if I did not ask the Minister when the lighting towers at Football Park will be erected? One would hope that the lights will be operating in time for the next football season so that night football might be played there.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I cannot answer that question. This is a matter between the South Australian National Football League and West Lakes Limited. I understand that they have reached an agreement regarding the height of the towers and the intensity of the lights. I understand from secondhand information that the lights will be erected early in the new year and will be operating before the next football season.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister advise me what amounts of money will be spent to assist disabled persons who wish to participate in sport? In what specific areas will money be spent to help disabled persons in South Australia to participate in sport and for what specific sports will that money be spent?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There are a number of programmes to assist disabled people to engage in sports. They come under the heading of 'Recreation for Disabled Persons'. A recreation officer is employed to work in this field for the greater part of his working time. Disabled persons face particular problems in achieving recreation opportunities. These opportunities centre not only on the problem of physical access but also on the general attitude and acceptance by the community of these matters. Improvements have been made in housing, education, welfare and employment services for these people. There is much more to do to improve the wider acceptance of disabled persons in the community. Recreation plays a vitally important role in their acceptance in community life.

As I have said, a number of schemes are available through which a disabled person can be assisted to participate in sport. They are as follows: the Capital Assistance Scheme; Equipment Subsidy Scheme; Recreation and Development Grants; Coaches' Development Scheme; Junior Sports Talent Coaching Scheme; Attendance at National Events Scheme; Conduct of Interstate Sporting Events Scheme; and, more specifically, the Special services programme grant which has currently allocated \$3 000 towards the development of recreational opportunities for disabled persons. The aim of this scheme is to encourage disabled persons to become more involved in on-going recreation activities, to provide assistance in physical acquisitions and to foster integration.

Grants may be approved in respect of recreation programmes which cater for disabled persons, are innovative, new, or are yet to commence with the organisation concerned or which positively encourage integration of some degree of independence. Assistance may be given for instruction, hire of facilities, publicity and administration, minor equipment, consumer items, hire of adaptive equipment or minor alterations. I point out that the Sports Administration Centre provides a facility for the South Australian Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association to have a full-time administrator and for the Recreation Association for the Disabled in South Australia and the Sport and Recreation Association for Intellectually Disabled Persons in South Australia to have part-time administrators.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister inform the Committee what money is available for those persons who are retired, or for senior citizens clubs, what emphasis is placed on this area by the Department of Recreation and Sport and how much money has been spent in previous years to assist these people to enjoy their retirement?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The amount of money involved is tied in with the general programme and is not itemised. I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I turn to the Sports Institute, and thank the Minister for his comments and for bringing to the fore the fact that I compromised him somewhat by writing a letter to the Chairman promising the Institute another \$80 000 last year from Loan funds. I do not mind taking the blame for that matter, at all.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** They kept us to it.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Knowing the personnel at the Sports Institute, I had no doubt that the Minister would be held to that promise. It has been mentioned that there has been an increase of \$245 000 in the allocation to the Sports Institute this year. However, the total amount allocated to the Institute this year is \$300 000 compared with \$139 000 plus \$80 000 last year. I do not therefore see where the amount of \$245 000 comes in. I am not fussed about this matter. I applaud the fact that the Government has given extra money to the Institute. Will the Minister clarify this point when answering my question? When as Minister I attended Recreation Ministers conferences there were proposals for decentralisation of the Australian Institute of Sport.

One piece of decentralisation that was mentioned quite widely was that the Western Australians would take up the role of the Australian Institute of Sport in relation to hockey so that it would become a branch of the Australian Institute of Sport. I always believed—and had some preliminary discussions on the matter—that South Australia could become a branch of the Australian Institute of Sport in regard to cycling, in which we are almost pre-eminent in this country. Has the Minister been able to further these discussions, and is there any chance that the South Australian Sports Institute could become a branch of the Australian Sports Institute for at least one sport?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, I have pursued it with the Federal Minister (Hon. John Brown). He has given me more or less an assurance that that will occur, but it would be in the Federal Budget next year. I might also mention that the cycling fraternity made approaches of its own to the Federal Minister through the Australian coach, Charlie Walsh, and then officially through the organisation, both in the State and nationally. I am very pleased to tell the member for Torrens that I have followed it up. It would be a great innovation for cycling in South Australia. A number of factors are helpful to us in relation to cycling in this State. It is true that we have some most outstanding competitors in this sport. Charlie Walsh would be recognised as one of the best cycling coaches in the world. As I said, I am hopeful

(more than hopeful—I am pretty well assured) that in the next Federal Budget there will be an allocation to the Sports Institute to diversify its activities. The Federal Minister is quite keen on this diversification.

I have also made another bid for rowing to be considered in South Australia. I am less hopeful about that, but I can still pursue it as much as possible. Here again, we have two things going for us: first, the venue at West Lakes is also the best in Australia. The second advantage is that again in that area we have a considerable influence in the rowing field in Australia, having won the Kings Cup three times in a row and having provided probably a majority of participants in the Australian rowing team. So, I am hopeful that I can pursue that as well.

A question was also asked by the member for Torrens about the Sports Institute in regard to figures. The Director tells me that we have the breakdown of those figures if that is of interest to the Committee.

**Mr Taylor:** The previous figure for 1982-83 was, as the honourable member will remember, \$139 000, but \$11 000 had been provided in the year before that. In 1983-84, it is planned to provide \$380 000, but the sources of this are from three different pockets: \$139 000 from the miscellaneous line; Soccer Pools will provide \$161 000; and \$80 000 will come from Loan Account.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am glad to see that the present Minister is fiddling the books as well! I might say that for a project as worthy as that I am sure that no-one in the community would mind. Might I say at this stage on the matter of procedure that we have two other votes. The Opposition is well aware of that, but as the funding—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before the honourable member goes too far on that, I might suggest also to the whole Committee that I have been allowing questions that really relate to miscellaneous lines. The Sports Institute and the South Australian Jockey Club are on the miscellaneous lines. I was hoping that by showing a blind eye we might be able to get on with things more quickly.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I thank the Chairman. It is typical of the way that he has chaired these Committees, and we appreciate it. The funding, as has just been explained, to the Sports Institute comes from different pockets. In fact, with all areas in recreation and sport there is an overlap between the lines; so I thank you for that. We may get to the other lines later, but there will not be many questions.

My next question relates to the Betting Control Board. The Minister may wish to change officers if he wishes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the Minister to introduce his new officer at the table.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I introduce Mr Paul Morrissy, the Secretary of the Betting Control Board.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Is the Minister or the Government considering the introduction of telephone betting as far as bookmakers are concerned? If so, what limits would be applied to that telephone betting? Once again, what effect does the Minister expect such an introduction would have on the T.A.B.?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, I am not considering telephone betting on-course at all. The consideration has been given by the South Australian Jockey Club and the Betting Control Board. I have not played any part in that consideration at all, except to become aware of what was proposed by the South Australian Jockey Club. Mr Morrissy might be able to give us further information, but it is only a proposal at this stage and nothing has been really firmed up.

**Mr Morrissy:** Yes, it is still very much in the preliminary stages. The Jockey Club has met once only with the Betting Control Board, and has gone away to seek more accurate

figures, particularly from Telecom, on the likely cost of introducing telephone betting to on-course bookmakers. Concerning the specific question as to the effect on T.A.B., in the earlier discussions we talked in terms of a minimum bet of perhaps \$50 with a view to having little impact on the average T.A.B. bettor, but there is nothing firm at this stage.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is only a proposal, which has not really been firmed up.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I will not pursue the matter any further, but I assume—I hope correctly—that the Minister will consult the T.A.B. before any such decision is made by the Government.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes. I am advised by the General Manager of the T.A.B. (Mr Barry Smith) that the Jockey Club has had discussions with the T.A.B. on that matter.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am delighted to hear that. My third question goes back to the aquatic centre. By way of introduction, the Minister's figures which he quoted for the all-up cost of the Hindley Street proposal were correct. The original figures that were given to me in the consultant's report that I commissioned were of the order of \$9 million. Obviously, that inflated; hence my question to him before on the inflationary effects on the \$4.75 million that he mentioned for the North Adelaide pool.

In that same consultant's report, we asked for a preliminary costing of covering the North Adelaide pool because, as the Minister would realise at the time, it was one of the real alternatives to building a new aquatic centre in Hindley Street. Of course, as I remember that consultant's report, the figures for covering that pool were well over \$6 million, and that was in 1980 dollars. I am pleased that the Minister has been able to get a price considerably less than that. It shores up my opinion of that first consultant's report that we received, because it was inaccurate in many other respects as well. I hope that the material that the Minister has received is more accurate than the information which I received and on which the former Government based its decision.

If we are to be able to build an aquatic centre in Hindley Street for \$9 million and still retain North Adelaide pool, one could have two swimming centres for \$9 million rather than one for \$6.5 million. Obviously the cost benefit was there, but that did not eventuate.

I return to the question of funding and the Commonwealth matching grants to which the member for Morphett referred. The Minister said that \$515 000 was spent on the Hindley Street centre. I point out to the Committee that I understand that \$335 000 was received from the Commonwealth as a matching grant for the Hindley Street aquatic centre studies. Where has that \$335 000 gone? Has it gone into general revenue or has it been repaid to the Recreation and Sport Fund or the Soccer Pools Fund from which the initial expense money came for the Hindley Street centre?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am advised that the money has gone back into the Recreation and Sport Fund. The total expenditure was \$869 755, with a Commonwealth contribution of \$355 288, which resulted in a difference of \$514 467.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I was working on the figures from the Auditor-General's report, which were probably for the last financial year only. I therefore accept the correction.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister say what developments will be taking place in regard to hockey and the upgrading of hockey facilities in South Australia? Some of the best teams come from the north-western suburbs, which are in the District of Albert Park. It has been brought to my attention that consideration is being given to setting aside land in the southern suburbs for a hockey ground.

Can the Minister elaborate? Being somewhat parochial, I would like to see a hockey ground retained within my district, and there are several reasons for this. International hockey would have an enormous audience, especially in conjunction with countries such as India and Pakistan. I am most interested in the Minister's response. If a hockey ground is to be established, I hope that wherever it is it will be of an international standard.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have received a recent submission from the South Australian Hockey Association, although I have not yet had time to assess the submission. In the past it has made representations for one of the areas to which the member referred in the southern suburbs, the South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Field, where, I understand, women's hockey is played extensively at present.

We are looking at the concept of a synthetic field comprised of Astroturf, which is an extremely expensive undertaking and which would cost about \$1 million for a hockey field. The only capital city with such a facility is Perth, Western Australia, and I understand that it is also a recent development in Melbourne. It is an expensive operation and must be considered with all other demands for facilities for sport.

One unfortunate aspect was mentioned previously, although it is good luck for Western Australia and bad luck for South Australia. The Australian Institute of Sport regards Perth as the Australian hockey headquarters and, as a consequence, it has already established a Division of the Institute in Perth. That puts South Australia at some disadvantage in trying to provide for the association and people involved in hockey a synthetic surface at a cost of \$1 million.

**Mr HAMILTON:** In regard to 1986, can the Minister say what type of sporting events are planned for the bicentennial celebrations in South Australia? As there have been a number of announcements about the State's 150th birthday, can the Minister advise what type of events are planned for that specific year?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** A multitude of special sporting events are proposed for the 150th celebrations in 1986. As I mentioned in the House a few weeks ago, one of the great disappointments was that we had a bid for the world youth rowing championships, finished up in the final two, but Czechoslovakia beat us to the punch and will hold that championship in 1986. Nevertheless, we have the opportunity to hold that event in Adelaide for the Australian bicentenary in 1988. A number of sports have arranged their national championships in Adelaide in 1986. Two international events that have been confirmed are the World Roller Skating titles and the World Moth Class Sailing championship to be held at Largs Bay. I will provide the member with a complete list of sporting events to be held in 1986. Some that come to mind are the Surf Lifesaving Championships, the Australian Marathon and the 14th National Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Games.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister state the community response to the proposed Calcutta sweepstakes?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have had no response whatsoever.

**Mr OSWALD:** What distance was completed in the construction of the Heysen Trail in the last financial year?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** In 1982, 90 kilometres from Wilpena to Parachilna was completed. In 1983 until now we have completed 70 kilometres from Wilpena southwards to Hawker. This is not yet open, pending the availability of maps.

**Mr OSWALD:** A press release of the former Minister in 1982 stated that an average of 100 kilometres per year was being completed. It is interesting to see the current achievement and whether or not the project has been scaled down. Will the trail be completed for the 1986 celebrations?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The total distance completed in the past five years is 405 kilometres. The distance still to be completed is 670 kilometres. It is not likely that the trail will be completed by 1986 and, at its present rate of progress, it will probably be another seven or eight years.

**Mr OSWALD:** I have a supplementary question. Would the Government consider upgrading the priority of the Heysen Trail to have it completed for the 1986 celebrations?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is an application for a job creation programme to speed up the completion of the Heysen Trail and I hope that there will be a joint announcement with the Commonwealth Minister regarding that programme. That will certainly help us in regard to the completion of that trail.

**Mr OSWALD:** In view of the indication that legislative backing will shortly be upon us for the banning of cigarette advertising, particularly in relation to the electronic media, has the Minister studied the impact of the ban and how it will affect the ability of racing codes to encourage sponsorship? In the light of my earlier question, will the Government as a matter of policy move to compensate the codes for any loss of revenue as a result of the ban being brought into being?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The answer to the first part of the question is 'Yes' and the answer to the second part of the question is 'No'.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister advise whether greater interest has been shown of late in relation to little athletics. I have had considerable response in that regard in the north-western part of my district, particularly in the Newport area. Tremendous enrolments for little athletics have occurred in that area of late. What facilities and grants are available from the Government to clubs such as Newport Little Athletics Club? Are any other benefits available to little athletics clubs such as Newport?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Basic assistance would be in the provision of sports equipment and capital assistance. Little athletics associations are proliferating, and I understand that a number of new centres have been built in the past few years. Of course, that area receives important sponsorship from the State Government Insurance Commission and it receives limited assistance from the Government mostly in the area of sports equipment and some capital assistance.

**Mr EVANS:** I refer the Minister back to two earlier questions and ask whether the Minister can provide more complete answers, perhaps in writing. I refer to a statement on page 72 of the yellow book to the effect that the Government has directed the Department to implement high priority Government policies. In his earlier reply, the Minister did not mention any of those policies. Will the Minister provide in writing details of the policies that the Government regards as having a high priority and those that it regards as having a low priority at the present time? The Minister also stated that he had no knowledge of any representations being made to him in relation to the provision of an equestrian centre at Cheltenham. Will the Minister check with his departmental officers to see whether there is any documentation in the Department in that regard or whether any departmental officers have been approached in relation to the provision of an equestrian centre at the Cheltenham Racecourse? If that information is not available now, will he provide it in writing?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I give that undertaking in relation to both of the honourable member's questions: first, in relation to priorities for Government policies in the recreation and sport area and, secondly, I will check with the Department to see whether we have received any official approach. As I have said, I am not aware of any official approach. I will investigate the matter and advise the honourable member in writing.

**Mr EVANS:** Earlier, the Minister answered a question in relation to hockey, a sport that we all recognise as being of major importance in this State. It is a sport that has had some prominence in this State for some time, nearly as long as football. Has a joint project been considered to accommodate at least some of the soccer and hockey requirements under a single project?

I must confess that I have an interest in the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, and we are keen to see more development there by the Government. However, both the soccer and the basketball authorities are looking for an astro-turf facility. Will the Minister say whether approaches by those sports are being considered? Many other sports, such as power-weight lifting in the Olympic area, are looking for national or even international standard facilities to be used as headquarters in this State. However, soccer is tied to hockey to a certain extent and, although difficulty might be experienced in programming both sports, consideration should be given to their joint usage of an astro-turf facility until they can be provided with separate facilities.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Discussions have been held between departmental officers and representatives of the soccer and hockey associations regarding the joint use of a synthetic surface either at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields or at another venue in the city parklands.

**Mr Taylor:** We have taken up that matter. An important role of the Department is to co-ordinate such approaches so that groups that would not otherwise have thought to join with others will get that opportunity. The executive officer of the subcommittee of the Sports Advisory Council, which works on these matters for the Minister, has been working with various groups, not only the two referred to by the honourable member. I cannot say that I am optimistic about the outcome, but an attempt is being made.

**Mr EVANS:** The Minister told me recently that, at last, darts had been recognised by the Department as a sport. Now the sport is at least semi-professional with prize money of up to \$20 000 being available. Indeed, a team has been sent to America to compete. In the United Kingdom there is a team that has not been beaten for many years and its players are millionaires from darts. Although it is professional in other parts of the world, it is mainly amateur in South Australia. Has any support been given to darts by way of grant, at least sufficient for the salary of an administrator to help members run their organisation?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Up to the present, no assistance has been given to the South Australian Darts Association.

**Mr INGERSON:** What contribution has been made, or is likely to be made, by the Government towards the cost of floodlighting Football Park?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No financial contribution whatsoever.

**Mr INGERSON:** A comment on page 76 of the yellow book suggests that the function of recreation and sport should be co-ordinated between Government departments. Currently, a travelling circus is proceeding within the Education Department, and some recreation students are displaying their project around the district. They say that they have many qualified people in this area but that there may be insufficient funds for them to continue. Is the Minister aware of this project and, if he is, will he comment on the co-ordination between the Education Department and Department of Recreation and Sport on this matter?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not aware of the project referred to by the honourable member for Bragg. I believe that there ought to be greater co-operation and co-ordination between Government Departments, not only in the matters he has mentioned but with many other aspects of recreation and sport. There is certainly duplication of effort and we need to assess, if at all possible, how we can co-ordinate

efforts involving recreation and sport, particularly in the Education Department. I am not specifically aware of the matter that the honourable member has raised.

**Mr INGERSON:** On page 76 of the programme papers there is comment about a survey being conducted in conjunction with sporting associations. Will the Minister comment further on that document and on what has come out of that programme?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not have the result of the survey with me. I will provide the honourable member with that information in writing.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Has the Minister carried on the practice instituted by the former Government of not granting capital assistance moneys direct to organisations but of making part or all of that money available as low-interest loans? If so, how many such loans has he instituted and what interest rates is he charging?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The money was available to applicants this year but none of it was taken up as loans. As a consequence it became direct grants.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** All the money went in direct grants and no loan funds were taken up?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Has the Minister considered making it mandatory that a certain percentage of the money be taken up in that way?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have not given consideration to that idea.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** In about the middle of the previous Government's term in office we asked the Recreation Advisory Council and the Sports Advisory Council to prepare green papers on recreation, sport and physical fitness. I received the papers on recreation and on physical fitness about a month prior to the election, or maybe a little before that. Has the Minister taken up the recommendations mentioned in these papers? The Recreation Advisory Council worked extremely hard in preparing its paper, which I thought was a tremendous effort on their part, an effort for which I complimented officers at the time. Has the Minister considered taking up these papers and releasing them?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** They have been circulated and we have received comments back about them. They have become public documents that are available to anyone who wants one of the papers.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Has the Minister made any changes to the complement of the Sports Advisory Council or the Recreation Advisory Council?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No change whatsoever.

**Mr EVANS:** Many lesser recognised sports, particularly women's sports, are concerned that they find it difficult to gain recognition from the news media. One of their difficulties is getting a person who can write articles that the press will accept and publicise. Is there within the Department of Recreation and Sport an officer who helps in this field, or could provision be made for an officer to help in this field so that sports struggling for recognition are recognised? After all, these sports are as beneficial to the physical and mental development of the individual as any other sports. I emphasise that it is women's sport that is being neglected in this way. Will the Minister say whether he is able to provide such help in preparing material for the news media other than through such programmes as 'Life, Be In It' or the women's keep fit programme, which I think are different from the normal participating sports in the team area, particularly the areas where juniors should be encouraged to commence a sport and continue with it?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No, currently within the Department we do not provide that facility to what we call minor sports. The member for Fisher is quite right that they have

difficulties in getting publicity through the media. We do not provide that service. We do not have persons with journalistic expertise, but we can consider that matter. It is one service that we could at least try and provide to those who desire that we do that for them. We will have a new Recreation and Sport administration centre. That could be one of the matters which might be considered in conjunction with our Department—providing some way of assisting these people to obtain publicity by the press and through the media. It is a matter to which I have not given consideration in the past, but we can at least provide some kind of service in the future.

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

---

Works and Services—Department of Recreation and Sport,  
\$1 160 000—Examination declared completed.

---

Minister of Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous,  
\$1 563 000—Examination declared completed.

---

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I thank the officers of the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Department of Transport, and it is nice to see the Director-General here again; it must be the fourth Department for which he has attended. I thank the officers from the T.A.B. and the Betting Control Board for their assistance. The fact that there were not many questions addressed on the Betting Control Board and the T.A.B. is a tribute to the healthy state in which the racing industry finds itself.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I add my appreciation and thanks to the Minister and the advisers for the assistance that has been given to the Committee all day. I express my appreciation to the Committee for the manner in which members have conducted themselves. It has made my task much easier.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.54 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 6 October at 11 a.m.