

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 3 October 1984

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

**Chairman:**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold  
 Mr H. Becker  
 The Hon. Peter Duncan  
 Mr R.J. Gregory  
 Mr I.P. Lewis  
 Mr M.K. Mayes

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** I recognise the member for Chaffey as the lead speaker for the Opposition, and the member for Florey as the lead speaker for the Government. All questions will be directed to the Minister, not to the departmental officers. The Minister may, at any time, ask his officers to respond to a question or supplement his reply. All questions must relate to the vote before the Chair and must not be of a general policy nature. I do not want to hear any second reading speeches, and there is to be no grievance debate. At all times the quorum will be four members. If at any time at least four members are not present, the Committee will be suspended until a quorum is present.

Members who are not Committee members will be recognised only if they have the authority of the lead speaker for the Opposition. I will not encourage members who are not members of the Committee to ask questions. There are several votes today. I suggest that the Minister and the lead speaker for the Opposition should get together, perhaps at 1 p.m., to draw up a time table in relation to the various votes to enable the Minister to arrange his officers with a minimum of confusion. I also intend to allow the lead speaker for the Opposition to make an opening statement of not more than 10 minutes, and I will also allow the Minister to reply, if he so wishes. I will allow three questions from the Opposition and then three questions from the Government, and then the call will alternate between the two sides. If a member should use only one question, that will be counted as the questions allotted to that side, and the call will revert to the opposite side.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$110 002 000

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr K.W. Lewis, Director-General, Engineering and Water Supply Department.  
 Mr D.J. Alexander, Deputy Director-General.  
 Mr A.N. Killmier, Director, Administration and Finance.  
 Mr R.J. Greatrex, Manager, Management Accounting and Budgeting.  
 Mr K.R. John, Senior Finance Officer.  
 Mr R.E. Mander, Acting Senior Finance Officer.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I assure the Committee that all of my questions and comments will definitely relate to the documents before us.

If not from the Auditor-General's Report, it will be from the Estimates or the yellow books. I start by referring to the Auditor-General's Report. My initial question will be broadly based and will give the Minister a chance to respond in a broad way. Page 86 of the Auditor-General's Report states: Planning, Management and Financial Control System

The Department is presently reviewing its corporate plan. During the year a strategic forward plan for operations was produced.

What does the strategic forward plan of operations that has been produced in the past 12 months contain? Can the Minister give me that in some detail, as that will set the scene of where the Department is going?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I will give the Minister the opportunity to make any statement and also to respond to the opening statement of the member for Chaffey.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The strategic plan for the Engineering and Water Supply Department encompasses the Department's corporate management plans for the next five years. It is a fairly lengthy and comprehensive document. I take it that the member for Chaffey does not desire me to go through all its contents. It comprises an introduction and the purpose of the corporate objectives of the Department. Part II is an overview of departmental services, and service provision policies to new customers. Part III looks at the prospects for the future under subheadings: economic and social outlook determinate of demands for services, and service demand projections and implications for future departmental activities. In Part IV is a plan of action, which is target strategies and actions, capital works activities, and subprogramme: recurrent activities, manpower, revenue and deficits, and action plans. Part V contains appendices to the report. I do not know how much detail the member for Chaffey desires me to give.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I am looking for any new initiatives as compared with the existing corporate management plan.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The plan as directed to me has only come to us since early March 1984: we are talking about 1983-84. It would need me to go through the strategy at that time and see what you desire concerning plans brought into operation since we have received this document. After the receipt of this, it had to be approved by Cabinet. It has been considered by a subcommittee of Cabinet—the Resources and Physical Development Subcommittee—and by Cabinet. Approval has been given for the reproduction and internal distribution of the document as a departmental plan for the future. I am not able to answer off the cuff the questions that you have asked in regard to the implementations that have occurred since then but, when I assess it soon, I will be able to give you a considered reply.

In response to your invitation, Mr Chairman, I will make an introductory statement in relation to the budget results for 1983-84 and proposals for 1984-85.

I remind honourable members that 1983-84 saw recovery from the worst drought on record in Southern Australia. I am pleased to report that metropolitan reservoir holdings are now at 80 per cent capacity, and this compares favourably to 86 per cent capacity at the same time last year. I am also pleased to advise that the Dartmouth reservoir is at 52 per cent capacity and the Hume reservoir is overflowing. The Menindee Lakes are being surcharged. There have been substantial rains in New South Wales and Queensland, affecting Lake Victoria which, because of an empty/fill operation to control the flow, is almost full. High flows in the Darling River and the tributaries of the Murray River have resulted in above entitlement flows in the Murray River at least until the end of December, and the member for Chaffey would probably know that consequently Murray River irrigators will be allowed to use additional water without incurring penalty charges until the end of the year.

Total water consumption in South Australia in 1983-84 was 266 454 megalitres, which was a decrease in consumption of 15 271 megalitres in comparison to 1982-83. Members of the Committee will probably recall that the Government announced increases in water and sewerage rates for 1984-85 in the belief that we should emphasise payment for water used. That is the appropriate policy to follow. Accordingly, there was an increase in the price of water from 1 July 1984 of on average about 13 per cent. Notwithstanding the increases in water and sewerage rates applied from 1 July, the rates payable in Adelaide per head of population are significantly below the rates in other capital cities in Australia. I announced in July that there would be no increase in irrigation rates in 1984-85.

I now refer to each of the budgets in turn. Regarding the recurrent budget, total expenditure by the E & WS Department was \$103.7 million, exceeding the previous budget estimate by \$5.4 million, because of: wage and salary increases, \$2.321 million; price increases, \$1.973 million; increased costs of writing off preliminary investigational expenditure, \$1.07 million; additional salaries charged to recurrent operations, \$817 000; and natural disaster write-offs, \$168 000. On the other side there were savings on electricity for pumping of \$770 000, and other minor variation savings of \$179 000. For 'Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous' the budget was \$1.6 million, which was exceeded because of the increased cost of writing off preliminary investigations, \$986 000, and natural disaster write-offs of \$109 000.

The proposed recurrent budget for 1984-85 totals \$110 million, to which is to be added the round sum allowance for wage increases of \$422 000. The Committee may note that provision for electricity for pumping has been increased from the sum actually spent in 1983-84, that is, from \$9.8 million to \$11.7 million, reflecting the increased cost of electricity.

The proposed recurrent expenditure represents no change in real terms over the actual expenditure for 1983-84. A reduction in the Public Service Act full time equivalents by 18 positions and a reduction in the weekly paid work force of 65 employees is proposed by natural attrition. I point out that, in the case of weekly paid employees the attrition will take place in the capital works area. In the Treasurer's line there is an allocation of about \$3 million to enable additional weekly paid persons to undertake activities within the Department, the major one being backlog maintenance.

We have made a submission in relation to that \$3 million in the Treasurer's line for a number of proposals involving the employment of daily paid employees. I will not go through all of the details but, if anybody wants the exact details, I will make them available. I turn briefly to the estimates of a capital nature. The total payments proposed are \$68.3 million compared to \$65.8 million in 1983-84. In overall terms, these programmes are increased by 4 per cent. I will not detail each of those matters, but if anybody wants the details I will be happy to supply them. With regard to the financial results of 1983-84, we saw an overall net cost to Consolidated Revenue of the operations of the E & WS Department decrease from \$45 million to \$35.5 million with respect to various undertakings as follows: metropolitan water works, a surplus of \$11 million; country water works, a deficit of \$26.3 million; metropolitan sewers, a surplus of \$8.3 million; country sewers, a deficit of \$5.4 million; and, irrigation, a deficit of \$10.2 million. Other undertakings that contributed significantly to the overall deficit were: South-East drainage scheme, \$2.1 million; water resources management, \$4.6 million; Murray River works, \$3.2 million; and, Loxton water service land settlement, \$700 000.

Significant trends that are able to be identified on examination of the financial results are a continuation of the increase in the deficit of country water and sewer undertakings, and a further increase in the irrigation deficit. The anticipated overall deficit on water and sewer undertakings is estimated to increase by \$4 million in 1984-85. The irrigation deficit is anticipated to increase by \$1 million. With a view to containing the overall deficit of the Department an examination of costs has continued throughout 1983-84, particularly in respect of irrigation areas, and these reviews will continue in 1984-85.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I inform the Committee, particularly the Minister, that if there is a question to which he undertakes to provide an answer or further information later, that information must be provided to the Clerk of the Committee no later than 19 October.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I turn to the initial question I asked in relation to the Strategic Forward Plan. If it has been approved by Cabinet, then somebody must know what it contains. If there are any new initiatives in that plan that did not exist in the prior plan, I would like to know of them. Is it just a continuation of the existing plan, or are there any new initiatives in it?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I can give an outline of the major considerations without going into great detail. The major projects in relation to the plan are over five years, of course, and may not be regarded as new initiatives but as continuing initiatives.

The water filtration programme is the major plan for the future. Another matter is Murray River salinity control. Some of these projects are in progress and in the process of evaluation and investigation. A number of projects concern the extension of water and sewer supply: Port Augusta is one; Golden Grove is a proposal for the future in which the E & WS Department will be substantially involved. I am talking about major projects some of which are in progress at the moment, and they may not necessarily be new initiatives. For instance, one of the salinity proposals that the member has raised previously in Parliament is Lock 2/Lock 3 (the Woolpunda scheme) which is in the process of preliminary investigation. There are 65 proposals or objectives. Does the honourable member wish me to go through each one?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** No, just the new initiatives. I know most of the existing ones.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We will go through them all and the honourable member can then decide whether they are new or old initiatives. There is the assessment of water resources planning management issues in the metropolitan region; the assessment of water resources planning management issues in the northern region; the assessment of water resources management options of Murray River, phase 2; the Angas-Bremer water resources management study; to encourage the efficient use of water by summer advertising campaigns; the strategy for progressively reviewing policies for providing and charging for services, which are various pricing studies—

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The Minister said that there were 60-odd initiatives. I ask the member for Chaffey whether he wants them read out or whether they can go into *Hansard* without being read out.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** They can go into *Hansard*. I was looking for new initiatives. The initiatives read out so far have been on the programme for a number of years and are obviously ongoing. I expected that there might be three or four new initiatives because the Auditor-General made reference to it in his report. That is what I was looking for. If there are no new initiatives we will go on from there.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There are some new initiatives but I cannot readily bring them to mind out of this list of 65.

To save the time of the Committee, it may be best for me to provide the list, perhaps broken up into what we may consider are new initiatives for 1983-84, or is the honourable member referring to 1984-85?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I am referring to the statement in the Auditor-General's Report that a new strategic forward plan was produced during the year. All I asked was whether there were any new initiatives in that new strategic forward plan or whether it was an ongoing programme that has been virtually checked out.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Part of it is an ongoing programme, and a section of it would be new initiatives.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I am quite happy to have the list incorporated in *Hansard*. If the Minister can provide specific new initiatives at a later date, I should be happy and can raise it at a later date when Parliament resumes.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is an internal document of the Department, even though it has been approved by Cabinet. I want to have the opportunity to assess whether it can be made public or otherwise. I will provide the basic detail rather than information that is not applicable, if it is just one of the Department's internal documents.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I suggest the the Minister provide a document to the Clerk of the Committee before 19 October for inclusion in the record.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I am happy about that.

**Mr BECKER:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, why cannot we have now a copy of the document from which the Minister is quoting?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Because he says that it is an internal departmental document that he is unwilling to disclose.

**Mr BECKER:** It has been before Cabinet and could be censored before it is tabled.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Will the Department check through the new strategic plan and indicate any new initiatives that have been devised in the past 12 months?

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister referred to filtration, salinity control and lock 2 and lock 3 groundwater interception schemes. In regard to filtration, it would appear that the Morgan filtration plant is proceeding on schedule. What forward planning has gone into the Swan Reach-Stockwell water filtration plant? When will funds be allocated for the commencement of that project? I cannot find reference to it in any document. I understand that it is an integrated system, with water being pumped both from Swan Reach and Morgan into the northern towns system and, until the Swan Reach-Stockwell filtration plant is constructed, we will have a makeshift situation because it is an integrated system and water can be transferred from either the Morgan plant or the Swan Reach plant into any part of the northern distribution system.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** As the honourable member said, the Morgan filtration plant is proceeding on schedule, and I had the pleasure of inspecting its progress only last week. The main expenditure during 1984-85 will relate not only to the Morgan filtration plant but also to the Happy Valley project, which is the major project. Recently, I requested the Department to provide details of funding requirements that would bring forward the construction of not only the Stockwell plant but also Myponga, and I expect to receive a report in the near future. The honourable member may note in the documents a provision (a small one) of \$10 000 made for the Stockwell water filtration plant for preliminary investigations. Although it is not on the present programme, it is certainly not forgotten, and I understand his comment that it is part of the overall system for the northern towns and Yorke Peninsula.

We are proceeding to ascertain the funding requirements in relation to the Stockwell plant. Of course, we can do only one thing at a time. The major part of the programme relates to Morgan and Happy Valley.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister has partly answered the question and in so doing has admitted that nothing has been done in relation to Swan Reach/Stockwell. The Minister said that only one project can proceed at a time. By the same token, if there is no indication as to the Swan Reach/Stockwell filtration plant and when it will be built and completed, it is a farce to forge ahead with the Morgan plant. No absolute guarantee can be given to the people of the northern towns of Yorke Peninsula that they will be free from *Naegleria fowleri*. This issue is of great concern because *Naegleria fowleri* has been found right through the whole system, regardless of who is in Government. The only real chance of protecting people from amoebic meningitis is through filtration and allowing chlorine and other chemicals to effectively knock out the amoeba. Much of the value of the Morgan filtration plant will be lost if the Swan Reach/Stockwell plant does not proceed as a matter of urgency.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not regard that as a question; I regard it as a comment. The honourable member may be aware that consultants have already completed the design concept for Stockwell. As I have said, it is not forgotten. It is still an important part of the ongoing programme of filtration throughout South Australia. We can only go as far as we can given the funding limitations of the Government. As a consequence, over the next 10 years all of these plants, including those for the metropolitan area, will probably be completed. As I said before, we can only go so far at any time, doing one thing at a time. I point out that the Little Para filtration plant has been completed and will be commissioned on 23 November. The programme is implemented step by step over a period of years. Hope Valley was the first, and the others include Anstey Hill and the Barossa. The Stockwell plant is being further investigated and is under consideration. We will proceed as soon as possible, given the limitation on funding.

**Mr MAYES:** One issue of concern to people in the southern region is the development of the Happy Valley water filtration plant. It is of great interest to people in the district of Unley because we will come on line with the filtration development at Happy Valley. What is the current status of the development of the Happy Valley water filtration plant? What funds have been set aside for the development and what progress has been made with the actual construction and planning of the Happy Valley water filtration plant?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Progress has been very satisfactory. Over the past 12 months we have spent about \$11 million on work by a day-labour force and on contract work. The Department is staging the transfer of the St Mary's area depot and the Lonsdale depot within the confines of the Happy Valley reservoir area. That is expected to open within the next few months, probably in December. That project will cost about \$4 million. Progress at the plant has been fairly substantial. At present we expect to commission at least part of the plant in 1988-89 or thereabouts, with final completion in about 1990.

**Mr MAYES:** I refer to 'Flood mitigation and warning' on page 8 of the yellow book. I took up this matter as the candidate for Unley before the last election. It is a matter of continuing interest because of the recurrent flooding in Unley. In fact, there was flooding in the Unley area on New Year's Eve. What progress has the Department made in relation to establishing a flood mitigation unit? What establishment of staff has occurred, and what is the current status of the unit in relation to establishing warning programmes?

I am informed by indirect sources that the Unley council has now received a report on the future projection of work required to establish flood mitigation and upgrading of the drainage system within the Unley area. We have been waiting for that for some months. I have received that advice unofficially. My question relates very much to that report from the Unley council.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The major work that the E & WS Department has undertaken in relation to flood mitigation is not necessarily centred on Brown Hill Creek. About 18 months ago we introduced amendments to place responsibility on persons and councils in the vicinity of the creek to ensure that we could mitigate potential flooding in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, not only in Unley but also in the eastern suburbs. From personal experience I am aware of the problems with Third and Fourth Creeks in the eastern suburbs. A flood mitigation unit is being established. The Unley council or any other council should ensure that they take that advice. After all, the E & WS Department would be involved only in an advisory capacity. Acting on that advice we could mitigate as much as possible, because it is a difficult area to assess. Over a period of time in various parts of the metropolitan area we find that councils have approved the construction of buildings in what might be flood risk areas.

It is very difficult after that has occurred to try to catch the horse after the stable has been opened, but the major work that is to be undertaken by the E & WS is the Torrens River Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme, which is a fairly extensive programme over the next four or five years. We hope that it can be completed in 1988. For the information of the member for Unley—I know that it does not specifically affect his electorate, but it has a substantial effect on the western suburbs particularly, and I am sure that the member for Hanson would be interested in what we are doing in that area—the works programme for 1984-85 for the Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme is that we will complete all works at Kangaroo Creek dam on the adjustment to the spillway (actually, they are 99.99 per cent completed, because it was expected that they would be by the end of October).

Bridge structures on the programme for 1984-85 will complete the modification of a large weir downstream from South Road. 'Complete minor finishing works and finalise some outstanding land acquisition settlements' has created some difficulty for the Department over a period in the acquisition of land. 'Commencement of work package 3', which is in the Southwark-Thebarton area—we still need to acquire some land in that area to continue that work. It is intended that we will complete the earthworks and river banks stabilisation and landscaping. Tenders are now out for this work, and close on 25 October 1984.

'Flood mitigation work package No. 4', covers the eastern suburbs, and part of the linear park programme is associated with the O-Bahn system. About \$2.5 million is set aside for the work associated with that section, which coincides with the O-Bahn system. In the eastern suburbs further on, such as Campbelltown, we have 11 properties where acquisition is required. We have to finalise settlement before we can commence any work, but design details are being completed in consultation with the respective councils.

The funds sought in 1984-85 for flood mitigation work packages is \$3 million, and for linear park land acquisition, \$580 000, a total of \$3.58 million. That is the major work that the Department is undertaking in regard to flood mitigation. I repeat, for the benefit of the member for Unley, that flash floods are a cause for concern. I know that such a flood occurred recently in the Unley area, but basically the E & WS Department interest in that is in an advisory capacity only.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask members to confine their questions to the line that is under consideration. Whilst the Minister was answering that question I looked at it. It should have been asked under the Capital Works line, which is the second item. It can be found on page 178 under 'Minister of Water Resources'. It shows Torrens River Flood Mitigation and Linear Park as \$5.68 million. The question has been asked; I was in error in allowing it, but I ask honourable members to confine their questions to the lines under consideration.

**Mr MAYES:** In clarification, I directed my question under 'Flood Mitigation Warning', which is a recurrent expenditure within the budget allocation. A sum of \$1.1 million has been set aside in recurrent funding. I did not direct my question towards the linear park development. I am aware of your ruling, Sir, regarding questions on capital expenditure.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister's reply was certainly connected to that line.

**Mr MAYES:** I ask a question related to page 28 of the yellow book regarding recurrent expenditure and remissions to pensioners on E & WS and local government rates. Does the Minister see that this as a growth area, and what percentage, if it is applicable, can the E & WS predict, given our present population trend towards a higher medium age with the predictions up to 2001 of a higher proportion of our aged population?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Department administers the remission to pensioners on behalf of the Department of Community Welfare. The question that has been directed to me relates to what might occur with an ageing population, relating to an increase by Government for payment of remissions to pensioners. Anything that I might say would be only hazarding a guess, but the trend is towards a greater amount each year.

**Mr Killmier:** The water rates remitted under the Rates and Taxes Remission Act for 1983-84 were \$4.7 million, compared to \$4.2 million in the previous year. In the case of sewerage it was \$3.8 million as against \$3.2 million in the previous year. You can see from that that the increase for 1983-84 was \$1.1 million. That increase is made up of a number of components: first, rates and taxes increase in any year because remissions are 60 per cent of the account up to a maximum of \$75 for each of water and sewerage. As the rates go up one would expect the remission to go up. On top of that are the increasing number of people eligible for remissions. I do not have with me details of the increase in the numbers, but clearly they are increasing. We can obtain that information for the honourable member, and provide it if he wishes. The extent to which it will go up in future will depend also on any change of arrangements made by the Government.

I believe that members would be aware that the Government has appointed a committee to review a whole range of concessions. My Department is a member of that committee, which is chaired by officers of the Department for Community Welfare. The review is likely to take some time because it covers not only pensioner remissions for rates but also concessions for transport: there is a multitude of concessions to be taken into account. The committee is considering whether the present arrangements are as good as they could be or whether alternatives would ensure that the concessions are provided where they are most needed.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I apologise for harping on this topic, but it is of vital concern to the health and welfare of the people of the northern towns and Eyre Peninsula. Some four years ago the then Opposition very fiercely attacked the then Government and me in particular because of the loss of a life at Whyalla due to *naegleria fowleri*, or amoebic meningitis. Although we had been in Government for only

a few weeks we were solidly held responsible for the loss of life and the fact that amoebic meningitis had occurred once again in the northern towns.

In this case the best answer I can get from the Minister is that the Swan Reach-Stockwell filtration plant will be completed within a 10 year time frame. There is only one conclusion that anyone can draw—and I am quite sure that a lot of people in the area affected will come to this conclusion—that the Government is literally gambling with the lives of the people who live in that area of South Australia. I can only come back to the attitude adopted by the then Opposition in 1980 in comparison to the attitude the Government is displaying today.

The Government is virtually saying that, as long as the programme is completed within 10 years, it is good enough. That is certainly not the attitude displayed in 1980 when, unfortunately, a person died in the Whyalla area. That matter was of great concern to everyone in South Australia. The attitude that 'The programme will be completed within a 10 year time frame and that is as good as we can do' is certainly not the attitude expressed in 1980.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** This is a repeat of the previous question.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I have not received a decent answer, that is why.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is the honourable member's view, not mine. He is entitled to his point of view.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There must not be debate across the Chamber.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Minister is gambling with people's lives.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I can only repeat that the Morgan plant will substantially assist in curtailing difficulties and will improve the quality of water in the northern towns. Indeed, chlorination at the extreme end of the pipeline where difficulties have occurred will also assist. The member for Chaffey is endeavouring to say that, without the Stockwell plant, the Morgan plant is of no benefit to the people in the northern towns of South Australia.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** You cannot guarantee that there will be no *naegleria fowleri*.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not agree with that. I believe that it substantially improves the quality of the water and the opportunity to detect and identify problems not only in that area but also in other places in South Australia. I have confidence in the State Water Laboratories in determining the effect that *naegleria fowleri* may have on water supplies in South Australia. There is continual experimentation and monitoring by the State Water Laboratories. I do not agree with the view of the member for Chaffey that the Stockwell plant is absolutely essential to the distribution of water in the northern part of South Australia. The Stockwell plant has not been forgotten.

The honourable member said that the project will not be undertaken for 10 years: I did not say that: I said that the filtration of water supplied to the northern towns and the metropolitan area is likely to be concluded in a 10 year programme. 'Likely to be' does not mean that Stockwell will be the last project completed. It depends on Government priorities, either a Liberal or a Labor Government, and advice of departmental officers. We must decide what priorities to attack first. I believe that we have moved substantially in the right direction in filtering South Australia's water supply. This is essential to the health and welfare of South Australians and this Government is doing its best.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I suppose that one could say that things are different when they are not the same. If the Minister referred to the speeches made by his colleagues in

1980, he would see that certainly a different attitude was expressed at that time.

I refer now to irrigation rates. The Minister's response to a question I asked in the House on 11 September was very sensible and rational—totally in conflict with the written response I received from him a few days later. Whoever drafted the letter for the Minister certainly has absolutely no concept of the situation. The Minister ought to take up this matter with that person. I asked the Minister to consider a proposal in relation to water rates paid on or before 30 June by ratepayers but not received in the Department until two or three days later, the rates being deemed to be paid by 30 June. The Minister responded as follows:

I appreciate the point that the member for Chaffey has made. Certainly, the intention of applying penalty rates was to try to catch up on what I call recalcitrant payers and not other persons who intend to pay. I think that the matter is worthy of consideration. There should be some discretion perhaps from a Ministerial viewpoint, and I will certainly consider the matter that the honourable member has raised. As I have said, it is not the intention of the Department to be Draconian in the application of penalty rates, even though the legislation was supported by the member for Chaffey . . .

I agree with that, but I make the point that the legislation was drafted in particular to take into account existing Government legislation in relation to payment for wine grapes, and it is a fact of life that payments for wine grapes from the major wine companies are not received by the growers until the third or fourth day of July, even though they are due and payable on 30 June. Consequently, the same situation applies. The legislation was designed to encourage people to pay rates that are due and payable by 30 June. Part of the Minister's response of 25 September in reply to my letter of 31 July was as follows:

Your suggestion that some leeway be given to payments received in the mail a short period after 30 June has been considered. In doing so inquiries were made with the land tax office, some local councils, and bankcard organisations. These inquiries revealed that in each instance the date of receipt of payment is taken as the date of payment.

Technically that is quite correct, but what we are talking about here has absolutely nothing to do with local councils, bankcard, or anything else. We are talking about a substantial rate, and the whole legislation which was introduced into Parliament and which was designed to match up with major payments to growers. In fact, the Minister acknowledged that in the House of Assembly when, off the cuff, he said that he appreciated the common sense of the matter. In the letter that followed a fortnight later the Minister said:

Under the circumstances, I am not prepared to waive the interest charges.

This was even though payment was received within two or three days of the due date and, in fact, posted on about 28 June. I know of a number of similar situations. Will the Minister say which of his two statements he stands by?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** As I recall the events, the member for Chaffey asked me a question in relation to this matter in the House of Assembly but did not give any specific detail. If he reads my reply to its conclusion, he will find that I said I would investigate the situation and advise him accordingly. I was not aware at that time of the specific case that is the reply to the letter that the member for Chaffey is talking about at present. In that specific case mentioned the person concerned received an account in February 1984. That account was due for payment on 31 March 1984. Of course, that person had an additional three months to pay.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** That goes for everyone.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It applies to everyone, but there must be a cut-off point. The person had an additional three months to pay that account. That is what is contained in the legislation we agreed upon and what that legislation is

all about. What we are doing is drawing a comparison with what one could call normal business practice in other aspects of commerce where people pay their accounts on a particular due date, and the date that is accepted is the date of receipt and not the date of posting the payment. I can see all sorts of complications here. In respect to the particular case the member has raised (and which he did not raise with me in the Parliament when he asked a general question), I had not at that stage had an opportunity to see the letter mentioned. Someone else may have drafted that letter, but I signed it and approved it. I think that most Ministers do the same thing. The point I make is that the person involved was given an additional three months to pay, and that period expired on 30 June.

I suggest that the member for Chaffey should advise his constituents, as I have advised them, that there is an Engineering and Water Supply depot in the Riverland where they can pay accounts personally. It is unfortunate that in this instance the person posted the payment, say, on 28 June, which if I recall was close to a weekend—probably Thursday or Friday—and as a consequence the amount was not received until probably Tuesday of the following week. If we make an exception and create a precedent for this one person, then we must do the same thing for all growers and all accounts outstanding at that time. On the basis of the information conveyed by letter to the member for Chaffey, one can see that we determined this matter on what is regarded as normal business practice in commerce.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I think that the Minister has completely missed the point. Either the Minister stands behind the legislation on the books in relation to the payment for wine grapes, or is he going to launch a prosecution of every winery in South Australia because they are required to pay growers by 30 June? The reality is that the wineries post payment by 30 June, but the grower does not have that money until about 3 or 4 July. We are talking about growers who at the time are at their absolute financial limit by way of overdraft and who, in many instances, are way beyond their overdraft maximum. To expect them to write a cheque for another \$4 000 to pay the Government its water rates when they have not received payment for their grapes is unreasonable.

The Minister was spot on when he said that the whole purpose of amending the Irrigation Act was to get payments in. The vast majority of growers are paying their rates on 28 or 29 June because of mailing arrangements and because they cannot run the risk of sending a cheque before then and having it returned because they are up to their absolute limit or beyond that limit and the cheque has been rejected by the bank. We are talking here about two or three days, and I think it is unreasonable for the Minister to adopt the line he has in these circumstances, because we know darn well that the major wine companies in South Australia present absolutely no problem with their payments and that they abide by the legislation enacted in South Australia. Growers can be assured of getting their money within two or three days of the end of June. It is a real dilemma for a grower not to be certain that he will have funds in his account when he writes a cheque for \$4 000. The sentiments expressed by the Minister in the House were totally appropriate in relation to this matter.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is there a question?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Will the Minister reconsider this matter, because it will go on for year after year, and growers will be penalised that extra 5 per cent each year? I made the point to the Minister on the day I asked the question that, if a grower had no intention of paying his account by 30 June, there would be no point in his paying it until 31 July because he would be no worse off. A grower would not put a cheque in the mail on 28 or 29 June

knowing he will incur the penalty for late payment, and that the penalty will not be any more until it increases to 6 per cent as from 1 August. The intention in this case was quite clear: the grower put his cheque in the mail on or prior to 30 June, so I ask the Minister to reconsider this matter and to ascertain what can be done to overcome this problem. The three months about which he talks was specifically granted to match provisions in the grape price fixing legislation that exists in South Australia.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is a dilemma not only for the individual grower but also for the Department. The exercise in relation to penalty rate interest was gone through to encourage persons to pay their accounts without incurring that interest. As I have said before, the specific instance was raised with me. The Finance Officer has informed me that a great proportion of the accounts were paid before 30 June. Perhaps he can add something to what I have said regarding this matter.

**Mr Killmier:** Irrigators were informed on a number of occasions. The accounts that were sent out had a due date for payment of 31 March. Irrigators were given a number of advices between then and the end of June that the closing date for the penalty interest was 30 June. From an administrative point of view the only satisfactory way to address the proposition of the honourable member would be to delay the billing and make the accounts payable not on 31 March but at the end of April, in which case the penalty interest would not apply until the end of July.

From an equity point of view about \$500 000 was received in the Berri office on the last day of June by people who took the trouble to come in and pay their account knowing that penalty interest would apply. The persons to whom the honourable member refers chose, because they were busy pruning, to post their payment. Of course, it was not received until the Tuesday or Wednesday of the following week. From an administrative point of view it would be quite inequitable, I believe, to require the vast majority of people to obtain bank overdrafts or whatever means they used to be able to make their payment before 30 June, and allow others to expect the Minister to use a discretion.

Administratively, the only satisfactory way around the problem would be to delay the billing. The account we are talking about is in respect of expenditure that the Department has had to pay out (electricity and other payments) many months previous to that. In fact, a good argument could be made out that the accounts are already far too delayed. Reference has been made to wine grape growers, but they form only a proportion of the total number of irrigators. Many other irrigators have other crops and receive money at different times throughout the year. If we are going to tailor the billing around the wine growers, the next request may well be to tailor the billing around the citrus growers or whoever. Of course, the billing programme has to be determined by the Government and then good sound business principles should be followed in the administration of that billing.

**Mr BECKER:** Earlier the member for Unley referred to concessions for pensioners and so forth. How many persons are receiving those concessions, and what are the comparisons with figures during the past 12 months or two years, if the Minister has those figures? What are the predictions and determinations for this year in relation to the number of persons and the amounts that the concessions will cost? Do these figures average out at so much per concession?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Mr Killmier has already indicated to the member for Unley that we do not immediately have those figures available to us. Certainly, we will be able to obtain them. We do not have the details sought by the member for Hanson. The basic figures are contained on page 144 of the Estimates of Payments in the Minister of

Community Welfare's lines under 'Miscellaneous'. That is where the programme is administered. Is the member looking for an average remission?

**Mr BECKER:** Yes basically, statistical data for the past couple of years.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The best I can suggest is that we supply the member for Hanson with the details.

**Mr BECKER:** The quality of water has been mentioned on many occasions. I understand that there is a system for clearing choked sewer and water mains, and that some mains may have to be replaced. The western suburbs still continues to have dirty water. Years ago the Department cleared a main down there and found that part of it had not been cement lined and that the contractor every now and then would skip a few metres. What is the continuing programme to ensure that we receive reasonably good quality water?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We should go back not just to individual mains in the western suburbs but to the quality of water generally in South Australia. Last financial year most water supplies to the metropolitan reservoirs of Adelaide—not all—came from the Murray River/Darling River tributary system. From an aesthetic point of view when that occurs there is a fine colloidal clay in the water and unless the system is filtered, particularly in the southern areas, the water is clouded. I am advised that the supply to the western suburbs is mostly not filtered. So, water then appears to be somewhat cloudy, as it contains substances washed down the system through the Murray River into the Adelaide supply, which is not filtered.

The other problem is that unlike most other major cities throughout the world our reservoirs are surrounded by rural activities that create difficulties in regard to water quality, particularly during summer when the Department is required, although not all the time, to use various chemicals to maintain the water quality. All reservoirs are monitored continuously by the State water laboratories, and I assure the honourable member and the public that from a bacteriological point of view the water supply is safe. Of course, that does not mean that we should not supply water in a clean and colourless condition. The problem that we have is not necessarily a bacteriological one but relates to aesthetics—our water does not look good when one turns on the tap or uses it for washing clothes because the consumer receives a coloured water supply.

The only alternative to that is a filtration system for the whole metropolitan area, and I will not go over that position again. Another problem that recurs was highlighted by the member for Hanson in respect of the condition of pipes, which creates difficulty from time to time. In older Adelaide suburbs some of the pipes were laid about 80 years ago. Some cast iron pipes remain, and even cement-lined pipes are subject to root intrusion and maintenance difficulties. I am sure that the Director and Engineer-in-Chief will give the Committee the technical term for these difficulties. We then have the reticulated system of minor mains supplying Adelaide suburbs. Indeed, we have about 3 000 kilometres of mains.

**Mr LEWIS:** Above what diameter?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** They would be of varying diameter. Although I do not know the exact figures, we have a substantial system that is added to each year, and that adds to the problem of maintaining mains in a condition conducive to the satisfactory supply of water of clear quality. Sometimes a great problem we have relates to dead-end mains that we no longer supply. Consumers can ring the Thebarton Control Centre and departmental people will flush such mains because sediment builds up in the system. Sometimes we have notified the immediate area of our intention to flush mains. This results in sediment being disturbed and flushed

out of the system, but it recurs at certain times of the year depending on the seasonal conditions. Not only the member for Hanson but also the member for Albert Park and I receive many complaints about water quality in regard to the aesthetic nature or appearance of water because sometimes, if it is used in a washing machine, it will stain white clothing. The only way to overcome this is by filtration. Much of the area of the western suburbs will come under the Happy Valley filtration scheme when it is completed. I ask the Director to add to what I have already outlined to the Committee.

**Mr K.W. Lewis:** Most of the water mains in the metropolitan area are either concrete lined or are asbestos cement. Few mains would be unlined. Generally, the Department knows the worst areas where dirty water occurs and where it tends to build up in the ends of mains. Therefore, the Department does routine flushing of those areas. In other cases after receipt of individual complaints, our watermen will attend the area and, if special flushing is required, it will be carried out. We have three methods of flushing. Plain water flushing involves simply opening hydrants. We have on trial a cheaper method of air assisted flushing, and the ultimate means of flushing mains is by using a polyurethane swab which is passed down through the main and which is an expensive method of clearing mains. It is used normally following the implementation of a water filtration plant in areas where mains are known to be especially difficult and contain much dirty sediment.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Gregory):** You said it was the most expensive method. Can you indicate how expensive?

**Mr K.W. Lewis:** I cannot put a figure on it because it involves the size of the main and the degree and amount of dirt in the main. We could supply estimates but they would vary from place to place. I used the word 'expensive' as an indication of comparison with other methods to which I had referred.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I am sure the member for Hanson would be grateful for any additional information.

**Mr BECKER:** Yes. I would like to know the amount expended on flushing and clearing mains. The Minister referred to the various chemicals used. At page 41 of the yellow book reference is made to chlorination of water supply to achieve a satisfactory bacteriological quality and algae control in reservoirs by copper sulphate dosing. I thought that was done only at the Patawalonga. Reference was made to asbestos cement lining, and I wonder about the safety aspect. Consumers of our water, especially in the western suburbs, are entitled to be reassured about the monitoring system and its effectiveness. They need to be assured that chlorination and other chemical dosing is safe, and that fibro cement piping is safe as well. How much is being expended on that programme?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The honourable member has referred to the subprogramme of treatment of water supply on page 41 of the yellow book that actually covers the operation and maintenance of reservoirs. The honourable member seeks information in relation to the cost of chlorination, fluoridation and the chemical dosing of reservoirs by using copper sulphate. That only occurs in mid summer when algae growth is more substantial than in the winter months. Does the honourable member require individual or collective costs?

**Mr BECKER:** I seek a breakdown.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The figures are provided on page 8 of the yellow book under 'Fluoridation of metropolitan water supply'. The proposed expenditure in 1983-84 was \$482 000. The actual expenditure was \$236 000, and the proposed allocation for 1984-85 is \$246 000. The difference

between that now proposed and the amount proposed in 1983-84 is fairly substantial.

**Mr BECKER:** Is there any particular reason for that?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It would be associated with payment of accounts for the chemical involved. The chlorination figures can be found on page 148 of the Estimates of Payments, and they relate only to the metropolitan area. In 1984-85, \$1.130 million is proposed, whereas \$1.185 million was actually spent last year. I do not know whether those figures can be broken down into individual items. The entire water supply in the metropolitan area is chlorinated. In relation to country water works, chemical costs in 1983-84 amounted to \$611 863, and \$584 000 is proposed for 1984-85. The copper sulphate dosing only occurs at specific times during the year. I will have to obtain that information for the honourable member.

**Mr BECKER:** Are the specialist pipes safe for use and for the conveying of water? Are there any problems with the asbestos?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Director-General will respond.

**Mr K.W. Lewis:** Asbestos cement pipes are used around the world. They are used in Australia in most States, and certainly throughout Victoria and South Australia. In recent years concern has been expressed about the use of asbestos in pipes. However, all of the evidence researched since those concerns were expressed indicate quite clearly that no health hazard is associated with drinking water which comes through asbestos cement pipes. Concern has been expressed in relation to the cutting of pipes, because that could release asbestos fibre. However, there are techniques available which avoid that problem. We observe those techniques at all times.

**Mr HAMILTON:** What action has been taken to reduce the odours emanating from the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works? I appreciate the fact that successive Governments have spent in excess of \$500 000 to reduce the odours from those works. I understand that many of the complaints that I receive result from commercial and industrial waste processed at the works. False expectations were built up in the West Lakes and Tennyson areas in relation to the elimination of these odours as a result of a letter that was sent out by the E & WS Department in August 1979, as I recall. If my memory serves me correctly, the letter stated that the plant would be comparable to the Glenelg sewage treatment works. What has been done in technical terms from 1979 until now to reduce the odours? I am still receiving complaints from the Lockside Drive area and from the West Lakes High School Council. What action will be taken in 1984-85 to reduce the odour?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The member for Albert Park has asked this question on previous occasions and, indeed, he is a regular correspondent to my Department on behalf of his constituents, following complaints from residents located in the vicinity of the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. First, it must be appreciated that the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works is the oldest plant in the State. Indeed, it caters for a large section of the metropolitan area. Of course, there is a buffer zone around the plant. However, over the years housing has developed in close proximity to the works, and in one area mentioned by the honourable member it is on the edge of the buffer zone. In fact, I believe that is where the majority of complaints come from.

In an attempt to eliminate some of the difficulties that exist in regard to odour control, over a period of time the Department has spent a lot of money on upgrading and replacing assets. In fact, \$383 000 in total was spent on capital works in 1979-80; in 1980-81 it was \$473 000; in 1981-82 it was \$255 000; in 1982-83 it was \$272 000; and in 1984-85 it is proposed to spend \$802 000. The aeration pipework replacement amounts to \$338 000. That is an ongoing project to replace and upgrade the aeration system

so the system for the provision of oxygen to the micro-organism is made more efficient. A digester mixer will be provided to replace an aged sludge digestion tank at a cost of \$380 000. Screen replacement, which will involve the replacement of aged and corroded screens, will amount to \$150 000.

There is a site beautification proposal, which is an ongoing project. It does not do anything in regard to the emanation of odours. Its cost is \$53 000. I said last year, and I repeat, that the Department makes every effort to assist in odour control, not only from the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works but also from other treatment works along the shore of the metropolitan area.

As more persons decide to reside within the vicinity of a treatment plant, say, at Port Adelaide, difficulties occur from time to time, no doubt because of its age. Endeavours have been made by the Department over a period of years to replace aged and perhaps worn out equipment. It depends a lot not only on the plant itself but on prevailing weather conditions. So, there are a number of factors. We are doing as much as possible on behalf of the constituents of the member for Albert Park to eliminate the difficulties that occur within the vicinity of the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works.

**Mr HAMILTON:** What reductions have taken place in the amount of hydrosulphide from 1979 to 1984, so that I can advise my constituents accordingly? The Minister would be aware of one of my constituents who corresponds regularly with him and who lives on Lockside Drive. He said in recent correspondence to the Minister that the programme had been a disaster and that the only way to overcome this problem was to relocate the plant; that, I understand, would cost something between \$80 million and \$100 million. If the Minister could provide me with that information I would be most appreciative.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will take the question on notice because it is difficult to quantify. I understand that it is in relation to the reduction of the use of hydrosulphide over the five years since 1979. I will get the information.

**Mr LEWIS:** What is really happening is that the kinds of things that are essential to health standards are being prejudiced and delayed because of money being spent on these tissyng-up programmes for the kinds of things to which the member for Albert Park refers. His constituents moved there knowing that the sewage treatment works was in that locality at the time. It is not that their health is threatened at all.

My first question relates to the numbers of underground water resources advisory committees. For what underground water supplies, for any purpose whatsoever, are there underground water resource advisory committees and what are the names of the members of those committees? Can the Minister give us those and indicate any changes that there have been to the composition of any of those committees during the past 12 months?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There are a number of regional committees. I cannot off hand give the names of the personnel because the member for Mallee is right in saying that there have been some changes. We have the River Murray Water Resource Advisory Committee, Padthaway Water Resource Advisory Committee, Northern Adelaide Plains Water Resource Advisory Committee, North Para Water Resource Advisory Committee, Angas-Bremer Water Resource Advisory Committee, and the Arid Area Water Resource Advisory Committee. Only this year we declared another area, the Murray Mallee, which I am sure the member for Mallee is specifically interested in, as a declared area. As a consequence, we have the Murray Mallee Water Resource Advisory Committee. Also, we are in the same process with Tatiara, which will be incorporated with the



Padthaway Water Resource Advisory Committee. If the member for Mallee desires the names of the personnel, I can obtain that information and advise him accordingly.

**Mr LEWIS:** Supplementary to that, I thank the Minister. I would be grateful if he could also indicate the sitting fee or other annual or any recurrent expenditure incurred by the Department for convening meetings of those committees: for the chairmen and members if their fees are in any way different. Can he specify whether there is any difference in the sitting fees paid to members of different committees?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I can obtain that information. I should take that question on notice, also, because we have not the figures available at present. I take the opportunity to pay a tribute to all of the personnel of those advisory committees. They do a job that is very effective for their areas. Some public servants are members of committees, but receive no remuneration.

**Mr LEWIS:** That is their job.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is recognised as part of their job, but I do not have the details with me at the moment. I will obtain them and advise the member for Mallee as soon as possible.

**Mr LEWIS:** By way of explanation, I imply no criticism of the committees or the membership from any quarter whatever by asking questions about them. My reason for wishing to know that information is that I can more accurately and directly make contact with those people from the South-East, the area overlying the Murray Basin in the Mallee and in the Angas-Bremer region, where those people are my constituents and the resource is also used by industries that are owned and operated by my constituents.

I have been curious as to the reasons for the changes to the membership of the committee in recent times since the Minister came to office, particularly in the Angas-Bremer Plains region. It struck me that members of that committee had always given their best and spoken honestly and frankly with and to the Minister; yet, several of them were summarily dropped from the committee not long after the Minister took office.

No explanation was given as to why it was thought that they were less competent than other people, nor were they consulted, nor were the irrigators consulted, nor were any reasons given for the policy changes about the installation of meters in that area. Will the Minister say why changes were made in that instance (I do not mind if he takes the question on notice) and reassure the Committee that the programme to install meters and determine how much water is withdrawn from that resource by the irrigators and accordingly facilitate the determination of how best to manage the resource as an enduring resource is continuing?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am quite surprised at the question, because on two occasions I had the opportunity to visit the area in which the Angas-Bremer advisory committee operates. I cannot recall immediately what changes have occurred in the membership, but I point out that the members are nominated from panels representing various groups in the district.

**Mr LEWIS:** Not in this case.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not think that the honourable member is correct, but I will check that.

**Mr LEWIS:** If that is the case, there was a fiddle in the nomination papers.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I try to take into account the feelings and the wishes of the people residing in that area because the purpose of the advisory committee is to obtain information from people on the spot, those who are directly involved in the operation. I am surprised that the matter has been raised today, because I am quite unaware of any person who was replaced. If members were replaced, they would have been nominated in a panel by the respective

organisations. We are considering seriously metering bores in that area, and it is likely that approval will be given for part of the area to be metered in the 1984-85 financial year.

**Mr LEWIS:** In that case, I direct the Minister's attention from the Angas-Bremer Basin and the water resources advisory committee to the Murray Basin and its committee. For how long will there be a moratorium on the establishment of irrigation bores in the Murray Basin, and why was the moratorium initiated? Does that mean that no further irrigators will be allowed to drill holes and pump water? Why is that the case? Given that the Department of Mines and Energy furnished the Engineering and Water Supply Department with information that about 45 000 megalitres of water a year was the annual recharge rate of the Murray Basin that would be available for subartesian exploitation by irrigators in the more contemporary context and domestic and stock users in the historical context in that region, why is the Department going in that direction, and when will it get started again?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, the Department of Mines and Energy assesses, and on the advice of the Department we declared the Murray Mallee a proclaimed area. A full hydrological assessment is required before we can finally determine the allocations and resolve other matters in relation to that area. That is likely to occur within the next 12 months or so and we will consider allocations then. I understand that there are seven members of the advisory committee at present; the committee is fully representative of those who are directly affected by that proclamation. That action was taken because there was a realisation that increasing usage of the underground water resource would occur over a time, and had occurred to some degree in the past.

The purpose of the exercise and the decision to proclaim other areas was to protect the underground resource for future use. Resources are not all replenished to the extent that they might once have been—it depends on the usage and the hydrological nature of the area. The Murray Valley Basin is in its infancy. We hope to receive sufficient information from the assessment to determine, probably in the next 12 months or so, what action we need to take for the future.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** What comparative statistics does the Department have in relation to the cost of supplying domestic water and sewer systems in the Hills areas as against areas on the plains? If there are such statistics, can they be supplied?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That question is difficult to answer off the cuff. I am not sure whether we can differentiate between specific areas in regard to the cost of providing water. I can say that the State-wide price of water this year is 53c a kilolitre and I could give the cost to the Department from a regional point of view. To relate specific costs to the Adelaide Hills might cause some difficulty, but we may be able to come up with an approximation rather than a direct relationship. Is that sufficient? I could give metropolitan costs.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** That would be of assistance. One of my unfinished concerns is that a small area of my district, the Salisbury plain, still is not supplied with water. It has been put to me, and I believe quite rightly, that a dollar spent in that area would give a relatively cheap supply of water compared to, for example, a dollar spent in the Adelaide Hills, where additional pumping is required. It seems to me that that is a legitimate argument, and I would like to know the statistics. If the statistics are as I expect, I would want to ask questions about the Department's pricing policy, and I would want to know why the Department does not charge people who live in the Hills additional amounts for their water because of the additional costs of supplying water.

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

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The member for Elizabeth, who is not present, asked a question prior to the luncheon adjournment. Can I briefly reply?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member may turn up some time this afternoon before 4 o'clock and the Minister can answer then. If he were interested in the answer to his question he should have been here at 2 o'clock.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I have a brief question, the answer to which can be provided at some future time. What was the average metropolitan water rate for domestic consumers for the years 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84, and what is the estimated amount for 1984-85? I am not talking here about the average base rate but the average metropolitan water rate account for those years. I would like similar figures for metropolitan sewer rates over the same period.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will take the honourable member's question on notice as we only have base figure information about revenue per head in Adelaide based on the population. I will get a detailed answer for the honourable member.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I return briefly to the matter we were discussing before lunch relating to payment of irrigation rates. Mr Killmier mentioned the amount of time available for payment of rates when he commented on this matter. Is the Minister, in line with what he said in the House of Assembly on 11 September, prepared to look at this overall situation? Although Mr Killmier mentioned that the situation I outlined related largely to wine grape growers and referred to citrus and dried fruit producers, I think that if an examination were made one would find that the rates paid within two or three days of 30 June were mainly paid by wine grape growers because of the unique situation that they are in. Any grower who could not pay his rates by 30 June, or within two or three days of that date, would not be able to pay them by 31 July in any case.

In view of the Minister's statement of 11 September, will he reconsider this situation as a whole as well as reconsidering the particular situation to which I referred as an example, because there are many other people in the same situation. I believe that without changing the legislation and by using Ministerial discretion people could be allowed the two or three days extra time to pay that I have been speaking of. I am not talking about a month, two months or anything like that, as I am basically concerned about the person who has genuinely endeavoured to juggle their finances to meet the requirement of this legislation.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is always difficult when someone talks of Ministerial discretion in matters such as this. As I have said previously, the legislation was put in place to give individuals the opportunity to pay their rates within a certain time. There must be a cut off point somewhere. The whole purpose of the legislation with regard to penalty rates was to encourage the payment of rates by a particular time. I indicate to the member for Chaffey and to other Committee members that I am prepared to investigate the matter he has raised in relation to payment of an account. However, the decision made in the case raised, and no doubt in other cases, was based on the fact that at present accounts must be paid by 30 June. I said earlier in relation to the specific case raised that the person involved received the account in February, had until 21 March to pay and then had another three months to pay. The Department is not in a position to tell wineries when they should pay the grape growers. It may be that the wineries should have a discretion with regard to payments to growers.

I make the point that I am prepared to look at the situation again to see whether there is a method by which we can assist. I do not want to be too Draconian concerning this matter. Mr Killmier will confirm that there has always

been a problem with arrears in relation to the payment of accounts in the Riverland. This has been referred to over a period of time in Auditor-General's Reports. I am prepared to reassess the situation, without giving any guarantees on the matter, based on the comments made by the member for Chaffey.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I turn now to salinity control programmes undertaken in the Murray/Darling system. The Lock 2/Lock 3 ground water interception scheme will not be implemented by the Government before 1987. In 1982 a consultancy was let to study that proposal and the initial report indicated that it was very cost effective.

If we are serious about controlling the level of salinity in South Australian water then we have to forge ahead at a faster rate than what is outlined. If we are not looking at the practical side of implementing the Lock 2/Lock 3 proposal it means that we will not be doing any more in reality to try to control salinity in the Murray for the remainder of this decade, other than to carry out a few investigations. Can the Minister show me that the necessary investigations that have to be carried out cannot be done in a shorter time frame than is indicated?

The Minister is aware that a project of that nature with an effect on salinity has a very long lead time. If we let the situation deteriorate, when we seriously get around to implementing further mitigation work it will be a number of years after that before the projects really start to take effect. What negotiations has the Government had with Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth in relation to implementing the necessary works that have been identified as necessary by various consultant reports in Victoria and New South Wales? What progress has been made in relation to determining the water quality standards at various points in the Murray/Darling system so that, hopefully, we can arrive at a water quality standard for South Australia at the border which will ensure that any works undertaken in South Australia will be of direct benefit to the State and will not be trying to counteract the lack of action in Victoria and New South Wales?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Lock 2/Lock 3 ground water interception scheme, on current 1984-85 values, has an estimated cost of \$16 million or more. In an expenditure of that nature it is tremendously important that all the preliminary investigations are undertaken to ensure that we obtain real value for money. The question was asked concerning the proposed expenditure of this scheme. The papers show that we intend to spend \$640 000 in 1984-85, rising to \$6.146 million in 1987-88, \$6.686 million in 1988-89, and probably a further \$6 million to complete the scheme.

This project will no doubt be the major scheme in relation to ground water interception undertaken in comparison with previous projects. The honourable member would be aware that we have made substantial progress concerning salinity mitigation work. As the previous Minister, he would know that we are involved in the Noora Drainage Disposal Scheme, which is fully operational; the Rufus River Scheme, which was commissioned on 30 March this year; and the River Murray Water Quality Management Study which was completed by Maunsell and Partners in April 1984, and is a detailed quality and quantity model of the Murray River, that will form the basis of future planning studies in relation to salinity control.

The honourable member will also be aware that the Victorian Parliamentary Select Committee on Salinity Control visited South Australia to examine options with a view to producing a report to Parliament. I am not sure whether that report to the Victorian Parliament has been presented. Of course, there are other schemes with investigations proceeding. I am not talking about only South Australia but about the whole of the Murray River and its tributaries.

We need a comprehensive water quality management plan, and this is being prepared by the River Murray Commission in collaboration with the States and the Commonwealth Government and will take account of these investigations. So, not just the Woolpunda interception scheme is important as a scheme to control salinity in South Australia and the Murray generally.

I draw to the attention of all members of the Committee that the Director-General of Agriculture, Mr McColl, returned from a fairly extensive four weeks overseas study tour in August this year. I note from the press that Mr McColl was very complimentary in what he said about investigations and work done concerning the Murray River Salinity Control Programme. He said that South Australia's programme was 'a world leader' and that more should be done to make it known overseas. That is something of a recommendation. We are not unaware of the problems, but there has to be co-operation between the States and the Commonwealth. The Director-General of the Department is also a Commissioner on the River Murray Commission and I ask him to supplement the answer I gave on salinity control, not necessarily only in regard to the Lock 2/Lock 3 ground water interception scheme, but also relating to the whole of the programme that may be undertaken by the River Murray Commission and the individual States. Our big problem is to encourage Victoria and New South Wales to do their share (and perhaps insist on their doing so) in association with the Commonwealth concerning the salinity control of the Murray River.

**Mr K.W. Lewis:** The River Murray Commission did commission a River Murray Water Quality Management Study by Maunsell and Partners with a view to establishing a computer-based water quality model for the Murray River. That work has been completed so that the River Murray Commission now has a model into which it can make inputs in order to determine the effect that various strategies in managing the water quality of the Murray River might produce as output from the river.

The River Murray Commission has established a task force since that model was received to, first, validate the model and ensure that it did in fact reflect what would happen when one made changes to the regime in the way in which one managed the Murray River, what the effects of adding salinity components to the river would be and, furthermore, what the priorities ought to be for salinity mitigation schemes on the river itself. Within that context, the Commission will test many schemes with the new model. Investigations are proceeding, for instance, into the provision of dilution flows—in other words, the establishment of additional storages on the Murray system, probably in the head works. The Commission will also look at the enhancement of the upstream groundwater interception works at Buronga, Mildura and Merbein. Much investigation is undertaken by both the Victorian and New South Wales Governments looking at groundwater interception at Karadoc Swamp and also at Nangiloc-Colignan. A number of other schemes are being investigated, including groundwater interception at Lindsay River, upstream from this State, and a groundwater interception scheme near Chowilla, where we have established that natural inflows into the river may prove to be economically cut off and disposed of away from the river system. Similar schemes are being looked at within the Department at Berri East, Loxton and Waikerie.

The end result of all these studies will be, we hope, a water quality management plan for the Murray River and for the whole Murray River Basin. Ultimately we would hope that this would also lead to a water management plan for the Murray River in the future. Naturally, there are conflicting views between different users of the river, and compromises will have to be reached so that all river users

will receive reasonable value from the river in the final analysis.

For instance, if one optimises the amount of water available upstream for irrigation, it could mean that the quality of water in the downstream reaches of the river would be unsatisfactory and so some compromise has to be reached. If one optimises the river use for perhaps tourism or recreation it could reduce the amount of water available for irrigation or other purposes, or metropolitan water supply purposes. An enormous amount of work must be done before the River Murray Commission can come forward with a clearly defined water quality management plan or a water management plan *in toto*. The Commission's intention is to make that available for public comment, not only to the three participating State Governments and the Commonwealth but also to the general public, because of the great divergences in opinion by different river users.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I understand that the Minister has a reply to the question asked earlier by the member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I assume the honourable member's question dealt with a rural sector of the honourable member's electorate?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** No, it is light industrial and residential—that is the problem.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The question concerned the economics of a water service to an area of Salisbury Plains, in comparison to a service in the Adelaide Hills. In regard to any scheme involving the supply of water, the policy is that a 15 per cent return must be assured before the Department will provide the service. I cannot relate the specific details of the area concerned, but I believe the honourable member made representations to me by letter about the area, which is part residential and part industrial. I do not understand why an industrial area does not have a water supply, because it could not operate without that facility. Perhaps the honourable member could provide further information.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Two questions are involved and I do not want to get them confused. First, I refer to the situation of my constituent. This area was developed before the new Planning Act was introduced and is comprised of a loose mixture of industrial and residential areas. Specifically, the industrial user is connected from a different road, but the whole section of road about which we are talking is on the side of the industrial area and therefore the people at the other end find that they cannot get water. The more general point is that I understand that it is the Department's or the Government's policy to charge a uniform water rate throughout the metropolitan area. It seems logical to think that it is more expensive to supply water and sewerage to people living in the hills than to people on the plains, because one does not need as many pumping stations on the plains as in the Adelaide Hills, where water has to go up and down and so forth. I seek confirmation of that. I seek statistics about the cost of the installation and supply of water and sewerage in a typical area on the Adelaide Plains and a typical area in the Adelaide Hills. I do not necessarily want that information today, because it is not the sort of information that the Minister has at his fingertips, but it is important information that the community should have so that judgments can be made by the community at large about the effectiveness of a uniform pricing policy.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The honourable member is quite correct: we do not have that information to hand. The information is contained in the Budget papers, and I also addressed this point during my opening remarks. There is certainly a large differential between the cost involved and the return between metropolitan sewers and water supply as compared to the supply in all country areas. The very

nature of the State is such that that must apply. The Statewide price of water is 53c a kilolitre. I understand the reason for the honourable member's question. There are areas quite close to the metropolitan area of Adelaide which are regarded as uneconomic because the policy and the criteria established provide for a 15 per cent return on capital investment.

The Government must also consider, particularly in regard to the deficit on country water supply and sewers, the recurrent deficit which will occur if all schemes come to fruition. It is a bit of a 'catch 22' situation, and is of concern to me, the Government and the Department. As a consequence, we are looking at a review of the mains extension policy. I trust that in some way that will assist in the supply of water, particularly in the areas mentioned and in the Salisbury Plains. There has been residential development all around the Salisbury Plains area, which has now become isolated and is in effect an island. That area was basically planned for industrial use. I am sympathetic to the problem. I will obtain the figures requested by the honourable member. I am sorry that I cannot give a definite reply on the problem at Salisbury Plains. However, the problem is not isolated to that area. I am sure that members on both sides could give examples where people are looking for a water supply but because of the policy and the cost involved we cannot give them any immediate satisfaction.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Is the Minister clear that in asking these questions I am not suggesting that we should move away from the State cost for water? I think the statistics both in relation to the cost of country supplies and the supply in the Hills would be quite useful because from time to time people in rural areas are inclined to assume that they are not getting a fair go in other areas of Government activity. I think it would be useful to have those statistics so that it can be made clear where the subsidies apply. I am sure that all members who support programme performance budgeting would support me in the need to understand where the subsidies actually apply.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I can provide an analysis in relation to operating results of the metropolitan and country water regions. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* without my reading it a table in that regard.

Leave granted.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WATERWORKS**  
Analysis of Operating Results of Metropolitan and Country Water Regions 1983-84

	Operating Results										Water + Service Statistics			Average price and cost of water per kilolitre	
	Revenue	Mice & operating costs	Surplus or deficit on operations	Sinking fund contrib. (deprec.)	Interest	Repayment of principal	Total surplus or deficit	No. of servs	Consumption in kilolitres	Kilos	Ave. Per Service		Net surplus or deficit		Actual cost received
											Revenue	Costs			
Metropolitan	79 527 000	37 531 000	41 996 000(S)	2 840 000	27 530 000	556 000	11 070 000(S)	339 688	144 927 619	427	234	202	32(S)	0.55	0.47
Country	5 314 565	4 328 235	986 330(S)	337 020	3 770 730	3 121 420(D)	25 853	9 358 739	362	206	326	120(D)	0.57	0.90	
Metro. Ops	1 995 762	2 050 158	54 396(D)	1 311 562	993 245	1 179 203(D)	4 819	2 788 187	579	414	659	245(D)	0.72	1.13	
Mallee	11 932 239	13 118 984	1 186 745(D)	1 501 735	11 106 934	13 795 414(D)	49 608	24 641 941	497	241	519	278(D)	0.48	1.04	
Northern	4 536 757	6 309 584	1 772 827(D)	465 376	4 820 168	7 058 371(D)	13 853	8 037 879	580	327	837	510(D)	0.56	1.44	
Eyre	3 795 313	2 552 262	1 243 051(S)	150 310	1 580 163	487 422(D)	16 962	5 819 109	343	224	252	28(D)	0.65	0.74	
South-East	1 689 787	1 521 994	167 793(S)	60 997	729 760	622 964(D)	7 679	3 407 175	444	220	301	81(D)	0.50	0.68	
Riverland	29 264 423	29 881 217	616 794(D)	2 647 000	23 001 000	26 264 794(D)	118 774	54 053 030	455	246	467	221(D)	0.54	1.03	
Total Country	108 791 423	67 412 217	41 379 206(S)	5 487 000	50 531 000	556 000	15 194 794(D)	458 462	198 980 649	434	237	270	33(D)	0.55	0.62

This statement is prepared on a cash receipts basis and therefore does not relate to the actual price of water charged.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Can the Minister provide information in relation to the water supply to the Roxby Downs project? Although the initial proposal was to build a pipeline from the Murray River to Roxby Downs, I understand that, at least in the short term, it has been scotched and the current proposal is to pump water from the Great Artesian Basin. A constituent of mine who is a market gardener on the northern Adelaide Plains has raised with me the question of how much the Roxby Downs joint venturers will pay for the use of this water, seeing he has to pay for water that is pumped out of the northern Adelaide Plains.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** As the member for Elizabeth has said, a pipeline from the Murray River will not be provided. I understand that water will be supplied from a bore some 100 km north of Roxby Downs. There was also a proposal, which I am not quite sure about, in regard to the Commonwealth pipeline from Port Augusta to Woomera, which was mentioned as a possibility in earlier times. That pipeline is not quite up to the standard of the E & WS Department, but it was effective in earlier days. The Commonwealth is somewhat anxious that we as a State take over that pipeline. We have not yet responded to that request. I understand that the water for Roxby Downs will be via underground resources. I do not know whether it can be compared with the constituent's complaint on the northern Adelaide Plains as far as water is concerned, because that is an entirely different situation.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Will there be any charge for the water?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Director-General will respond.

**Mr K.W. Lewis:** The main water supply for Roxby Downs will be drawn from bore fields in the Great Artesian Basin. The first bore field A is in the vicinity of Herman Hill Springs. As members may be aware, an environmental impact statement and an environmental assessment report have been developed to permit that to begin. There will be no charge for the water itself from the basin, although all costs associated with drilling the bores and delivering the water to its point of use at the proposed mine will be met by the joint venturers. I do not understand the honourable member's question in relation to the northern Adelaide Plains. There is no charge for ground water in that area unless the licensee exceeds the allocation. Of course, there is a meter rental, but that is not a charge for the water.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** An employee of the Department named Sanderson was sacked and subsequently took court action to be reinstated. The magistrate in the Industrial Court found that the Department's action in sacking this person had been harsh, unjust or unreasonable. Subsequently, the Department might have decided to appeal. Who made the decision to appeal? How much is it anticipated that it will cost the Department to run this appeal?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am familiar with the case to which the member for Elizabeth refers. The Public Service Board as the employer lodged the appeal in this case. I do not have any further information as to where the matter stands at the moment.

**Mr GUNN:** Following a similar line, is the Minister in a position to clearly explain the situation with those 32 uneconomic proposals that the Department currently has before it? Last year the Minister at my prompting tabled these. How much money will the Government provide this year to the E & WS Department to commence some of the backlog? It appears absolutely outrageous that in 1984 places like Denial Bay and those areas west of Ceduna (Denial Bay being adjacent to the township of Ceduna) have no hope of being connected to a reasonably adequate supply of water.

One can compare the sort of funds available through the Government to subsidise and operate non-essential organisations. I refer to the building adjacent to Parliament House; funds can be found in a matter of hours to repair the Festival Theatre or its surrounds. In excess of \$5 million can be found to subsidise people sitting in the seats there. I do not object the Festival Theatre, but I strongly object if there is no money to provide what people regard as a basic necessity of life. Can the Minister give an assurance that some of those projects will be commenced in the next 12 months? How many applications have been made to the Commonwealth for funding through the CEP scheme besides that for Coober Pedy?

Considerable concern has been expressed in my area and in other parts of the State. The majority of the needs would be associated with my electorate. I realise that the Department operates in country areas at a significant loss, but that loss is nothing compared with the loss with which the STA operates and no-one says that we should not expand the STA services, which have been expanding all the time. So, we can write off completely any argument that because of the loss nothing can be done.

It amazes me that funds can be found for other projects but that it is so difficult to provide for these people in those isolated communities in places west of Ceduna such as Denial Bay, and at Terowie. I could go through the list in my area and give lengthy explanations but that is not necessary. I await the Minister's reply with interest.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We cannot write off the cost to Government relating to these schemes. Not only is capital cost involved but recurrent cost. I cannot assure the member for Eyre or other members who approach me in regard to what we describe as uneconomic water supply schemes, because there is a criterion. Part of his question related to Federal Government funding so far for 1984-85. It does not apply specifically to the uneconomic schemes, although an application was made for six schemes. Two are currently awaiting approval, namely, Coffin Bay and Upper Sturt.

**Mr GUNN:** Which schemes have you applied for?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There was an original application.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Gregory):** The honourable member has asked two questions at once. Now, that is a third. I am being generous.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I was going to answer that anyway. They are Meadows, Kingston South, Echunga and Mount Compass. Two are still being considered or awaiting approval. The total is 34 schemes. The capital cost of them all totals some \$53 million. No matter whether it is the Festival Theatre or some other scheme, the Government assesses its priorities. The Festival Theatre scheme is not within the budget of the E & WS Department. Nevertheless, we appreciate the difficulties of people living in those areas.

The member for Eyre has been a persistent and consistent advocate for people within his electorate and I do not deny him that. But, here again, we have to assess them in priority order in relation to a number of factors such as the financial and health aspects. Coffin Bay is one where there is a tremendous problem. We endeavour as much as possible to cover them if and when the opportunity provides itself. Certainly, we need Commonwealth funds to be able to provide any funding regarding those uneconomic schemes.

The CEP funding that has been provided to us for this current year covers a number of different projects that are not directly related to the uneconomic schemes, but we have a number of them: to repair and replace pipeline gulleys, the Dimet coating of the Tod trunk main in the member for Eyre's electorate, the restitution of above-ground pipelines, land use capability assessment in the Onkaparinga region, preparation of water data catalogue, the Mount Lofty watershed pollution assessment, the upgrading of the water

pollution control records, preparation of material for Silver Jubilee, historical water data transfer, and tree planting at the Little Para Reservoir, which is awaiting approval now.

**Mr GUNN:** That has nothing to do with it.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The supplementary question contained a number of comments about CEP funding. The total Federal Government funding so far received is \$1.674 million, which applies to about nine projects, some of which are in metropolitan and some in country areas. Out of that the State Government has contributed \$250 000. As I said before, we need further Commonwealth Government assistance to tackle any of those uneconomic schemes.

**Mr GUNN:** I listened with great interest to the Minister's comments. Is he prepared to submit for the Commonwealth's consideration the scheme that has been mooted for many years to provide an adequate supply of water west of Ceduna?

If that has not been done, will the Minister consider the proposal urgently, and I point out that I was interested, to say the least, in the proposed scheme at Mount Compass, because that district is part of the highest rainfall area in South Australia, also having supplies of underground water and natural runoff. I do not have to remind the Minister that the area west of Ceduna has little or no runoff potential and no underground water. Great difficulties were experienced when people applied for assistance to drill bores during the drought. The Department advised the council that there was no value in drilling bores in that area because it was unlikely to find water for human consumption or stock purposes.

These people have been patient, they are South Australian citizens, and they see millions of dollars expended in various other ways. All they want is what the average citizen believes to be his right—a supply of water within a reasonable distance from where he lives. The Minister referred to a scheme at Coffin Bay, and I entirely endorse that. I point out that the people who build houses at Denial Bay have to comply with various codes and septic tanks must be installed. They do not have reticulated water. They have to do the best they can. I appeal to the Minister to do something about this problem. It gives me no pleasure to continue to raise these matters, but I would be failing in my obligation if I did not strenuously put these points of view to the Minister on behalf of the people I represent. It is really becoming very annoying, reading through the documents, to note that millions of dollars are allocated for different departments, but the Engineering and Water Supply Department is starved of funds to carry out what I believe to be basic maintenance and provision of facilities. I am told that there has been a delay in laying the new main to Smoky Bay because the Department has no money, but when there is a slight problem in regard to the Festival Theatre, the money seems to fall from the sky.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That has nothing to do with the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

**Mr GUNN:** It is the same taxpayers who are paying. The Government is willing to spend taxpayers' money on one project but not on projects in isolated areas. Those people and I cannot understand why there appears to be two classes of citizen. I admit that I have made these points strongly, but I make no apology for that, because that was what I was elected for. But I am getting to the stage of thinking that these people pay their taxes so why should they not get a fair return?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The schemes to which I referred are determined on economics in the first instance and, secondly, on what we call social needs. That may be arguable. However, I suggest that Opposition members get their act together, have a meeting and determine priorities. The member for Flinders may determine that provision of facilities at Coffin Bay is more important than provision of

facilities in the district of Mallee, and the member for Mallee may interpret the situation differently, as may the member for Alexandra or the member for Eyre. The point I make again (and I made this point fairly clearly in my opening remarks) is that the Opposition should study closely the returns to the Department for country water supply: members would see very clearly from the figures, particularly the figures for last year, that people in the metropolitan area of Adelaide are paying substantially for the supply of water to country areas. It may be that, if people want the service, those who benefit from it will have to pay, because that sort of burden cannot be imposed on other taxpayers in the State. That determination may have to be made in the future.

**Mr LEWIS:** What about the State Transport Authority?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The State Transport Authority is under the responsibility of the Minister of Transport: the honourable member is a day late. The State Transport Authority has no relevance to the Engineering and Water Supply Department or its deficit in relation to country operations. Each country member of the Opposition has made representations. Even the Leader of the Opposition made representations recently about a water supply to Wallaroo North, and no doubt he would consider that project to be much more important than projects proposed by other members who have brought deputations to me from time to time.

I am not arguing that those projects are not important to the State, but the basic consideration is economics, and if we make a comparison between the metropolitan area and the country areas of South Australia in regard to costs, I repeat that we will conclude that, if people benefit from the extension of water supply (those specifically mentioned by the member for Eyre living west of Ceduna) which basically is not for domestic consumption but for watering stock, and if they improve their financial position (and I do not see anything wrong with that), they ought to make a significant contribution to the scheme.

**Mr BECKER:** What are the reserves of the Great Artesian Basin, and what is the quality of the water? I read a conservation magazine recently in which it was estimated that it takes 600 000 000 years for water to flow from Queensland to South Australia. That seems to be an awfully long time. On 1 May 1984 (page 4038 of *Hansard*) I asked a question about the number of pastoral bores in South Australia, and the Minister replied that there were about 120 000 bores. I tried to ascertain the draw off level from the Great Artesian Basin and I was informed that, as far as Roxby Downs is concerned, it is about 500 kilolitres a day, increasing to 33 000 kilolitres a day in the future. I am concerned about the amount and the quality of water in the Great Artesian Basin.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Was the question of 1 May directed to me or to the Minister of Mines and Energy?

**Mr BECKER:** To the Minister of Water Resources, as this matter comes under natural resources.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Mr Lewis will reply.

**Mr K.W. Lewis:** There have been many estimates of the reserves of the Great Artesian Basin, which extends over four States. No-one has stated the total reserves in the Basin. There is an enormous quantity of water in the Basin and unfortunately I cannot recall the best estimate, but I will attempt to obtain that information for the Committee.

The water quality is obviously for the most part better in the northern part of the basin, which is in Queensland, where a great deal of the recharging of the basin takes place. The water is of a lesser quality on the fringes of the basin where the bedrock breaks through. There is not a great deal of good quality water in the southern areas near the edge of the basin. It is on the edge of the basin that natural

mound springs break out. These are of great concern to the conservation movement. The location of bore fields has been related to protecting those mound springs and to getting water of a quality that is economic to pump out and treat for various purposes.

The drawing of up to 33 megalitres of water a day, which is the ultimate estimated usage by the Roxby operation, would not have an unsatisfactory impact on the basin provided that the bore-fields that supply it are located in appropriate places. The location of those bore-fields is determined in consultation between the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Water Resources. However, it is the Minister of Water Resources who finally gives the licence to withdraw water. We have satisfied ourselves that the present proposal is quite satisfactory so far as the basin is concerned.

**Mr BECKER:** Allegations have been made in relation to Roxby Downs, and a suggestion made, that there could be pollution of the Great Artesian Basin because of the work to be done and the processes at Roxby Downs. Was desalination of seawater and its pumping from the gulf to Roxby Downs ever considered?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It may have been considered but it would be uneconomic. Desalination of seawater is an expensive process and no action is likely to be taken in that regard.

**Mr BECKER:** On page 3 of the programme performance papers under the heading 'Organisation Structure and Staffing' it shows that as at 30 June 1983 there were 1 587 public servants employed in the Department. I take it that that is a figure for full-time equivalent staff. There were 3 400 weekly paid employees at that time and 39 other employees—and I would like to know what 'other' means—a total of 5 026 employees. The figures as at 30 June 1984 were: 1 590 people employed under the Public Service Act, 3 228 weekly paid employees, and 30 other employees, a total of 4 848 excluding 59 persons employed under the CEP Scheme. Therefore, there was a drop from 1983 to 1984 of 178 employees. The number of employees proposed as at 30 June 1985 is: 1 572 people employed under the Public Service Act, 3 163 weekly paid and 31 other staff, a total of 4 766, a drop of 82 on the previous year.

I am concerned about the impact of reductions on the number of employees in the Department and about the fact that I have not seen any significant drop in the overheads or administrative costs, although they must exist. Can the Minister supply the Committee with a list of staff classifications of public servants employed in the Department, their classifications and salaries; the number of weekly paid employees and whether they are broken up into categories such as skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled, tradesmen or whatever; and their ages, so that we can predict what the natural attrition rate will be within the Department and what impact that might have on any future savings.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The reference to 'others' refers to employees of the River Murray Commission who are mainly employed on locks, and so on. The question that the honourable member asked regarding staff classifications within the Public Service will require a comprehensive undertaking to supply an answer. With regard to weekly paid employees, their employment categories and age profiles we have some figures on that. I have an age profile table, but it is not with me at the moment. The average age of weekly paid employees, as I recall, is in the 45 years old range, or thereabouts.

With regard to the actual head count of public servants, as at June 1984, there were 1 550 full-time equivalent officers. We made adjustments during the year to account for the appointment of 22 waterworks inspectors who were ex-weekly paid staff; appointment of five additional drainage

and plumbing inspectors to cope with an increased work load and the retirement of some officers; an extension of five officers to the capital works programme; and five officers to cope with increases in land development activity. As a consequence the revised target as at 30 June was 1 587 full-time officers. There was a reduction of 156 weekly paid employees, although the actual number of employees as at June 1984 was 3 228, which is 16 above the anticipated reduction, but was after allowing for the 22 waterworks inspectors appointed to Public Service positions.

Reductions occurred mainly among the employees engaged on capital projects that concluded during the year. In addition, the Department had what we call 'specific term contract employees' engaged on capital works who became full-time employees. There were some such employees at Port Augusta and some at Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant. In addition to the employees I have mentioned in 1984-85 the Department has employed 71 people under the Community Employment Programmes that I have mentioned previously, nine of those under the Public Service Act and 62 weekly paid employees. They are not included in the departmental manpower statistics. All of the breakdowns the honourable member requires will have to be obtained for him. If I recollect correctly, I have a directive from the Chairman that such information should be with the Clerk of the Committee by 19 October. The figures are fairly extensive and I ask that if they are not ready by then that I be granted an extension of time to provide the figures.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Gregory):** Be that as it may, 19 October is the deadline and if the information is not available by then it cannot be published in *Hansard*.

**Mr BECKER:** I was under the impression that there was a computer printout list available in the Department as at 30 June in relation to these matters. Some time ago the Public Accounts Committee was given a similar list and I would have thought that this could be readily available.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am advised that we will be able to provide it by the time suggested by the Chairman this morning, so there is no further problem. We will not only list staff positions but also weekly paid employees.

**Mr LEWIS:** A letter from the Minister of Local Government, states in part:

From the information given to the departmental officer it would appear the hold-up... is with the E & WS Department and not the local authority or the Point McLeay Community Council.

That letter was written to me in response to a letter I had written to the Minister of Local Government, the Minister of Water Resources and the Premier, seeking reasons why there was a hold-up in the proposal to connect the Narrung water supply to the Point McLeay water supply. Given that that was the advice provided to the Minister of Local Government by his officer who investigated the problem, I ask the Minister of Water Resources responsible for the E & WS Department to explain why there is still a hold-up in connecting the Narrung water supply to the Point McLeay water reticulation system.

I wrote to the Minister, as he will recall, on 28 August 1984. I sent copies of that letter to the Minister of Community Welfare as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, to the Minister of Local Government, to the Regional Director of Aboriginal Affairs, to the Director of the Minister's Department (Mr Lewis), and to the Meningie District Council. I wrote that letter in response to a telex sent to the Premier on 17 August from the Point McLeay Community Council, expressing concern about the detrimental consequences of malicious, libellous, slanderous comments that were being made in the locality about that council's involvement in the matter. It was accused of being the fly in the ointment.

Will the Minister tell me what the hold-up is and when it is likely to be overcome?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I cannot tell the honourable member what the hold-up is. I am not familiar with the telegram and the letters he has in his possession. I assure you, Mr Acting Chairman, and the member for Mallee, that we will look at the matter as quickly as possible and, if it is possible, we will expedite the matter. The honourable member mentioned a letter sent to me dated—

**Mr LEWIS:** The most recent one is dated 28 August. This goes back two years.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I assure the honourable member that we will get the details and advise him accordingly.

**Mr LEWIS:** By way of explanation I will jog the Minister's memory. The Minister wrote to me on 28 March this year, stating:

I refer to your letter of 29 February 1984 concerning the connection of Narrung to the Point McLeay water reticulation system. The Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief has advised me that the additional information requested by the Point McLeay Community Council was provided to the Chairman at a meeting on site on 13 March 1984. The meeting was attended by the Chairman of the Community Council, the Community Manager and an officer from the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Further details relating to the cost of installing domestic water meters were requested at the meeting, and these were supplied later the same day. It is hoped that with the availability of the additional information the council will be in a better position to reach a decision on the takeover and that all outstanding matters can be resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Still nothing happened. I wrote to the Minister again on 28 August, subsequent to my getting a blister through the Premier's Office in the form of a telex from the Point McLeay Community Council, wherein it sought to absolve itself of responsibility for the delay. The Minister's office wrote to me on 3 September acknowledging my letter of 28 August—exactly a month ago today. The letter states:

The Minister is away this week. Your letter [my letter] will be brought to his attention on his return. In the meantime the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been asked to provide the Minister with a report on this matter.

Presumably, the Minister still does not have that report?

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

**Mr LEWIS:** Leaving that matter aside, notwithstanding its considerable significance and embarrassment to me, since it goes back a very long time and causes me to be constantly involved in correspondence, I now turn—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** You have explained yourself to the Minister. Will the Minister please answer.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have it clear. We will chase it up and advise the honourable member as quickly as we can.

**Mr LEWIS:** Will the Minister provide the Committee with the direct and indirect costs of pumping water from the Murray River to Adelaide? The 'direct costs' would be salaries and wages of staff and the electricity involved in getting the water from the Murray River over the hills and into the pipes in Adelaide. The 'indirect costs' are further salaries, wages and other allowances for staff who have to be employed regardless of whether the water flows through the pipeline or not—just to be there to maintain the system. Of course, this also includes an allocation for depreciation. If we are to make a realistic appraisal of the cost of bringing water to Adelaide this must be included as the pipeline will not last for ever—nothing or no-one ever does. In due course the pipeline will have to be replaced. If possible, will the Minister also indicate the estimated cost of replacing the pipeline from the Murray River over the hills to Adelaide at 1984 prices?

I ask that question for two reasons. Presently we are bringing water to people and industries. Would it not be more profitable to take the industries and the people to the

water? A great deal of water is brought from the Murray River and left in storage in the hills unnecessarily, in excess of demand by consumers. Presumably this is done to keep some water in puddles for the sake of the fish and the appearance of the place. I see no other good reason for the reservoirs to be more than half full or half empty, whichever way one wants to look at it.

The other problem concerns unnecessary additional water pumped into the reservoirs from which it is reticulated. It evaporates while in the reservoirs. It is okay if it evaporates from the Murray River; it has not been pumped at that stage and it does not cost a cent. If it is pumped through the hills and it evaporates, you have paid to get it there and to give it back to God. That seems a waste of money.

If the puddle is kept smaller and the surface area is reduced, the evaporation from it is directly and proportionately reduced. I am critical of that practice on that basis and concerned about the continuing cost of extending the metropolitan area further north and south when it would be just as easy to get the people to go over the hills and take up jobs in a decentralised sub-metropolitan development in that locality. At present the State applies none of the moneys and effort that it has to apply to providing water in Adelaide towards decentralised sub-metropolitan development. Will the Minister obtain those figures?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will get the pumping figures for the honourable member. An allowance in the Budget this year includes an increase in electricity costs, and the total cost is \$11.7 million. Several factors are involved, including seasonal fluctuations. Reservoirs are more or less balancing storages, and we are in a difficult position if they are not full or near full at the beginning of the summer season. Indeed, from time to time it is necessary to keep up the level of reservoirs, and this is calculated by computer from experience gained over many years. Pumping costs are kept to a minimum through continual monitoring in regard to the Morgan pipeline, to offtakes in the Adelaide Hills area and pumping from tanks to supply those services not on a gravitational basis.

The position is not as clear as the member for Mallee imagines. We have never wasted our pumping efforts. One cannot predict with any certainty what sort of season will come in the following year. In the past two years we have had good seasons in regard to rain, but no-one can be sure that we will not have bad years in the future as we did in 1979, 1980 and 1981 when 80 per cent of our supply from reservoirs to the metropolitan area came from the Murray River. We have great fluctuations from year to year in Adelaide's demand for water. I am willing to get the individual figures the honourable member seeks. I do not have them with me, just the total costs for what might be involved in 1984-85.

**Mr LEWIS:** Can the Minister explain why it is not possible for people with irrigation licences in the lakes area to buy or obtain transfers of licensed quantities for irrigation purposes from people elsewhere? If they want to sell or transfer any part of their allocation, they may not even transfer it to someone in their own region; they have to transfer it to someone upstream. Will the Minister review the policy?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The reason for the policy is that we have to ensure that any transfer is equitable to all concerned (I am talking about river users generally). I am willing to review the situation. It applies to areas in the member for Mallee's district, downstream from Wellington to Lake Albert. Transferability up river has applied only in recent years. I am willing to consider an extension of that policy downstream in the future.

**Mr LEWIS:** The policy was introduced by the Minister and irrigators down river were told that it was because of the high salt loads, meaning that the high levels of salinity



in the water in the Lower Murray made it necessary for the Minister to prevent them from transferring irrigation licences in from elsewhere. However, I would have thought it to be in the best interests of the river and the river communities—ecologically and sociologically—to transfer irrigation use from where the salt loads enter the river upstream to those areas at the end where it will create no problem. That would mean, if one stopped irrigating so heavily upstream, the amount of water that came back into the river from those irrigation schemes carrying that salt load would be reduced, and therefore the salt load in the river would be reduced and the people at Swan Reach, Bow Hill, Mannum, Murray Bridge and Adelaide and everywhere to which the water is reticulated from Mannum and Murray Bridge, across South Australia, would have better quality water in their taps with less salt in it, and it would be less likely to cause hypertension and heart disease. South Australia would not have to subsidise what appear to be horticultural industries in grave trouble in the Riverland if producers could sell their irrigation licences at the prices that efficient dairy farmers or the other efficient crop growers downstream are willing to pay for them, because they are certainly willing to bid more per unit volume of irrigation licences to use around the Narrung Peninsula/Meningie area and on the eastern side of Lake Alexandrina than elsewhere. They are willing to pay more for their water than anyone else can afford to pay (or indicates any willingness to pay) along the river, yet they cannot buy any water and, if they have so little that it is not quite a viable operation these days and they want to sell it, they have to sell it upstream and further exacerbate the problem by doing so. That is the reason for my question. It is only common sense to reverse the order of things from where they have been going. The sooner the Minister can give that review the better.

I turn now to a new topic altogether. Can the Minister indicate what risk there would be to human health, if any, if the trace elements of copper and cobalt were to be injected into the water supply servicing farms through the 90 mile desert, which is said to have a deficiency of copper in soils and cobalt in rumens of farm animals, such that supplements are needed. If these supplements can be added to water at little cost, does the Minister have any objection to, first, doing it in the same way as chlorine (chloramine now) and fluoride are added or, secondly and alternatively, allowing farmers to buy a venturi system or some other means of injection and putting it in themselves?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I think it is appropriate to direct that question to my colleague, the Minister of Health, obtain a report and advise the member accordingly.

**Mr LEWIS:** He told me to ask you.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am telling the honourable member that I will ask the Minister of Health. We will compare notes and come up with an appropriate response.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the Committee that we have yet to deal with four lines under this vote and there is an agreement to complete them by 4.30 p.m.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I return to the matter of Murray River salinity. It is generally accepted that one of the major contributors to salinity in major river systems is poor on-farm irrigation practices. The Government rehabilitation areas have been closed down, effectively wiping out the on-farm improved irrigation grant scheme that we had going. Has the Government entered into effective negotiations with Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth for a Murray-Darling Basin scheme which does not need any investigation? The value of improved irrigation practices is acknowledged and recognised around the world. There is a major programme to reduce salinity in the total Murray-Darling system which can be introduced virtually overnight.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** My information, which is somewhat limited, is that the Commonwealth would provide incentives to individual farmers. I agree with the honourable member that a major cause of the salinity problem relates to poor farming practices which have occurred over a considerable period. Only last year I visited areas of New South Wales and Victoria where it was fairly obvious that there was a considerable amount of what is referred to as laser grading of farms. Whether it is too late or whether too little has been done too late in those areas is a question to be determined by the three States in conjunction with the Commonwealth. Some on-farm irrigation improved practices have been resisted unless incentives have been provided to the individual. I believe that the Federal Department of Agriculture should provide those incentives.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I could not agree with the Minister more. However, it is quite obvious that the Federal Government will do nothing about it unless we in South Australia (the Government of the day) do something about it. It is something that we can virtually put into effect tomorrow. We have only to look at the experience in other parts of the world and draw on their knowledge and experience in this area, even to the extent of providing incentives similar to those provided in the United States. The provision of incentives is what we are talking about.

It has been recognised beyond doubt in the United States that the most effective cost benefit approach by the Government and the taxpayers is to provide incentives to treat the major cause of the problem at its source, which is on farm. Until that occurs, I think we are only playing around with the subject and we are certainly giving no indication of being serious about the matter. Unfortunately, the small incentive scheme we had going in South Australia has virtually gone out the window as a result of the shelving of the rehabilitation programme in this State.

Only about two days ago I received a document produced in May this year from the Colorado River Salinity Control Forum, which must report every three years as a forum on the current status of salinity control measures in the Colorado River. I will make the document available to the Department if it does not have a copy. The report highlights once again the need to proceed with all haste with on-farm improved irrigation practices and known capital works programmes that will control salinity. I think it would be an appalling state of affairs if in the past two years we have not been leaning heavily on the Federal Government, particularly in relation to improved irrigation practices. I appreciate that there can be a certain delay in relation to ground water interception schemes, and so on, but I do not accept the length of delay involved in the lock 2/lock 3 scheme. I am quite certain that on-farm irrigation practices have a tremendous benefit in the overall salinity control programme. I hope that as a matter of urgency the Minister will take up this matter with the Federal Government, because it must be a Federal Government funded programme. Quite obviously, the Federal Government will do nothing about it unless South Australia creates one hell of a fuss about it and leans on the Federal Government quite heavily.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not think there is any difference of opinion on the matter. I agree.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** My concern is that insufficient effort has been made by South Australia to impress on the Federal Government the need to get this programme off the ground. I am quite sure that it would be of enormous benefit to South Australia if an effective on-farm incentive scheme were developed for improved irrigation practices. Earlier in the day discussions revolved around improved water filtration and the problems in the metropolitan area in relation to high pay loads within the water particularly as a result of water in high flow periods coming from the

Darling. That problem exists right across South Australia and probably to a greater extent in towns adjacent to the Murray where there is no chance of any water settlement before it is pumped into the reservoirs. Water is being pumped directly from the river into the local reticulation systems of towns adjacent to the Murray River. Has the Government done any forward planning in relation to water filtration on a small scale for country towns, especially those in the vicinity of the Murray River and those mentioned this morning on northern Yorke Peninsula?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The answer to the honourable member's question is, 'No'. We have not given any consideration to filtration for small towns along the Murray which obtain their supplies direct from the river.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Supplementary to that, obviously because of the nature of the systems for towns adjacent to the Murray one does not have the same risk of amoebic meningitis because the water is not contained in the surface distribution system where the temperature can reach a critical level which triggers off the *Naegleria fowleri*. By the same token, it is just as undesirable for people living in those towns to have the quality of water in high flow periods in the Murray as for people in any other part of the State.

Coming back to the point that I made this morning (in the light of no clear indication of the priority that has been given to the Swan Reach-Stockwell filtration plant), if it is just to be included as part of a total programme over a long period, I still claim that the Government is literally gambling with the lives of people in the northern towns and on Yorke Peninsula because of the history of what has occurred in those areas in the past. I urge the Government to rethink that project and raise the level of priority of the Swan Reach-Stockwell filtration plant because if there is another outbreak of amoebic meningitis in the northern towns of Yorke Peninsula obviously the blame will have to be sheeted back to the Government because that is where the present Government sheeted it before.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I take that as a comment rather than as a question. I do not think that it requires an answer.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** We did not get a clear indication from the Minister this morning as to what was the Government priority of that project other than that it would be contained in the 10 year time table.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is part of the total filtration programme over the next seven to 10 years, depending on funding at a particular time. I cannot be more specific than that.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** That is not good enough.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is not good enough from your point of view, but that is the answer to your question.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** We are talking about lives, not about the cosmetic effects of water filtration to stop clothes getting dirty in the wash. We are talking about the risk to human life when we talk about the northern towns and Yorke Peninsula—a totally different category. There is no risk to the people of Adelaide of getting amoebic meningitis, but there is certainly a risk in the places I mentioned and will continue to be until the Swan Reach-Stockwell filtration plant is built and in operation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Have you asked a question?

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Yes, I just cannot get an answer.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I covered the subject earlier in the day. It is only a repetition of what was expressed by the member for Chaffey this morning. I am just replying as I did this morning that the Stockwell filtration plant is part of the overall programme for filtration plants in South Australia. We are proceeding with Morgan and Happy Valley, and Stockwell will possibly be the next project under some

investigation and will come under part of our plan within the next seven or eight years.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Government has still got its priorities back to front when it is literally gambling with human life. That is exactly what is occurring.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I suggest to the member for Chaffey that we are getting nowhere. If you ask questions you may get some answers. If the Minister chooses not to provide any further information, that is his prerogative.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There is nothing further to provide. It is a hypothetical question.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** It is back to the northern towns to try to press their case.

**Mr LEWIS:** Will the Minister give the Committee an undertaking that he will review the Flood Management Act, or whatever it is called, and amend it so that all counties south of the counties of Russell, Buccleuch and Chandos are exempt from the provisions of the Act, that is, the counties of McDonnell, Robe, Grey, Cardwell, and Buckingham, all of which are either under the control of the South-East Drainage Board or the Tatiara Drainage Trust or are outside the control of those bodies and have no rivers in them anyway?

At present, the way that legislation is written is ambiguous in its definition of stream, swamp or marsh. It could have very serious implications and result in enormous costs to individuals as well as to district councils (and therefore their ratepayers) in contesting the validity of that law as it might otherwise affect, say, the District Councils of Tatiara, Coonalpyn Downs and Lacedpede if an action were taken against them and the Tatiara Drainage Trust jointly by a disaffected ratepayer, to either or both the bodies, as a result of their, say, being negligent in not taking some action that they should have taken or for taking some action and being sued for doing that.

The Act has created in that part of the State a great deal more controversy and a great many more problems than it could or was ever likely to solve. Nobody there was at all happy that the Act applies there, and it would not in any way detract from the capacity of the Act to do the job for which it was passed through the Parliament in controlling flood problems that arise here in the metropolitan area or elsewhere in the State where they have rivers and streams that are readily identifiable and do not have vast, open flat watercourses that are up to 30 miles wide.

When floodwaters move through them 10 inches to a foot deep they are watercourses and the Act defines them as such; yet, it is contested, and will be next time a flood comes through there if the Act stays applicable to that region, that negligence or contributory negligence will have caused property damage. Will the Minister repeal its effect and impact on those counties?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Act referred to is the amendment to the Local Government Act that took place some 18 months ago or early this year.

**Mr LEWIS:** Flood management.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It was incorporated in the Local Government Act at the request and insistence of the Local Government Association. I recall that the same questions were raised by the member for Mallee on that occasion.

**Mr LEWIS:** You said that it did not apply, but legal opinion is now divided.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will check out that opinion with the Crown Law opinion.

**Mr LEWIS:** There are as many opinions as there are lawyers.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We can get varying opinions from different people. I do not think that the member for Mallee has any legal qualifications—

**Mr LEWIS:** Neither does the Minister.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:**—and I might mention in passing that neither do I, but I will certainly take advice as to whether it is applicable or otherwise. I recall the argument that occurred at that time. The advice that I got was that they were not covered—

**Mr LEWIS:** We can put it beyond doubt with one simple amendment.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:**—in that amendment to the Local Government Act. It was the Local Government Act being amended for flood management.

**Mr LEWIS:** Another quick question relates simply to the provision of water supply to country communities as contained in the kinds of questions asked by the member for Eyre. They are said to be uneconomic.

Many of the communities that I represent would like the legal authority to install and operate their own systems even though the rates charged would be higher than those charged in the metropolitan area. They believe that for the sake of their health and the development and expansion of their communities it is more important to have the service than to be denied it. They would need statutory authority to levy a rate on all people in the community, but at present that is not possible. Is the Minister prepared to accommodate communities such as South End (but I could name a dozen—they are on the list, and the Minister knows where they are)? If those people could only get a supply of potable water in a few short years they could develop their community because of improved standards of health and convenience. The increased number of people who will live there will mean that the schemes will soon become economical. It is a chicken and egg question. These communities are prepared, if the Minister gives the go-ahead, to accept that their water will cost them more. They are prepared not only to meet capital costs but also to pay higher rates.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not prepared to give that undertaking. I could delegate responsibility perhaps to the local government area for such a scheme, but under Statute we are required to provide a service at a particular standard.

**Mr LEWIS:** Well, there is no service now, standard or otherwise.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have already referred to 30-odd schemes, some of which, because of the very nature of the honourable member's district, are located there. When it comes to the supply of water within South Australia, I do not want to use the old cliché about South Australia being the driest State in the driest continent because, even though that is true, it results in a very grave difficulty for the E & WS Department in supplying a reticulated water service. I believe that, generally speaking, the undertakings that we have achieved over a period have been quite remarkable: let us not knock what we have. There are plenty of opportunities to expand the service but, as time has gone on, communities have expanded in various parts of the State and costs have escalated to a degree where Government can no longer afford to carry the cost and responsibility for that provision. There is nothing wrong with my delegating that responsibility as long as it is accepted that the people who take on the responsibility for the scheme, wherever it might be, engineer and organise the scheme as well as raising the revenue, paying the rates, and providing maintenance over a period.

**Mr LEWIS:** Are you questioning their ability to run the show?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No, I am saying that it would probably depend on the individuals in the community having sufficient knowledge and expertise by way of a consultant. Of course, the Department is always ready to give advice in regard to a particular scheme, and I have made this point to a number of deputations. We have offered assistance,

but I have some reservations in some cases about the ability of people to manage schemes effectively. However, if people want to do that I do not have any objection as long as they bear the cost and the responsibility for maintenance.

**Mr BECKER:** I note that the proposed allocation for the employment of apprentices indentured to the Department is \$1.551 million. It was proposed that 91 apprentices be employed in 1983-84, but 109 were actually employed and this year it is proposed that 112 apprentices be employed. In 1983-84 it was proposed that 48 apprentices indentured to other organisations be employed, 30 were actually employed, and this year it is proposed that 35 apprentices be employed. I am concerned about the decline in the number of apprentices indentured to other organisations. Will the apprentices, particularly the 112 apprentices indentured to the E & WS Department, have opportunities for full-time employment with the Department? What opportunities are available to the 35 apprentices who will be indentured to other organisations? I appreciate that the Department has excellent workshops and that the training facilities and opportunities for these young people are outstanding.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Department trains its own apprentices at Ottoway and it also assists with what we call the GOYAS scheme, the group 1-year apprentice scheme. At present there are 27 people in that category, and that is why there is a difference in the number of apprentices. I cannot give an assurance about employment, because these young people are employed by private individuals. We also train apprentices for other Government departments in the metal trades area. We have an excellent facility that is used not only by this Department but also for the training of apprentices in the metal industry and by private employers. In the past two years we have employed nearly all the apprentices who have completed their apprenticeship, and I trust that that will continue.

**Mr BECKER:** I recall that some years ago the previous Minister said that a committee had been established by the Department to review continually the system of water and sewerage rates determination. I have always believed that to use property values as the base is wrong. It seems to me that it takes away the initiative for people to develop and look after their property if the valuation is used as a base for water and sewerage rates, land tax, and council rates. The properties in Henley and Grange have been revalued, the average valuation increasing by about 58 per cent, but in some areas by 161 per cent, and water and sewerage rates in one area have increased by 200 per cent. What progress is the committee making in coming up with an alternative and more equitable scheme for water rating so that a suitable amount of water can be provided at an appropriate cost to the consumer?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, the honourable member would be aware that there is a five-year cyclical valuation system used for assessments. It may be that that reassessment occurred in the area of Henley and Grange last year. That does significantly affect the valuations done by the Valuer-General. Over a period of years there have been a couple of major reviews in relation to the assessing of the most appropriate and equitable method of determining water rates and sewer charges. One of them was conducted, I think, in the early 70s and went on for some considerable time. It was chaired by Mr Justice Sangster.

If my memory serves me correctly, there was a further review in the late 1970s. Out of all this came the system we use now, what is known as the pay-for-use system. I think that the previous Government, the Government before it and the present Government determined that this was the most appropriate method to adopt in relation to this charge. There is a lot of misunderstanding in relation to

this matter held by most consumers about the method by which we arrive at the charge for water and, indeed, how quotas are determined each year. These quotas are based on the valuations done by the Valuer-General's Department. If we changed the system basically one of the unfortunate occurrences would be that the average domestic ratepayer would undoubtedly pay more and the commercial and industrial sectors of the community would pay less. This means that an additional financial burden would be thrown on individual householders.

I should not harp on this, but I refer again to the fact that the metropolitan user paid more last year as compared with country users. This shows that the burden of cost in this area is more and more sustained by metropolitan users. Of course, because of the nature of the system, as compared to the system in the country, that is allowed to happen. Nevertheless, I think we should try to refine the system rather than making any basic changes to it. I am sure that we ought to continue to assess varying ways by which we can minimise this cost to the average householder.

I would be pleased to receive submissions or advice that might assist us in refining this system so that we can arrive at that determination. Perhaps one of my officers might like to add something to what I have said in relation to water rates and sewer charges, because this is a matter that is referred to us fairly frequently by members of the community. I believe that there is a lack of understanding of the system. We issue a pamphlet in relation to this matter every year for the information of householders. I would like to know how many householders take note of the information contained in that pamphlet, which I believe we should continue to issue, anyway.

*[Sitting suspended from 4.5 to 4.20 p.m.]*

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

Works and Services, Engineering & Supply Department,  
\$66 490 000—Examination declared completed.

Works and Services—South-Eastern Drainage Board,  
\$240 000—Examination declared completed.

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous, \$1 581 000.

**Chairman:**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

The Hon. P.B. Arnold

Mr H. Becker

The Hon. Peter Duncan

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr I.P. Lewis

Mr M.K. Mayes

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr K.W. Lewis, Director-General, E. & W.S. Department.

Mr D.J. Alexander, Deputy-Director General.

Mr A.N. Killmier, Director, Administration and Finance.

Mr R.J. Greatrex, Manager, Management Accounting and Budgeting.

Mr K.R. John, Senior Finance Officer.

Mr R.E. Mander, Acting Senior Finance Officer.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** In the Estimates of Payments on page 149 there is an item 'National Water Resources Association—Expenses of representative'. It indicates that the actual payment last year was nil and this year no payment is proposed. Does that mean that South Australia no longer has a representative on that Association?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We do not have a representative on the committee of that Association.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** What is the situation?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The expense last year of \$2 000 concerned a meeting of the association. This refers to the previous 12 months but comes into the 1983-84 budget.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** It would appear that there were no meetings last year and that no meetings are anticipated this year.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Director understands the situation clearly. We had a representative, but he was not able to attend the meeting. I ask the Director to explain why.

**Mr K.W. Lewis:** The National Water Resources Association was established largely in north-western Queensland, although it did claim to have a national interest in respect of water. It was quite a large committee. There was a South Australian representative on it last year, Mr K.M. Sawers. He was to attend the meeting and this \$2 000 was to cover the cost of getting him to and from the meetings, which are normally held at places like Wogga in New South Wales. Most of those meetings were called at fairly short notice and were usually held on weekends. It took two days for the representative to get there and get back. Unfortunately, the content of the meetings did not justify a person of the standing of Mr Sawers, or anyone else, taking the trouble to go to them. As a result we have withdrawn membership from the committee of the association, but have asked the association to keep us apprised of the minutes of the various meetings that take place.

**Mr BECKER:** On page 149 of the Estimates of Payments under 'Preliminary investigations—water supply, sewerage, irrigation and sundry works', it states that, in 1983-84, \$500 000 was voted and the actual payment was \$1 486 288. This year the proposed expenditure is \$400 000. On page 88, the Auditor-General's report states:

*Preliminary Investigations*

An amount of \$1 070 000 is included under operating and maintenance expenses as an additional write off of preliminary investigation expenditure for certain projects not resulting in capital works but chargeable to business activities. Refer Note 8.

Note 8 gives a further explanation of projects that are to be submitted to Treasury. What can be done to avoid this write off of \$1 million? There has been an increase of \$986 000 over the previous year. Some years ago there was criticism of the huge amounts that were written off by the Public Buildings Department in relation to preliminary work and design work undertaken on projects never proceeded with.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Before we undertake any scheme it is always necessary to have preliminary investigations to ascertain the desirability and economics of the projects. That \$1.486 million is made up of eight projects for water supply and sundry works: consultancy costs for the Murray Irrigation Study; the Iron Triangle Study; Moorook Irrigation Rehabilitation Scheme (which was not proceeded with); the Mount Gambier sewage outfall; the North Para pollution abatement; the Finger Point Sewage Treatment Works; and Barossa Valley water pollution (which was a consultant study). Unless those preliminary investigations are under-

taken, one is not aware whether one will continue with a scheme.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed. In doing so I thank the Committee, the Minister and his officers for their assistance.

Recreation and Sport, \$4 568 000

**Chairman:**

Mr G.T. Whitten

**Members:**

Mr H. Becker  
The Hon. Peter Duncan  
Mr R.J. Gregory  
Mr G.A. Ingerson  
Mr M.K. Mayes  
The Hon. Michael Wilson

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G. Thompson, Director, Department of Recreation and Sport.

Mr L. Watson, Senior Administration Officer.

Mr P.S. Prodanovski, Acting Finance Officer.

Mr B.F. Smith, General Manager, South Australian Totalizer Agency Board.

Mr T.D. Arbon, Acting Totalizer Officer.

Mr E.A. Jamieson, Acting Secretary, Betting Control Board.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** First, let me welcome Mr Thompson to his first South Australian Parliamentary Estimates Committee, and I extend that welcome to the other officers. I am sure the Committee supports my remarks. The Department's Budget Estimates outlined in the papers are changed this year to more accurately reflect the programme papers. The Department is also in the midst of a large reorganisation that started over two years ago. The Committee would be interested in both financial and other details of what is happening in the Department and also ascertaining detail on the Budget. In regard to the State Aquatic Centre, is the estimated revised sum of \$7.2 million an estimate that applies to the completion date and inflated to that completion date?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I believe that \$7.2 million will be the accurate estimate of the cost. There have been some delays in construction, and we have tried to obtain savings on the original design, but we are not absolutely sure whether that is possible. Delays have resulted from poor weather and other factors. This appears to be an accurate estimate of the cost of the centre, but I invite Mr Thompson to comment further.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before we proceed, I am finding difficulty in relating the expenditure of \$7.2 million on the State Aquatic Centre to this line of Recreation and Sport, \$4 568 000 and the capital works provision of \$6.2 million. Under what provision does this outlay come?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I refer to page 178 of the Estimates of Payments for the year ended 30 June 1985, under 'Department of Recreation and Sport'—for the line 'State Aquatic Centre' the actual payment in 1983-84 was \$1 501 900, and the proposed sum in 1984-85 is \$5 700 000.

**The CHAIRMAN:** In that case the question should be asked under the line dealing with the Department of Recreation and Sport, capital purposes. However, if it will assist

and if the Minister does not object, I am willing for questions to be asked on both lines.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am willing to proceed in that manner.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** There is a difficulty because of the reformation of the papers and the programmes. When one relates the programmes in the yellow book to what is in the Estimates the difficulty is apparent. I agree to that suggestion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I will accept questions to both lines and put the lines separately as a vote.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Can the Minister provide the Committee with an accurate estimate of detailed figures as to the delays in the construction of the State Aquatic Centre and the inflated cost on completion of the centre? I ask him to do that in response to what he has just said.

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

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The centre has been funded by the State Government and the Commonwealth Government, but it is also subject to agreement between the State Government and the Adelaide City Council. I understand that the State Government is to meet any operating deficit over a period of 10 years. Will the Minister provide the Committee with the fine details of the agreement between Adelaide City Council and the Government in respect of the operations of the centre?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, I can provide that information. It also entails discussions in relation to a number of matters on the aquatic centre at North Adelaide. One matter related to not only the operating costs over a particular amount but also the management committee for the centre. Initially there was a dispute (which was resolved) about the additional aspect of car parking in the vicinity of the aquatic centre. I do not have the figures readily to hand, but they will be supplied to the honourable member.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I am somewhat disappointed that the Minister does not have the figures. It is important that the Committee receives them and I appreciate his assurance that they will be supplied. I now turn to the operating costs. Page 178 of the Auditor-General's Report contains the following extraordinary statement:

In addition, the State Government will meet any increased operating deficit, in real terms, over the existing level for a period of 10 years. There has been no attempt to quantify this cost.

I find that an extraordinary statement. The Government is entering into a contract to provide \$7.2 million in association with the Commonwealth to build this very important facility for South Australia. The Opposition supports the provision of the facility. However, from what the Auditor-General has said, it appears that the Government has entered into this project without trying to quantify the operating costs. This project could represent a severe drain on the taxpayers of this State, not to mention the agreement with the Adelaide City Council, which was the substance of my previous question. Since I have been a member of the House I have never seen in the Auditor-General's Report a like statement, which I believe represents a lack of planning. Will the Minister provide the Committee with the estimated operating costs for the facility, and can he explain why the Auditor-General made that statement?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Certainly, because I as Minister and the Department also find it difficult to quantify. We are operating on a base of \$120 000, which was the operating loss in 1982-83. Anything over that is determined in agreement with the Adelaide City Council. As I have said, it is extremely difficult (and probably impossible) for us to determine exactly, because the facility will be utilised in a different way from its previous use. It will be used all the year round rather than a specific period during summer. As a consequence, it is almost impossible to quantify (it would only

be a guess—an estimate) what, if any, additional operating costs will be incurred. It is a completely new ball game.

Of course, the city council was somewhat reluctant to negotiate a lesser period of time as proposed by the Department. We wanted an opportunity to reassess the situation over a lesser period of time. As I have said, it also involved other negotiations and a degree of flexibility because of the time factor involved in relation to the centre and the agreement on the base rate to ascertain the operating costs. It is indeterminable, simply because we have a completely new ball game as a result of the usage of the centre on a 12-month basis. I do not know what criteria I can establish to satisfy the member. Indeed, I find as much difficulty as the Auditor-General in ascertaining the costs.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I do not think the Auditor-General has attempted to quantify the costs; he said that there has been no attempt to quantify the costs. I believe that with my limited expertise I could at least make a worthwhile effort at quantifying the costs, if I had all the available data. The position is that with expenditure of \$7.2 million we will have a vastly increased maintenance bill, anyway. I know from my other interest in education that, if the capital value of an installation is increased, the maintenance costs will be vastly increased. Those costs, such as lighting and power, can be quantified, let alone costs associated with staffing, which can also be quantified.

I understand what the Minister is saying: at the moment a certain number of people use the Adelaide Swimming Centre per year only in the summer months and that neither the Minister nor his officers can predict how many people will use this year-round facility during the winter months. I can understand that, but I cannot understand why no attempt was made to quantify operating costs based on the parameters I have just mentioned. A projection could then be done in relation to the other matters. Surely, in any budgeting context it is common sense to try and ascertain how much an investment will cost to maintain. Will the Minister give an assurance that he will try to do that?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It needs to be done in the fairly immediate future, anyway, whether or not I give the member an assurance. When the Auditor-General says that there has been no attempt to quantify the costs, I think that there might be a misunderstanding in the sense that we have found it difficult, because of the factors I have mentioned and the member for Torrens has mentioned, to find a satisfactory figure in relation to costs. As I have said, other factors in the negotiations were involved, and that was not the only consideration in reaching agreement with the council. The Director was directly involved in negotiations with the Adelaide City Council officers, and he will supplement my comments.

**Mr Thompson:** Last year the Adelaide City Council told us that the deficit was about \$120 000. It was agreed that the last full year of operation would act as the base year. Subsequently, we were told that the deficit for the 1983-84 season had been reduced to around \$100 000. The question that we asked ourselves was how can a deficit be reduced when all other swimming pool deficits went up. We asked the council for details on how it reduced the deficit and for information on other elements involved in reducing the deficit for operating costs. We need that information. There are two imponderables that we cannot estimate: first, the amount of usage (there is no comparable enclosed pool in South Australia of a similar size), because we have no idea how many people will use the facility; and secondly, a massive amount of air will be required to put through the conditioning process, so the power bill, which will be the largest component, is unknown. A major cost will be for salaries (which is a function of the number of people who

go through the gate and will be difficult to estimate), which could account for 60 per cent of the total operating costs.

The other one is the total power bill, which could be another 25 per cent. Given that we cannot estimate those two figures, we find it extremely difficult to sort out the deficit.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The previous Government was able to estimate, however broad parameters were used, what the proposed operating cost would be for the aquatic centre that was then to be built on the West End site. It was detailed in the previous Government's deliberations that every effort would be made to contain those costs. Much of the area was to be let to private enterprise to try to defray the operating costs. Unfortunately, the high capital cost of that facility prevented it from being proceeded with. We were able to come up with a set of operating figures; I still believe that it is possible for a set of operating figures to be produced within broad parameters.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We hope to be able to do so eventually, but we are not in a position to do so at the moment, as the Director has already indicated.

**Mr BECKER:** I cannot accept that statement. Similar pools would be established in this country. We could get some comparison and could adjust the figures in relation to the population. It is a terrible indictment on the Department when the Auditor-General makes a statement such as that, and he would not make that lightly. Knowing the operations of the Auditor-General as I do, I point out that he would not make comments in the Report unless he considered that this was a warning to the Parliament that something was not 100 per cent or that there was something untoward. The warning has been given to all of us that no attempt has been made to quantify the cost. I hope that in the next few months an effort will be made to come back and say that it will be X. Now that we have the increase in power charges there is no doubt that this will cause a tremendous increase as well.

Going on to the general administration, which may be part of the Minister's problem, I point out that page 86 of the document that I have advised that last financial year \$549 000 was spent and that the proposed figure is \$579 000; that is an increase of \$30 000. Yet, the staff ratio will drop from 13 to 11.6; so, we go down 1.4 jobs. Why is there a need to reduce the number of staff in that section and how can the increase in dollar terms be justified?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** A reorganisation of the Department is in process at the moment. It is very difficult to compare a specific programme with what will occur in the forthcoming year. I sought the opportunity, but it was not afforded me, to make a preliminary statement that might cover a lot of questions in the minds of members of the Committee.

**Mr BECKER:** The Chairman usually asks, but he did not.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I was not asked. It is very difficult to compare administration and services from last year because of the complete reorganisation of the Department itself. We have available to us a comparative structure of the reorganisation. It is very difficult to link it with the administration of last year. It might be better for me to provide a schedule or a profile or proposed structure of the Department to the member for Hanson if the other members of the Committee wish.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Can we have it now?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We can obtain a copy and let the member have it as soon as we can. It might help us a bit if we are able to do that.

**Mr BECKER:** I appreciate that. Is the statement that you have prepared lengthy?

**The Hon. J. W. Slater:** It is a schedule of the reorganisation. The member will have noted in the press that we

have advertised for all the positions, and within the Public Service.

**Mr BECKER:** Twenty-one.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That is right. That might give a better opportunity for members of the Committee to understand what we are about. I wanted to make that clear from the beginning of the Committee meeting, but did not. It does not matter; we will deal with it now.

**Mr BECKER:** Is that statement that you prepared a lengthy one that you want to give to the Committee or do you want to incorporate it in *Hansard*?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No, I do not want to put it in *Hansard*. We will deal with it as it arises.

**Mr BECKER:** Does the Sports Institute come under the structure as well? I wonder what additional staff appointments have been made there or what opportunities there are to employ persons. I called in a couple of times to see the staff on problems prior to the Olympic Games. I was more than satisfied with the way in which I was attended to by the Chairman of the Sports Institute and Mr Nunan. I found that they were very competent people. The query that I had was answered to the satisfaction of my constituent, and I understand their position.

I am very concerned that in South Australia several of our young people who were selected for the various Olympic sports and who went to Los Angeles had to forgo their employment. For example, the assistant coach of the basketball team lost her job; her employer sacked her. Unfortunately, she has not been able to get a job. She is in her mid thirties; that is a terrible situation. The employer was most unfair. There must be some way in which we can assist or have a two-way system between employers and employees so that if anyone is selected to represent their State or country, whether it be an international meeting or the Olympic or Commonwealth games, that person's employment is protected. I felt very much the need of that person.

Also, one of the basketball girls lost her job. I wonder whether through the Sports Institute there is any opportunity for employment for some of these people who have skills in their sports and who also are good clerical workers, typists or stenographers. Have any additional jobs or employment opportunities been created there?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The current staff is the Director, Mike Nunan; Coaching Co-ordinator, Jess Jarver; David Stuart, Sports Science Co-ordinator; Graham Winter, Sports Psychologist; Neil Craig, Sports Science Co-ordinator; Forchi Brenecki, Administrator. The additional employee because of the increase in grants that has been announced in the total for the Institute this year of \$569 000 is Michael Turtur, also as Sports Science Co-ordinator.

There are limitations to the extension of staff numbers. We employ medical, nutritional and biomechanical consultants. We have employed people on a contract or fee for service basis, but at present there is only one additional staff member. There may be opportunities to employ other staff, but the board would no doubt make a submission to me on any determination regarding additional staff. We would have to assess it on the basis of the availability of funds.

**Mr BECKER:** Has the Minister had the opportunity to discuss with his Federal counterpart the provision of substantial scholarships or the employment of people of a standard of sporting excellence? Following the Commonwealth Games the Federal Minister announced that it was wrong to welcome athletes back to Australia knowing that a number of them would have to go on the dole. I believed that the Federal Government was considering a scheme under which sports scholarships would be offered at a level

that was sufficient so that these people would not have to depend on the dole.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have not had the opportunity to discuss this matter with the Federal Minister. I know that the issue was raised and that the Minister made an announcement, but the position has not yet been determined. I appreciate that people who participate in top level sport make personal and financial sacrifices. Indeed, we extended to State Government public servants exemptions to attend and train prior to the Olympic Games. We have no other influence in that we cannot instruct the private sector, although we can set an example. It depends very much on the generosity or otherwise of employers.

One of the problems is that many of these young people have not settled on a career, some of them still go to school, and others are more or less lacking in experience in the workforce. Indeed, they are the ones we should specifically relate to. For the benefit of the honourable member, I point out that we have employed Glen Beringen, who represented Australia in the Olympic Games. He started work in the Department last week. He had not had the opportunity for full time employment because he was a scholarship holder at the Institute of Sport in Canberra but then decided to come back to South Australia. We are doing what we can, recognising the difficulties that young people in top class elite competition face and the prejudices in the employment situation.

The determination is made by the individual but at least the State and Federal Governments should be in a position to provide as much as possible, not only assistance through the institute but also some sort of subsidy or financial assistance. Whether the Federal Minister will assist in that way is yet to be determined. To this stage we have no definite information.

**Mr BECKER:** The Department benefits from the profits of Soccer Pools, but I have been concerned for some time that Soccer Pools has not been promoted well enough and it has not been stressed that a certain percentage of profits goes to the benefit of sport. The Lotteries Commission tells us with absolute monotony that its surpluses go into the Hospitals Fund, and the populace still believes that that money goes to the hospitals when in actual fact it goes to the Hospitals Fund but, before the ink on the cheque is dry, it is transferred into general revenue. What has been done for sporting clubs? What can be done to boost the income to the Department from Soccer Pools? Interlinked with that is the impact of the proposed \$4 sports lottery. The Lotteries Commission Annual Report states:

A new format \$4 lottery was introduced in May with the first draw completed in June. It was not the success anticipated, but it is planned that it will be promoted in a more popular form in the new year.

The Lotteries Commission makes more money from Instant Money and X Lotto than from lotteries. I wonder about the impact of a sports lottery. Unfortunately, Soccer Pools has not been a success. What opportunities will sporting clubs have to raise money and will the Government seriously consider allowing the use of poker machines, provided that they are manufactured by the Government through the Engineering and Water Supply workshops, the Government controlling turnover and percentage payouts? I am concerned about the financial future of sporting organisations if the sports lottery is not a success.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The member for Hanson has asked a number of questions. Regarding Soccer Pools, it depends on how one measures success. Soccer Pools has provided to the Sport and Recreation Fund over \$3 million in 3½ years of operation. I believe that it has not reached the heights expected by the previous Minister or his Premier, who perhaps had higher expectations than some of us had.

The member for Hanson may recall that only the present Premier and I supported the introduction of Soccer Pools in the Lower House. There was also one member of the Labor Party in the Upper House who supported Soccer Pools.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** It is still worth \$810 000 a year.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Exactly! The point I am making is that it depends on how one measures success. I believe that Soccer Pools has not been promoted, and that is no fault of the promoters themselves. Also, it is in competition with a Cross Lotto block which has a more substantial impact on the community at large. For instance, it offers a much larger prize pool, which is the attraction of modern day gambling. As a consequence Soccer Pools has not been able to get off the ground. I should mention the fact that the weekly duty received by the Department of Recreation and Sport through the Recreation and Sport Fund—and I will only deal with the past two or three months—is on average \$14 000 to \$15 000 a week. I do not think that that is to be laughed at. Indeed, that is a much smaller amount than that amount which goes to the Hospital Fund, or general revenue, from the Lotteries Commission, or whatever one wants to call it.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** General revenue.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is in the form of the Hospital Fund. The sports lottery, about which the Premier has introduced legislation, is run by the Lotteries Commission and is not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Recreation and Sport, or the Minister. One can only guess at what sorts of returns may come from a sports lottery. Here again, I will not make any predictions, but whatever return there is to Government will certainly be gratefully accepted by the Recreation and Sport Fund which will then, of course, be able to provide our Department, and sport in general, with an opportunity to supply further moneys for the promotion of recreation and sport in South Australia.

The proof of the pudding is always in the eating and we are not sure what the return will be. I understand that the legislation in relation to this matter is in the course of its second reading debate in the Lower House. I am sure that explanations about this particular matter could be best elicited from the Premier during that debate. I support the introduction of a sports lottery. It was part of Labor Party policy prior to the last election. We must, in conjunction with the Lotteries Commission, determine which is the most effective way of running this pool. It appears that the small lotteries take some time to close and have lost their attractiveness so far as the public at large is concerned. What we are looking for is sporting bodies and groups to promote and participate in the proposed sports lottery for their own benefit. We hope that it will be promoted by sporting groups. The other matter that the honourable member brought to the attention of the Committee was poker machines. I think that it is fairly obvious to us all in South Australia from the comments made by members from both sides of the House that the introduction of poker machines into South Australia in the foreseeable future is about a million to one shot.

**Mr INGERSON:** We already have them in lottery.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That may be the interpretation of the member for Bragg about lottery, but it is not a poker machine, which is quite different from an instant lottery machine. One of the problems we have is that some of the so called dispensing machines have necessitated changes to the regulations under the Lotteries Act.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** On-line bingo machines.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Machines such as on-line bingo, dwarf poker and so on, which we regard as instruments of

unlawful gaming that are similar to poker machines. They are banned in South Australia. The odds about having poker machines in South Australia for the benefit of sporting groups is about a million to one and I doubt very much that they would help, anyway. I think they would help the big clubs and kill the small ones.

There have been negotiations in recent times because Soccer Pools are on an Australia wide basis and have recently been introduced into Western Australia. A meeting of officers of various Government departments was called a week or so ago and the Director, Mr Thompson, attended that meeting where negotiations in relation to changes relating to the tax paid were the major subject of discussion. I think it would be appropriate for Mr Thompson to provide information about that matter.

**Mr Thompson:** In Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria the licences are up for renewal in the latter part of this month. In renegotiating the licences the Treasurers of those States wished to increase the percentage of subscriptions paid out in prize money, which is currently 37 per cent, to about 50 per cent.

They have also asked that Soccer Pools managers increase the turnover to over \$1 million a week and to put considerable energy into making sure that Soccer Pools is competitive with other forms of gaming in the country. If the percentage of subscriptions going to prizes is increased then that money must come from somewhere and it is to come from the percentage given to the operators. The only way they will survive is by increasing turnover, so it is in their own interests to promote their product more actively in the market place. The net result, if duty remains the same, is that Governments and Soccer Pools—the Sport and Recreation Fund—will get increased amounts during the ensuing 12 to 18 months.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Is the duty still 32.5 per cent?

**Mr Thompson:** Yes.

**Mr INGERSON:** On page 72 of the programme papers there is a comment that expected total expenditure is \$15.1 million. In the recurrent line a figure of \$4.5 million is shown, and in the capital line a figure of \$6.2 million is shown. This leaves a difference of \$4.1 million. On looking at the reconciliation line one sees a line relating to payments from trust and deposit accounts of \$4.1 million. This seems to balance the figures. Will the Minister explain what that \$4.1 million is about.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will have Mr Prodanovski answer that question.

**Mr Prodanovski:** That payment from trusts and deposits relates, for example, to the Racecourse Development Board which has a trust account from which it draws funds and pays in receipts. A 'revolving account', is a more useful terminology, where money is placed and used as and when required. CEP projects are another example of this happening: we receive money from the Commonwealth Government and the State Government which is placed in a special deposit account from which we withdraw when and if salaries or payments are due. They are the sorts of things that go into that account. I can give a detailed statement of what that \$4.1 million comprises, if the honourable member wishes.

**Mr INGERSON:** I would appreciate that because it is almost as big an amount as appears in any line that we are debating, so I think we need that further information. There is a comment in the strategies section on page 71 that it is the Department's role to continue to ensure that the regulatory and legislative requirements of the Racing and Gaming Act are administered. There has been some confusion in the past couple of months in relation to the consultative process recommended in the Racing Act. Therefore, will



the Minister put on record how he understands the consultative process ought to work?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not quite clear. Is the honourable member referring to the Act?

**Mr INGERSON:** In the Act mention is made that appointments to any board result from consultation between the Minister and the particular part of the industry. How does that consultative process work?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It can be in writing or by personal consultation, depending on the circumstances.

**Mr INGERSON:** Does the Minister believe it should be in writing and in a certain period of time?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The advice should be in writing from the Minister, yes, or it can be by discussion. It entirely depends on the situation and the time factors involved. When talking about consultation the honourable member mentioned page 71 of the yellow book.

**Mr INGERSON:** In the Racing Act there is a section which deals with consultation. We all know that there was some confusion about that earlier this year.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The reference to page 71 is somewhat inappropriate to the question that the honourable member finally asked. The Department will ensure that legislative and regulative requirements to the racing, gaming and soccer pools Acts are administered. Inspectorial staff of the Department administer racing, gaming and small lotteries. Previously these people were in separate fields. It is proposed that they will now do part of each and will be amalgamated into one section. I had difficulty in interpreting the question in relation to page 71. The member talks about consultation under the Racing Act in relation to any appointment to the Board. This applies only to the Greyhound Racing Control Board and the TAB. Consultation concerning an appointment to the TAB Board from other boards can be in writing or by verbal discussion.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Who are the current personnel of the Racecourses Development Board? Is the Minister planning to change the structure of the Board, in particular the position of Chairman?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Mr B.J. Taylor is the Chairman; the members from the racing and galloping codes are D.R. Coles and E.J. Haddow; the members from the trotting code are R.J. Zerella and P.A. Rehn; the members from the greyhound racing industry are the Hon. J.D. Corcoran and N.L. MacKay; and T.D. Arbon has been the Acting Secretary.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Is the Minister proposing to change the Chairman?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** No. There has been a very significant increase in the Racecourses Development Board's activities because of an increase in the funds it is now distributing. Cabinet has approved a submission from me to have a full-time Secretary of the Board.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** An extra \$60 000 a year?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There will be a full-time Secretary of the Board and his duties will be incorporated in the Department of Recreation and Sport. It is a CO6 classification and the Secretary will be on a salary of about \$25 000 a year. With the change of legislation and the unclaimed dividends and fractions, there is a substantial amount, in comparison with previous years, of \$1.75 million that is in the process of being allocated to the three respective codes. The collective total is probably the most important. The allocation is made by the members of the Board.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The Racecourses Development Board has the power to borrow. I notice from the report that it is tied up with the South Australian Government Financing Authority. Is the Board required to pay the .5 per cent surcharge on borrowings to the Treasury? At 30 June I think that the outstanding borrowings were some

\$2.6 million. Obviously, the Board would borrow \$3 million every now and then. On my mathematics a charge for that guarantee from the Government is \$15 000. I know that \$15 000 is not much in \$3 million, but it would be very handy to a small country racing club to improve facilities on the course or a like effort. Has the Government decided to defray this surcharge on the racing industry?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We have not given it any consideration. Perhaps it would be appropriate for the Acting Secretary of the Racecourses Development Board to give the honourable member the details in regard to his question.

**Mr Arbon:** Loans outstanding by the Board were transferred to SAGFA. There was no surcharge payable. When the loans were first taken out with various bodies they were arranged at a cheap interest rate. SAGFA has discounted those rates on a comparable basis for the time being, because the Government did not want to disadvantage any racing club that was paying interest on its loan. No surcharge is payable, and the loans have been discounted.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the surcharge apply in the future?

**Mr Arbon:** I am unsure of that.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Is the Minister able to say whether it will apply in the future?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We will check it out and let the honourable member know.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The Minister referred to the appointment of a full-time secretary, a move with which I heartily concur because of the increased responsibility of the Board. Much money is now involved. The Programme Estimates show that there has been an increase in expenditure by the Board of \$60 000 in the coming year. Operating expenditure increased from \$60 000 to \$80 000 over the past two years, but in the next 12 months it will increase from \$80 000 to \$140 000. Obviously, about \$20 000 will go in the Secretary's salary, but I am not sure whether that will be over and above Mr Arbon's salary. Can the Minister explain in detail how the additional \$60 000 will be spent?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** First, the money for the Secretary will be paid out of the fund and will be shared equally by the three codes. In regard to the \$40 000, that does not necessarily have to be operating costs and could be paid out as grants or loans.

**Mr BECKER:** Since the Minister's strong call for greater action and activity to control SP bookmaking in South Australia, has the move been successful? I asked a Question on Notice early in May and at page 4041 of *Hansard* the Deputy Premier stated:

The estimated annual SP betting turnover in South Australia is between \$50 million and \$100 million.

I remember making an estimate based on figures provided by the Hon. Hugh Hudson during the debate on the establishment of the TAB that it would involve about \$20 million or \$30 million, and I was laughed at by the police who said that figure would be impossible. The number of persons convicted of SP betting was as follows:

Year	No. of convictions
1983-84	24
1982-83	27
1981-82	36
1980-81	13
1979-80	1

Has the Minister or the Government been successful in reducing SP betting? Is that success reflected in an increased TAB turnover?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I do not believe that anyone in South Australia can give an informed estimate of the extent of SP betting turnover, because it is an intangible figure. The police Gaming Squad has taken action and only a few

weeks ago press reports indicated that a ring in the western suburbs had been taken to court. At the time of an earlier debate I remember the member for Hanson make the extraordinary claim that there were no SP bookmakers in his district. For his information, the majority of the people apprehended two weeks ago came from his district. True, that might have happened without his knowledge, and he made that statement about 18 months ago.

It is not possible to estimate the extent of SP betting in South Australia. Through the efforts of the TAB and the racing industry generally, it is agreed that SP betting has a significant impact on turnover, and we all agree that has a subsequent impact on the health of the industry generally. Some of the innovations that have been undertaken by the TAB, including the placing of TAB subagencies in hotels and other innovations, reflect an effort to minimise—I do not use the word 'eliminate'—SP betting in South Australia as much as possible. One of the great problems that we have, not just in South Australia but throughout Australia, is that most activities these days of SP betting involve the use of the telephone and, as a consequence, it is difficult to apprehend offenders, although occasionally the police do make arrests after protracted investigations.

It is my considered opinion that most of the large money involves principals from interstate. My personal view is that, if we can get the assistance of Telecom concerning the installation of telephones, it makes the task of the police and the authorities much easier in each State. We are making inroads into SP betting in South Australia. We have increased the penalties, but they are still not significant enough to be a deterrent to the large operator.

We must continually review the penalties to ensure that they are a sufficient deterrent not only to those conducting SP bookmaking but more importantly to their clients. SP bookmakers cannot function without individuals placing bets with them illegally. One of the unfortunate things about the whole matter is that the good Australian ethic about SP bookmakers is no longer applicable. It is no longer a five bob operation in the corner of a hotel. It is a big organisation, and I suggest that it is connected to other activities. Indeed, its tentacles reach into South Australia from other States. I believe I have the support of all members in trying to minimise the effect of SP bookmaking on the racing industry, which is an important industry for the State.

**Mr BECKER:** I asked a question in relation to the Government's attitude to the Commonwealth Games. I understand that the earliest possible dates for the Commonwealth Games to be held in Australia would be 1994 or 1998. I take it that the Commonwealth Games and the Olympic Games rotate from the northern hemisphere to the southern hemisphere. Therefore, the earliest opportunity for Australia to stage the Games would be 1998. Has the State Government taken steps to prepare a submission to apply for the next Commonwealth Games to be held in Australia, albeit in 1998? If not, why not? If action has been taken, in what form is it, and what is proposed?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am pleased to inform the honourable member that we have initiated a feasibility study, which is currently being undertaken by a Public Service officer seconded to our Department. The feasibility study involves quite a substantial investigation: its terms of reference are to determine appropriate sites for facilities that might be involved in the Commonwealth Games and all of the other factors that are important. The feasibility study has been in progress for the past three or four weeks and it is expected to be completed and referred to Cabinet early in the new year. We are referring specifically to the 1994 Games. After the process I have mentioned there are a couple of other things to go through, because we must obtain

the support and approval of the Australian Commonwealth Games Association.

The final and perhaps determining factor is the approval of the overall body. We are working on it, and I think it would be a great idea. I know that in the past the member for Hanson has been a great supporter of an application to stage the Commonwealth Games in South Australia, but it is a long way off. I am not sure whether he and I will be members of the House if and when that occurs.

**Mr BECKER:** That is pleasing news. We must start somewhere. I believe that the Los Angeles community began preparing to stage the Olympic Games, which have just been held, in 1939. It involves a long lead time. If we have the opportunity of using Loan funds (and I object to their being used to prop up general revenue) and if there is a surplus of Loan moneys, we should build facilities with a long term view of hosting international sporting events, including the Commonwealth Games. I refer to the list of priorities that is being prepared. I notice in tonight's *News* that Leon Holme is again appealing for a suitable location to be used as a weightlifting centre. Does the Minister know of an empty building or shed that would be suitable? I think it is a tragedy that we have nowhere to house our weightlifters when we have an Olympic Games medalist and there is an upsurge in interest in this sport.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I could not agree more. I am familiar with the difficulties experienced by the Weightlifting Association over a period of probably four or five years. Indeed, the Association has had to move on probably five or six occasions. I know that the Association occupied various Government facilities that were unoccupied. One of the difficulties with weightlifting is the very nature of the sport: it requires a rather solid floor and foundations, particularly for weightlifters of the calibre of the world champion, who is probably dropping 230kg on to the floor. That shakes the foundations of neighbouring premises three doors away. As a consequence, the Association has had difficulty in acquiring a home. It is on our list of priorities in relation to providing international facilities.

I do not think that the provision of an immediate temporary home is the ultimate. The ultimate is to provide a headquarters facility where the Association can establish itself. Weightlifting is a growing sport in South Australia and I pay credit to Leon Holme, who has been the motivating force in the sport in this State. I think he deserves the highest credit. We are not unfamiliar with Mr Holme's comments in the press. I give him credit for that, because he is trying to promote his sport. We are considering providing help in some ways. Perhaps the Director can provide further information in relation to weightlifting and how we can assist the Association in obtaining permanent headquarters.

**Mr Thompson:** We are well aware of the problems being experienced by weightlifters. Not long ago we looked for Government facilities which could be used in the short term. However, that is not possible. We have suggested where the Association might find temporary accommodation and, obviously, it is pursuing those suggestions. We seconded an architect from the Public Buildings Department for a short period of time to produce schematic designs and prepare a cost estimate for the provision of a permanent home for weightlifting. That is well advanced. We are currently preparing a list of State and international facilities, and weightlifting will be included.

**Mr INGERSON:** My question relates to an inquiry into the TAB distribution between the three codes. I know from research that the previous Minister promised a review within 12 months of the beginning of 'after race' payouts.

The present Minister (the then shadow Minister) believed that that period was too long and that it should be shorter.

Also, in the same debate he indicated some support for a variation of the maximum level of something of the order of 72 per cent. As this suggested figure of 72 per cent has been exceeded in relation to the galloping code in the last three months of 1983-84, what is the current attitude of the Minister, and what does he intend doing about the review or the situation at the moment?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The TAB distribution is substantially different from the situation applying when that comment was made three or four years ago. Even though the percentage formula may have changed, the actual amount of distribution has significantly altered as well. The main recipient of that increase has been the South Australian Jockey Club, but both trotting and greyhound racing in actual monetary terms have received a greater amount than they received previously because the TAB distribution has increased significantly in the past two years. It is not true to say that I have not reviewed it. As Minister, I have kept my eye on it for the past two years. Indeed, one of the first things that will happen when we have our Racing and Gaming Manager is that he will make an assessment (not an inquiry) of other States' systems; they have a fixed percentage in Victoria, where the complaints still come from the respective codes about that distribution.

Our distribution in South Australia at present is based on results. We cannot destroy an incentive for a particular code to improve its performance. It is based on results. If the amount of money that has been distributed to greyhounds and trotting had not increased, as it had significantly, it would have been necessary to take precipitate action, perhaps, before now. Even though trotting people, particularly, keep making representations to me about a fixed percentage, that in itself may not be the answer to all their problems because, as I said, they need to show an incentive of their own. It means that if they get an increase in percentage one of the other codes must lose. Obviously, it appears now that that will be racing.

The situation as expressed three or four years ago was that the Jockey Club certainly was not in the financial position that it is in today. That is pleasing to all of us, because the racing industry is very important to the State. However, I have to consider very carefully the racing industry as well and its percentage of entitlement to the TAB distribution, because that money has been invested in the code. I am not counting, when I talk about distribution from the TAB, that there have been also increases in bookmakers' turnover, on-course tote and other factors. From a bookmaker's point of view, the increase in betting and in the money back to the codes last year was higher in trotting than in any other code. So, one has to balance the whole thing out and make sure that the three codes receive what they deserve, based on their performances.

**Mr INGERSON:** I note that there was a significant increase in the Federal Budget this year of some \$24 million to a total of \$65.5 million. Can the Minister advise the Committee how much of this increase or of any increase is coming to the State? I note that some \$5 million is to go to the development of capital projects, particularly in relation to international sports. How much of that \$5 million will come to this State and what part of this extra three year plan will come to this State as well?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There has been a significant increase in the Federal Budget in relation to recreation and sport. I am not entirely familiar with the break-up of the amount to the various States, but I still believe and I put on public record that once again South Australia will not receive what it is entitled to, from Governments of both political complexions. It is very difficult for a smaller State—not only South Australia, but perhaps Western Australia and Tasmania—to match dollar for dollar capital investment as

against the Commonwealth. I do not think that we ought to be the poor relation of the Eastern States, and I made that point very clear to my colleague the Federal Minister at the Recreation Ministers' meeting only three or four months ago. If we receive it on the basis of performances—

**Mr BECKER:** We would get the lot.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We would not get the lot, but a substantial amount over and above what we have received before. We have not got the breakdown of the figures with us, and some of them are as yet indeterminable. The State Government has to provide to the Federal Minister by the end of October a breakdown of what international facilities we can put on that three-year programme. We can cope with that all right, but it is the finding of the 50 per cent of the capital that makes it difficult for State Governments.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** What are the facilities?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** We are still in the process of determining them.

**Mr Thompson:** I might miss two or three, but I can give you a list of 10 or 12 sports with which we are seriously negotiating.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Bowling?

**Mr Thompson:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will give you that information later. We do not want to pre-empt our punches to the Federal Minister. We have to provide a list by the end of October. There will be about 10, which will include weight-lifting, an international standard bowls facility in Adelaide—

**Mr BECKER:** Hockey?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Hockey, and cycling perhaps (although that is really from the Federal AIS funds, where we are looking for assistance from a diversification of the Australian Sports Institute). It is indeterminable at this stage. We have to make a submission on our priorities and they will be assessed accordingly.

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

**Mr BECKER:** Who are the members of the Betting Control Board and what fees and allowances do they receive? Has the Board reported to the Minister—I do not recall seeing the Annual Report? Is the Board satisfied with the percentage increase in turnover? I note that in the 1983-84 financial year amounts invested with bookmakers were: horse racing, \$143.9 million, an increase of \$19.1 million; trotting, \$35.7 million, an increase of \$6.2 million; and greyhound racing, coursing and foot racing, \$29 million, an increase of \$4.8 million. Total turnover for the three codes was \$208.7 million, an increase of \$30 million. Is the Board satisfied that turnover is increasing at a reasonable rate?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Chairman of the Betting Control Board is Mr Kevin Gay, and the other members are Mr Prime and Mr McEwin.

**Mr BECKER:** Has the Board reported to the Minister, and has it commented on the increase in turnover?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, the Betting Control Board Annual Report was tabled in Parliament two or three weeks ago: under section 123 of the Act it is obliged to table the report in the financial year ending 30 June each year. As the honourable member has said, it indicates an increase in turnover, and the Chairman's report cites a number of other matters that are relevant to the report of the Betting Control Board. It also gives statistical information about the relevant codes. It is quite an extensive report on all the operations associated with bookmakers, the number of bets, the turnover, and so on.

The report was prepared for public consumption, and indicates that for the first time in a number of years there has been an increase in bookmakers' turnover. The Chairman

of the Board receives \$3 775 per annum, and members receive \$3 175 per annum, plus travelling expenses that are associated with their activities as Chairman or members.

**Mr BECKER:** I must have missed the Annual Report. A lot of statutory authorities or boards present annual reports to Parliament, and it is often handy to have those reports in electorate offices as well as in Parliament House. The Betting Control Board, the TAB, the Trotting Control Board, and so on come under the responsibility of the Minister. Will he ensure that the Annual Reports of those bodies and the Annual Report of the Sports Institute are supplied to members of Parliament? The Sports Institute also puts out a newsletter—a superb production. That sort of information is handy when dealing with inquiries in the electorate office, and I wonder whether members could be provided with those documents. Does the Annual Report give the amount invested on foot racing, and does it detail the number of licensed bookmakers in the various categories? How many bookmakers forfeited their licence during the year, and for what reason?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That information is given in the Annual Report, which was tabled in the House and which is a public document. Table 2 at page 3 indicates that in 1983-84 there were two meetings, and the turnover at those meetings was \$33 487, a percentage increase of 88.29 per cent on the previous year. The number of bets laid in 1983-84 was 8 366. Is the honourable member referring to general racing or foot racing?

**Mr BECKER:** I was talking about foot racing because I want to know whether it is progressing.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is progressing, and I have given the turnover figures. That was only the second year of operation, but it has been a success in the sense that people who are interested in that sport have the opportunity to bet legally.

Although there are no facts that I am aware of in relation to this matter, Mr Jamieson, Acting Secretary of the Betting Control Board, might be able to advise us in this matter. I believe that there were three bookmakers at the race in the first year of betting operations and two last year, but I am relying on my memory.

**Mr Jamieson:** There were three bookmakers at the Bay Sheffield the first year of betting operations but business was not sufficient for the board to justify the issue of three permits last year, so it issued two such permits. In fact, the growth of turnover last year I think justified the board's issuing only two permits to bookmakers.

**Mr BECKER:** What sort of percentage do they work on?

**Mr Jamieson:** That is a hard question to answer.

**Mr BECKER:** Bookmakers work to a formula; they have to work on turnover. The information I am seeking from the Minister is whether the Betting Control Board knows of a formula that applies in such cases because it cut the number of bookmakers betting on foot racing from three to two, which means each bookmaker made about \$16 000 or \$17 000. I am concerned to know whether it is a viable proposition to have bookmakers betting on foot racing.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I think that that depends very much on the bookmakers themselves. I do not think that when the member talks about it being a viable proposition that that would depend necessarily on turnover but on how the bookmaker laid his odds. Of course, it is somewhat indeterminable, but the issuing of permits to bookmakers by the Betting Control Board is based on previous results. The first year, 1982-83, was an experiment and it was found that turnover was not great. As a consequence, only two of the bookmakers fielded last year. I suggest that the return for their efforts on that day with their collective turnover was not great. The percentage of gross profit in relation to turnover by bookmakers at footrace meetings was 8.38 per

cent. There was a turnover tax of 2.07 per cent and a gross profit of 6.31 per cent. If one calculates 6.31 per cent of the turnover one can see that it was a reasonably profitable two days.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the Minister say what steps the TAB will take in relation to station 5AA and its broadcasting of dividends? I assume it will broadcast the races. In particular, I want to know how much of its programme time is to be devoted to such activities. I assume that this will happen otherwise the TAB would not have moved into this particular field. I think it is important for listeners of 5AA to know how much of their easy listening is to be interrupted by the requirements of the TAB. I would like to know those facts in fine detail, if they are available.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I think that the proposal for 5AA is that it will basically be a racing and sporting station. I suggest that it would probably be more appropriate for me to ask the General Manager of the TAB, Mr Barry Smith, to give the details required by the honourable member. Before doing so, I must say that as Minister I have supported the move to acquire this station because it has been fairly obvious to us—and when I say 'us' I mean those of us who have a special interest in the racing industry—that over a period of time it has become necessary to have a station that is oriented to providing an extended—and with due respect to 5DN—and better service to the racing community of South Australia. I think it is appropriate for me to ask Mr Smith to supplement what I have already said.

**Mr Smith:** This question was raised at a hearing we attended that was conducted by the Australian Broadcasting Control Tribunal. It questioned us extensively on programming and we satisfied the tribunal in this regard. That was one of the major reasons it approved of our acquisition of the station. The TAB, through the directorship of Festival City Broadcasters, intends conducting 5AA on a commercial basis. In so doing it will not be silly about covering TAB meetings. It will not flood the airways with racing and trotting reports. Simply, it will cover all TAB meetings that are currently scheduled.

We will not increase the number of TAB meetings to any great extent. There will not be any great change to the programming of 5AA. We will cover the broadcasting of such programmes between 11.30 a.m. and 4.30 p.m. each day. Race broadcasting at night will possibly be between 7 p.m. and 10.30 p.m. Station 5AA already reports sporting events on Saturdays, so in essence there will be roughly 40 hours of racing reported each week, which will be mixed with music transmission. In a total 5AA programme that runs for 24 hours each day that is not particularly significant. I again stress that our philosophy is that we will not be silly about this matter and flood the airwaves with continual racing information as does an interstate radio station.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I appreciate the details just given by Mr Smith and if he has any more specific information I would appreciate having it. The Minister discussed the matter of SP bookmaking with my colleague, the member for Hanson. I have always believed that the only way one has a chance of making deep inroads into SP bookmaking is for the TAB to provide a service under which punters will know the odds at which they bet.

Over the years various investigations have been held into this type of activity. I understand that this practice occurs overseas. Are there any plans at this stage for the TAB to enter this field? What investigations have taken place recently? I understand that Mr Wran in New South Wales announced a year or two ago that it was going to be introduced in that State. What eventuated?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have just been advised that we are having a meeting of racing Ministers in Adelaide on 9

November. One of the major items on the agenda is the question raised by the member for Torrens. I am not sure whether the member is referring to monitors giving odds in TAB agencies or, indeed, set odds indicating that a punter can take a particular price at a particular time, or a combination of both. The matter has been, as I understand it, under consideration. I do not know whether or not it has been implemented in other States: I doubt it. I am sure that that will be confirmed by the General Manager of TAB. I understand that some studies have been carried out; to what degree I am not sure. It may be more appropriate for Mr Smith to give details of what the TAB may be considering at a future time.

**Mr Smith:** Is the honourable member referring to fixed odds betting?

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Yes.

**Mr Smith:** All Australian TABs are currently investigating fixed odds betting, as they have been for quite a number of years. Unfortunately, no-one has come up with a solution whereby a computer system—or any system—can be applied to it, that is, without working on the bookmakers' approach of taking the risk of losing many dollars or, on the other hand, gaining a lot of dollars. At this stage I feel that most of the Governments in Australia would not be prepared to approve a system where there is the possibility of losing many dollars.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The member for Bragg brought up the question of the fixed percentage of TAB distribution, especially in relation to night codes. One of the problems of night codes is that the TAB is not always open for at least part of the meetings. I know that the question of telephone betting is a different matter. I realise that there is a cost involved in this and that will effect the whole distribution. Some time ago, I think when I was Minister, we extended the hours of TAB especially with the advent of after-race payouts. Has any consideration been given to further extending the hours of TAB, as that would be a partial solution to the night codes problem?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Yes, there has been consideration of extending the hours. As the honourable member said, over the past 18 months to two years we have extended the TAB hours to accommodate night codes. The opening hours of sub-agencies in hotels are coincidental with the hours at which racing night code sports are conducted. We are moving to a situation in which we are considering a further extension to accommodate the night codes. One of the complaints often referred to is the question of racing dates, particularly at weekends, where the racing fraternity has first choice of the punter's dollar.

There have been some alterations in relation to racing in Adelaide. The Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club now has meetings on Monday and Thursday evenings and the South Australian Trotting Club at Globe Derby has been experimenting with Monday afternoons and, indeed, additional meetings throughout the year. I do not think that additional meetings are the answer to the problem; they may go part of the way. The real problem lies in each individual code promoting its particular sport to attract the dollar from the investor.

The question of distribution is difficult, as the member would appreciate. As I said earlier, if one gives to one code, it must be taken from another code. This will be the subject of some investigation by the Department and, in consultation and agreement with the three codes, a formula that is believed to be fair and equitable to the three codes will be devised. The extension of hours would be only part of the story. I am advised that 30 metropolitan agencies now open to 9.15 p.m. on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights. It may be that rather than extending the hours we are talking about

widening the nights on which those agencies are open to accommodate the investors.

One should remember that the TAB needs to assess very carefully whether the additional nights would be profitable. If it is not profitable it means that it is taking away from the overall pool and we are losing, rather than gaining, in regard to that matter. The TAB turnover in the past two years has increased by 45 per cent, which clearly indicates that the innovations that have taken place have been successful. Not only the opening of agencies but the location of agencies is important. An improvement has followed when we have found more suitably located premises for the benefit of investors of TAB.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** In regard to racing, has the Minister received any recent approaches from the Quarterhorse Association about betting on sprint races? If so, what is proposed? Will the Minister give an assurance that he will not take any action in this matter without consulting the South Australian Jockey Club?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have received approaches, but I am not sure whether they were from the Sprint Racing Association. Two groups were involved and one decided to run independently of the South Australian Jockey Club, but I am not sure whether that group still exists. I have received recent approaches from a group associated with sprint racing. For the benefit of other honourable members it involves racing under a distance of 800 metres, usually on a straight track, although that is not a necessity. Their argument revolves around the fact that such racing has been successful in Queensland, and the present proposals seek to have sprint racing introduced in conjunction with recognised galloping events on country tracks. I have had consultation with the SAJC only last week and its attitude is strongly opposed to this move. As a consequence I have arranged for the persons involved in the Sprint Racing Association to meet with me soon to discuss the matter further, but the honourable member, Parliament and the public can rest assured that I would not be inclined to introduce sprint racing on country tracks without the support and approval of the SAJC.

#### Membership:

Ms Lenehan substituted for Mr Mayes.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Minister will know of my deep and abiding interest in the racing industry and the betting codes. I express concern on behalf of a number of people whom the Minister described as 'investors' and who have expressed their concern to me that on-course totalisators from time to time break down during meetings. The concern that they have—I freely admit that I do not understand the finer points of this—is that the effect of such a breakdown can be that investors can either lose their money or suffer some reduction in the odds that are paid, or something of the sort. It is a serious matter.

I understand that the on-course totalisator is not operated by the TAB, but it is still a matter that clearly comes within the Minister's responsibilities. Therefore, will the Minister say what steps can be taken, first, to ensure that such breakdowns are kept to a minimum and, secondly and more importantly, to ensure the protection of investors in circumstances where breakdowns occur? These investors are consumers of services just the same as anyone else in the community and they deserve to be properly protected. Will the Minister comment on this matter and reassure the Committee about such things?

**Mr BECKER:** I have a Question on Notice about that.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The member for Hanson's Question on Notice is in respect of the TAB computer and the frequency of breakdowns and so forth. The question of the

member for Elizabeth is different and relates to an incident about three or four weeks ago. There is no conflict involved.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister should carry on.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** In both the metropolitan area and country areas the on-course totalisator is a private system supplied by AWA—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** And is it the operator?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:**—and operated by AWA. The club has a contract with AWA. When the system was introduced not all that long ago there were some teething problems. In regard to TAB meetings, the on-course totalisator and the TAB have a common pool, and dividends are declared in regard to both the investment on course and the TAB investment. The greyhound and trotting codes have the Jet Bet system under which the controlling boards are responsible for administration; there are three aspects to the whole exercise. Unfortunately, as a result of technical difficulties there are times when the machines do break down. However, the time when they break down—the down time compared to the up time—is minimal. Complaints are referred to me from time to time and almost every complainant was going to back the winner. One has to take the position at face value. The position can be disconcerting and the honourable member is right: we are supplying to the public at large a service in the best possible way; consumers are the lifeblood of the industry; the industry will not survive without service to the punter.

If we do not provide that service, who knows where punters might take their business, perhaps indulging in some illegal activity (I hope that does not occur), and that business could be provided through an SP betting operation. The honourable member is right: we must ensure as much as is humanly possible that computers do not fail. As I am not fully conversant with the technical aspects, I will ask Mr Smith to supplement my reply.

**Mr Smith:** We are all possibly aware that in this modern day of technology one must face the fact that computers break down from time to time. One of the interesting things that people overlook from time to time is that it is not always the computer's fault. There are other aspects that can cause a computer to come down, for example, Telecom lines, electricity fluctuations, and so on. It is not always the computer that is at fault. However, everyone is always eager to blame the computer. Both the on-course and off-course computers have what we call an up time of over 99 per cent. That is a commercially acceptable standard. Unfortunately we are in a business, unlike banks and insurance companies, where if a computer does go down (as the Minister mentioned) everyone wants to back the winner and there are more emotional repercussions than is the case with computers in other areas of business.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Investors do not actually lose their money and a dividend is still declared.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Have there been any cases where people have alleged that they have invested and subsequently lost their money as a result of a computer going down?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is not possible to do that, and there have been no complaints in that area. Once money is invested it is recorded and the dividend is still declared. It is a pool system. If a person makes an investment prior to a race and five minutes later the computer fails, the money is still invested. The investor is paid on the pool system; that means that it may be in the investor's favour or otherwise in regard to the dividend paid on that race. I point out that one must still back the winner or a placed horse to receive a return.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I believe the question has arisen as to whether witnesses are covered by privilege before this Committee. My advice is that all members of the Committee

and the witnesses are covered by privilege. However, if there is any doubt, I suggest that the Minister answer the question, to be on the safe side.

**Mr INGERSON:** I refer to the general reorganisation of the Department. I think we all accept that there has been an excellent explanation, but I have a few points to raise. It has been pointed out that the staffing level will drop from 63.8 to 62.6. Page 72 of the yellow book states:

... additional staff will be appointed to each of the sub-programmes of the Recreation, Sport and Fitness Programme.

That seems to be contrary, one to the other. Can the Minister explain the reference to 'additional staff?' As the Minister mentioned earlier, in the past fortnight or so some 21 positions in the Department have been advertised. How does that relate to a drop in staffing along with the comment that there will be additional staff? How does that tie in with the one package of reorganisation?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That question can be more appropriately explained by Mr Thompson.

**Mr Thompson:** Based on the reorganisation there will be a drop in the number of people employed in the Department. We have cancelled a number of positions. In turn, we have also created new positions. In fact, four staff members have been seconded, with their agreement, to community agencies to continue managing camps. They are no longer included on our staffing levels and we are not paying for them any more. That is one saving. A number of positions no longer exist, and another range of positions has been created. There will be 21 new positions which are obviously distinctly different from the previous situation, and they have to be advertised and called, because staff cannot be moved from one spot to another.

**Mr INGERSON:** Comment was made about a major departmental review in relation to the grants programme. At what stage is the review, when will it be finished and what sort of grants will be reviewed?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** A number of reviews of various programmes and schemes relating to a salary subsidy review have been undertaken by a working party. That report is with me at the moment. We are also looking at what is known as the capital facilities programme, which involves grants to sporting and recreational bodies. We have also introduced separately a recreational grants scheme. In summary, we are looking at better utilisation and a review of some of the major programmes undertaken by the Department over a period of some years. I think it is always absolutely necessary to review programmes from time to time to ensure that we are receiving value for money from any grants that are made to the various programmes.

We are also considering a number of other programmes, and that has not been publicly announced. As I have said, once the Department and our officers have reviewed the programmes we will be assessing the direction to take in the future. As a matter of fact, for the first time ever we recently created a fitness advisory council (previously, we had a recreation and sports advisory council). Of course, as a result, the emphasis will be on providing community programmes with assistance from the fitness advisory council in regard to programmes for community fitness. In association with the reorganisation of the Department we are currently undertaking a number of reviews of programmes that have been part of our departmental situation over a period of some years.

**Mr INGERSON:** I refer to page 72 of the yellow book, as follows:

	\$
Totalisator Tax (On/Off Course) .....	350 000
Lotteries Tax .....	277 000
	<u>\$627 000</u>

It seems strange to say that it is mainly attributable to those two when on the next page there is an increase of \$5.8 million on that line. It says that there is a recurrent expenditure increase from \$12.7 million to \$18.6 million; yet those two lines add up to only \$627 000. Perhaps the Minister could explain that.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The totalizator tax on and off course and the lotteries tax do not go to the Department but to Treasury. Basically, the explanation is that for the first time the Racecourse Development Board funds have been included in our programme.

**Mr INGERSON:** As a supplementary question, can the Minister supply us with a breakdown of those increases in those taxes in particular, mainly because in the receipts under taxation the gambling taxation totals \$4.7 million and this line is \$19.2 million? It seems that there has been an accumulation of a lot of taxation estimates.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am happy to give the member that at a later date. To save time I will send you a prepared copy.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister will send it to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr GREGORY:** Now that the restructuring of the Department is complete, can the Minister say whether he will appoint an Equal Opportunity Officer or a Women's Adviser in his Department?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** As part of the reorganisation (I do not know what the title will be) we are appointing and we have advertised in our specific populations programme for a consultant on women's sport and recreational matters. We expect that appointment to be made following the close of applications, which is tomorrow. Consequently, a person will be appointed specifically relating to women's sport and recreation.

**Mr BECKER:** Can the Minister inform the Committee whether all shares in Festival City Broadcasters Limited have now been acquired or whether some shareholders have withheld the sale of these shares to the TAB? Is he in a position to advise the Committee how the purchase of Festival City Broadcasters Limited has been financed?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The TAB has acquired 100 per cent of the shares. The operation is being financed through the South Australian Financing Authority to the tune of about \$4 million.

**Mr BECKER:** As a supplementary question, I take it that the TAB has paid out all the shareholders?

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

**Mr BECKER:** The shareholders had no option whether they agreed or not?

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

**Mr BECKER:** The estimated purchase price of \$4.6 million has been paid for with a loan or partly with a loan. What is the interest rate, and did you have to pay a .05 per cent procurement fee to the Authority or the Government to obtain the money?

**Mr Smith:** The term of the loan from SAFA is \$4 million on a five-year term. The total capital will be paid back after five years; it is interest only during those five years, payable quarterly; the first payment is in December. The arrangements with SAFA are that it informs us of the interest rate a short time before the payment is due; so, unfortunately, I am unable to tell the Committee what the interest rate is.

**Mr BECKER:** You have to be joking! Do you mean to say that a loan has been negotiated from the State Financing Authority and that the board of the TAB does not know what that interest rate is? This is not a normal commercial transaction. I find that hard to believe.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I hope that the member for Hanson is not casting aspersions on Mr Smith or saying that he is

telling lies. I am sure that the member for Hanson did not mean that Mr Smith was misleading the Committee.

**Mr BECKER:** I am not saying that. It is a normal commercial practice that, if I go out to buy a motor car or anything else and I have to borrow some money, at least I have to know how much I am up for before the start. Can the Minister advise the Committee the projected figures for the operations of the new TAB 5AA? Have the balance sheets or projected balance sheets been drawn up, such as the estimated income and cost of operating the radio station, and what would the cost be if any booster stations are required in the country so that there can be complete coverage throughout the State? I believe that there may be some problems in 5AA's reaching the whole of South Australia and that booster stations may well be required. What is the estimated profit of the radio station? Then we can ascertain whether the TAB will be able to repay its investment without having any impact on its profits that go into the three racing codes.

That is why the key to the whole thing will be the interest rates. Surely, all these projected figures would have been drawn up. There would have to be a balance sheet or financial statement of some kind because Treasury would have to guarantee the loan.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Prior to the acquisition of the shares, I am advised that the TAB did a very close financial evaluation of what might occur as far as the station is concerned. It was a commercial transaction between Festival City Broadcasters and the board of the TAB. The point has been made that some \$4 million has been borrowed from the South Australian Financing Authority and some capital from the TAB capital fund.

It is a commercial transaction with which the Government and I as Minister were not directly involved. Indeed, that transaction was subject to the approval of the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal. I am not aware whether the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal was seeking to ascertain whether the station was going to be a profitable venture or not, but I think that that determination has been made by the TAB and, as a consequence, it is probably more appropriate for the General Manager to give further figures in relation to that matter. With a commercial transaction of such a nature, it is not always possible to ascertain with any degree of certainty what the profitability or otherwise is likely to be over an extended period of time, or even in the mid term.

One of the important aspects of the whole exercise is to ensure a continual service to the racing industry in South Australia and as a group they very strongly support it. It has been a subject of discussion over a long period of time about the racing industry in some way or another being involved with or owning a commercial radio station. I do not want to rehash the whole background of the matter except to say that, in my personal opinion, the move was a correct one. I believe it will take some period to demonstrate to us all and the public of South Australia that it will pay dividends in two directions, not only to the station itself but indeed to the racing industry generally. I ask the General Manager whether he has anything further to add to the honourable member's question.

**Mr Smith:** First, if an organisation has sound financial practices and management it can predict accordingly, taking into consideration the movement in interest rates over the next five years. I consider that the TAB has good sound financial management and the results, of which everyone is aware, over the past two years speak for themselves. The predictions from the TAB viewpoint, were based on turnover for the next five years costs, including revenue that we may receive from 5AA, taking into consideration the interest that we will have to pay from SAFA on soundly-based

predictions. They were checked out by Treasury prior to the Treasurer approving the loan.

In so far as 5AA is concerned, the TAB finance people did their own predictions and also engaged the local finance consultants, CCF, to do theirs separately. We finally came up with some predictions which were put to the Board in making the decision. I assure all members of the Committee that it was a sound commercial decision with every avenue—not only financial but all other aspects—being thoroughly investigated.

**Mr BECKER:** The question has not been answered. I want to know what were the amounts. I also asked about the procuration fee (I believe it was .5 per cent) for arranging the money through the South Australian Government Financing Authority.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is up to the Minister to answer. If he does not choose to answer, that is his prerogative.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I point out to the member for Hanson that Festival City Broadcasters, 5AA, is a separate organisation to the TAB. It is a private company and, as a consequence, it is not under my jurisdiction. Indeed, I do not think it is under the jurisdiction of this Parliament for me to answer a question on behalf of 5AA.

**Mr BECKER:** On a point of order, I disagree with the Minister because the profits of the TAB affect the amount of money handled by the Government. It goes through the Minister's supervision to the various funds, the Racecourse Development Board, etc. The profits of the TAB go through the Minister's supervision to the various sporting codes. It is in the interest of Parliamentary and public scrutiny for us to know what transpired with the acquisition of Festival City Broadcasters Ltd. It was purchased as a going concern and we want to know whether any decision made will have any impact on the future profits of the TAB. I hope that it will not—I do not think that it will—because, if it did, the Government may have to make up the shortfall to ensure a high standard in the racing industry. That is why I am pursuing the question. I do not doubt the integrity of anyone involved.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member was taking a point of order and explaining further. I reiterate the point that the Minister may or may not choose to answer. He has given the reason as to why he believes he should not provide figures and there is no way he can be compelled to give them.

**Ms LENEHAN:** I refer to a previous question asked by the member for Florey. I congratulate the Minister on the proposed appointment of a consultant in the area of women's sport and recreation. Of course equal opportunity is much more than women's participation in sport and recreation and involves a range of groups including the handicapped, migrants and other people in our community. My question relates to a philosophical commitment by the Minister and the Department to equal opportunities, not only as regards adequate sporting and recreation facilities for women but also, first, in employment in the Department and, secondly, by appointing a person responsible for equal opportunities as has been done within the Department of Education. That person is responsible for the implementation of an equal opportunities programme. Does the Department, in the medium and longer term, have any plans to implement an equal opportunities plan or programme which would encompass not only the provision of services for groups in the community such as women, migrants and handicapped, but would also promote equality of opportunity within the employment areas of the Department?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Education Department has been used as an example and it is a large Government Department. Our work force is only 64.5 people and certainly if we were able to increase our staff and our budget we

would want to give equal opportunity on the very point that the member for Mawson has made.

However, there is no immediate plan in that regard, simply because the Department is not large enough at this stage to bring about that implementation. One of the important things to remember is that, from a staffing point of view, the provision of a consultant for women is not a matter that is determined by me as the Minister but by the processes of the Public Service Board. All of the positions advertised are processed on that basis. There is no immediate intention to provide a specific position of a women's adviser to the Minister. Whatever terminology is used, that is basically the position. Because of the size of the Department and its budget, we are not in a position at this stage to give a positive answer to that question.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The Minister said that Festival City Broadcasters is not under his authority, but the TAB is under his authority. I note that the TAB has borrowed money from the South Australian Government Financing Authority, and I am sure that the Minister cannot say that that is not his responsibility, or part of his responsibility, even if the matter was handled by the Premier. I also point out that, according to the Auditor-General's Report, the common Government interest rate for the June quarter was 12.2 per cent. Mr Smith may have some idea of how interest rates fluctuate, but taking that interest rate of 12.2 per cent we are talking about interest on the loan of \$500 000 a year. As the loan is over five years there is only interest repayment and we are talking about \$2.5 million over the next five years. Continuing the point made by the member for Hanson, if the proposal is not profitable, TAB distributions to the racing codes could be severely affected by that amount.

As the member for Hanson said, no one is reflecting on the integrity of anyone here, but it is a very important point that the public has every right to know the minutest detail of the Government Financing Authority. Apart from that, does the TAB have to repay the Treasury or the Government Financing Authority a procuration fee of .5 per cent, which is in effect \$100 000 over five years if it is paid annually?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I will refer that question to the General Manager.

**Mr Smith:** I will provide firm information at a later date, but at this stage my view is that the interest rate charged includes an administration percentage.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before we proceed further with this line of questioning, I can understand Mr Smith's having difficulty. First, I see nothing in the Budget Estimates or in the other document under recreation and sport that can remotely be tied to Festival City Broadcasters.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** We are talking about the TAB.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister has already advised that the money came from the South Australian Government Financing Authority, and by that fact I believe that the questions should have been put to the Treasurer, not to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. If the Minister wishes to answer questions on the finances of Festival City Broadcasters, he may do so, but if he does not wish to reply, he may pass up those questions. I note from the document that \$4.56 million has been allocated under one line and \$6 million has been allocated under another line. It is a pretty fine line. I have let things go because I am a tolerant person but, if the Minister does not wish to answer these questions, I cannot compel him to do so.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman. You are saying in effect that these questions should have been addressed to the Treasurer?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am not saying that they should have, but I believe that—I am not sure.



**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Whereas we would have been able to question the Treasurer about the South Australian Government Financing Authority we would not necessarily have been able to question him about the TAB and its operations. That Board is certainly the responsibility of and is committed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have no argument with that.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** With the greatest respect, Mr Chairman, at page 73 of the Estimates of Payments it is more than made clear that that is a fact. However, as far as I am concerned, questioning on that matter has finished. Mr Smith said that he would try to provide detailed information. I just say that I regard that as extremely important and I would like the detailed information to be made available to the Secretary of the Committee as soon as possible—in fact, it must be available before 19 October.

*[Sitting suspended from 8.48 to 9.5 p.m.]*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I will canvass two other subjects, the first being the Sports Institute, which has well and truly come of age, as has been proved by recent successes at Los Angeles and Stoke Mandeville. Members have already paid tribute to the Sports Institute so it would be repetitious for me to repeat those tributes here. It was always my intention when establishing the Sports Institute that it should eventually break away from the Department and become a separate body, not necessarily a statutory authority but an organisation directly responsible to the Minister but separate from the administration of the Department. Has the Minister given consideration to this suggestion? I think that now is about time to start talking about this sort of action. If he has considered doing this, what does he intend doing about it? Also, has he had submissions from Mr Motley or members of the Board in relation to this matter?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have not received specific submissions from the Chairman of the Board in relation to this matter. However, the direction that we are taking is somewhat different from the philosophy just expressed by the member for Torrens. It is the Government's belief and my belief that the Institute should be part of the departmental exercise and, indeed, within the new reorganisation and structure, a copy of which I have given to members; one notes that it is included in the departmental structure. The member will recall that both the Director and the Sports Science Co-ordinator, Jess Jarver, were seconded from the Department to establish the Sports Institute. Recently, probably in the past six months, both of those persons have become public servants in the sense that they are part of the Recreation and Sport Department. Therefore, the trend is not to give the Sports Institute full autonomy, either as a statutory authority or through a Board. The trend has been the reverse of the philosophy expressed by the member.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Does that mean there is now a department with a Director at its head—an extremely good Director, I might add—and a Sports Institute with its own Board, the chairman of which is responsible to the Director and not directly to the Minister, because that is how it is shown in the structure?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The staff is responsible to the Director, but the Board is not. It will be responsible to me as Minister.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before we go any further I advise that the honourable member for Unley is replacing the honourable member for Mawson.

#### Membership:

Mr Mayes substituted for Ms Lenehan.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I turn now to salaries subsidy grants. The Minister has indicated that he is re-

examining the way in which these grants will be made in future. Will the Minister say whether he intends doing away with these grants or in what way he intends changing them? More importantly, will he say how many recreation organisations as opposed to sporting organisations receive grants, because I remember that when we originally set up the salaries subsidy scheme it was to involve twenty sporting to five recreation organisations. On Saturday I attended, with the Minister of Marine, Mr Abbott, the opening of the Sea Rescue Squadron and the presentation of its third rescue craft. This organisation provides an enormous service to the community, one which the Government would have to provide if this body did not provide it.

The situation is somewhat akin to that of organisations such as at the Surf Lifesaving Association and the Royal Lifesaving Society, which are both in receipt of special grants from the Department. I understand from the Commodore of the Sea Rescue Squadron that it is having some financial troubles. It seems to me that that would be an ideal recreation organisation—because it is a recreation organisation as well as a service organisation—to qualify for a salaries subsidy grant should it apply for one. I am very glad to tell the Minister that his colleague, when I asked him the question yesterday in this Chamber, agreed that he would support an approach, as I would, of course, to the Minister or one of his other Ministerial colleagues, for assistance in one way or another. The easiest way would be to see if the squadron could apply for and be granted a salaries subsidy grant, whether it is the full \$8 000 (if that is still the figure), or \$4 000, or whatever the figure for which it wished to apply.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have previously said today that a working party was established earlier this year to conduct a review and report on the salaries subsidy scheme. That report has been with me only the past couple of days. I have not read it closely and have given it only a cursory examination. It contains a number of options and recommendations, none of which suggests that we should discontinue the scheme. It is a fairly extensive report, and we need to assess its contents. From what I have seen so far it is a very good report. There are about four or five options that we can take. Two of those options are related more to extending the scheme to recreational groups, rather than sporting groups. Sporting groups have been the major recipient since the scheme came into operation. I believe that it is a very beneficial scheme for various sporting groups, as we support full-time and part-time administrators and coaches. The scheme has worked reasonably well.

There are times, after a scheme has been operating for four or more years, when it needs to be reassessed so that the respective groups and the Department can ensure that they are getting value for money in relation to the person's salary who might be subsidised. That is basically where the matter is at the moment. I will be considering all those recommendations in the next couple of weeks or so, and arising from that I will be determining the basis of the scheme for the future. None of the options recommended, nor would I agree, that the scheme should be discontinued. The options basically are for a number of redirections of the scheme. The amount available this year is \$200 000, which is similar to the amounts that have been available over the past two or three years. The review will assist consideration of distribution to respective groups and whether and in what fashion we can extend the scheme.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** What about the Sea Rescue Squadron?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I am not going to make a commitment at this time to the Sea Rescue Squadron. It is not a recipient under the scheme at present. We will be looking, as I said, to recreational groups specifically to see how far

we can apply the scheme to them or whether we are unable to do so because of funding.

It depends on the distribution of the whole \$200 000 in regard to the scheme. At this time I cannot make a commitment to the Sea Rescue Squadron and whether it fits in with the criteria that may be established in regard to the future scheme.

**Mr INGERSON:** I refer to page 76 of the Programme Estimates and the comment in regard to issues and trends that comprehensive data is significantly lacking in the whole sporting and recreational area. What is the general direction in which the Minister intends to move?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** That reference involves the re-organisation of the Department. We are looking for the advisory councils. We established one in regard to fitness and we want a greater opportunity for communication for those groups and persons who are recipients of our programmes as well as the community at large in which these programmes have some effect. The Director might wish to comment further, because we rely heavily on personal communication and it is important that we get feedback from the community we serve as to whether the programmes offered are getting community involvement or otherwise. We run a number of sub programmes. We do not want to list them specifically but we are never sure whether those programmes meet with the approval of the people we are trying to service, and it means a greater emphasis on obtaining feedback from the community at large, sporting groups in general as to whether the programmes provide value for money and whether they are as successful as originally intended.

**Mr Thompson:** The leisure activities survey which was completed (the data was collected a couple of years ago and the data was made available to the community and the department) is a major source of information. Each of the four units—sport, recreation, fitness and specific populations—will be given a specific responsibility in regard to already collected data. There is much data around but it is widespread. One good example is the fishing survey published by the Commonwealth that put an economic value on recreational fishing. Similar reports are spread throughout the country, so each unit will be given a responsibility to review the literature and bring together that material. That is the first stage. Having gone through and identified areas of need we will collect data but, with the resources that we have, we cannot afford to put much energy and effort into collecting primary information.

**Mr INGERSON:** Again at page 76 in respect of 1983-84 specific targets, reference is made to the appointment of an Aboriginal sports and recreation development officer. In the Estimates of Payments I note that we were to receive \$30 000 from the Federal Government for part of that payment, but nothing was received under actual receipts. Why has that payment not been made?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I ask Mr Thompson to comment.

**Mr Thompson:** The officer was appointed half way through the year. Had he been appointed for the full year we would have got the full subsidy. We were paid a pro rata amount.

**Mr INGERSON:** We were paid pro rata?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** He only commenced in April or May 1984.

**Mr INGERSON:** There appears to be no payment at all, although it may be under some other line. If that is the case, perhaps that could be confirmed. I refer to the sports federation and the regional sports assembly. What does that involve and how far has it progressed?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Director attended a meeting, which I could not attend, in relation to the development of a sports federation. It appeared that there was not a great deal of general enthusiasm for the establishment of a South

Australian sports federation, but the matter will be decided by the respective organisations and groups. The regional sports assembly is a proposal, with assistance from CEP funds, to initiate a programme of competitions on a regional basis. A final decision has not been made on whether we should proceed with this programme or otherwise; it is still being considered. No moves have been made in that regard—it is just a proposal to me as Minister. I am still considering the establishment of a regional sports assembly or otherwise.

**Mr BECKER:** I understand that the Australian paraplegic sports championships will be held in Adelaide in January 1986. Some months ago a representative of that organisation told me he was seeking support for accommodation. Has the Department done a needs survey and is it aware whether accommodation is available for about 260 people in wheel-chairs? I considered the new cottages at the West Beach Trust but, unfortunately, they are booked out for the Softball Association's Australian championships. The migrant hostel at Pennington was a possibility, but I believe it is to be demolished. I also tried the Department of the Army, a few of the colleges and the universities. I am sure we would all like to assist the paraplegics to hold their Australian championships here and any future major sporting events. What assistance can the Department provide?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have had discussions with the Administrator, Mr Parker, and with the Chairperson, Barbara Worley, in relation to accommodation problems for the Australian championships to be held in Adelaide in January 1986. There was a proposal to use the Pennington Hostel, but I am now advised that the Commonwealth will not come to the party. The other alternative at that time was a deal with a hotel or motel in relation to a reduction in rates. I do not know whether that proposal has been proceeded with. We offered to establish whether the Department could locate any other accommodation that might be suitable.

With 260 people, plus the fact that it has to have certain facilities to accommodate disabled people, it is a pretty difficult problem. It may be that over the past few days the Director has had a further communication from them which I am not aware of and which might throw some more light on the problem that has been raised by the member for Hanson, but to my knowledge they have not yet been able to establish a suitable accommodation venue. The Government is prepared to assist in any way possible in relation to accommodation, but it is difficult. There have been a few other proposals, none of them particularly suitable. It appears that the number one option at present is private accommodation at a reduced rate.

**Mr Thompson:** On behalf of the Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association, we talked to a number of Government departments and semi-government departments to determine what accommodation was available either in hospitals or in migrant hostels. None can cater for that very large number of people. We have discussed it with them and they have come down to a motel, which is the best option that they have. There are a lot of other major sporting events during that period and it has made accommodation very difficult to find. These people also require special accommodation because of their disabilities.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Has the Minister yet been able to decide what he intends to do about the problem of small lotteries in hotels and the doubtful laundering of the money that is obtained in some instances? Has the problem grown worse since the Minister took office?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The working party that was established by the member for Torrens when he was Minister reported to him; then the report was directed to me. Basically, I supported the recommendations, except for two or three matters. I cannot readily recall now what they are. We are still considering which is the best avenue to take. I did not

want to jeopardise in any way some of the sporting, social or recreational groups—

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** That is the big problem.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** (It is the big problem)—who currently, with the permission of the hotelkeeper, are running competitions in a legal way in hotels. On the other hand, there is fairly strong evidence that some of the so-called hotel social clubs are only groups of persons who are making private profit out of the conduct mostly of beer ticket machines and instant bingo, which would be the major sources of revenue. I find it very difficult to come to terms with. I have had further discussions with my officers of the lotteries section. We have a Parliamentary Caucus committee where there are still some differing views on which course the Government ought to take.

To be quite honest with the member for Torrens, we have had the matter in the too hard basket now for some considerable time. We ought to take some action at least while still safeguarding, as far as possible, the legitimate conduct of instant money, bingo and beer ticket machines that occur presently. The other part of the question was whether it has extended. I cannot give the honourable member definite information on whether or not it has gone further. We cannot ascertain the extent of the problem that has occurred over a period of time, but I believe that we ought to look at the matter seriously in another direction by making it more difficult by way of regulation or legislation, for the establishment of hotel social clubs, because it has been alleged (and the working party report substantiated those allegations) that many hotel social clubs were benefiting individuals rather than the clubs themselves. There were also allegations of overseas trips and all sorts of peculiar things happening with the money derived from that operation. To summarise for the member for Torrens, we are still considering closely some action in regard to the matter. Indeed, I am going to convene a meeting of members of the working party to further assess what progress we can make in coming to grips with the alleged problem.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Is the Minister prepared to provide the Committee with estimates of how much money is being lost to revenue and to legitimate hotel social clubs as there was such a document? I know that Messrs Watson and De George had some knowledge of it. I know that they are only estimates, as one cannot know exactly until one goes out into the field and finds it, but when I was Minister there was a document to that effect. Would the Minister provide that information?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have no objection to providing those figures although they would be somewhat out of date. I am advised that the figures are in the working party report. No further assessment has been done. The lotteries general turnover has remained static over the past couple of years rather than increased. It would appear that it has an impact by other forms of gambling or, alternatively, that people are not paying their contributions legally in regard to a licence from the Department of Recreation and Sport. There are no later figures in relation to hotel social clubs, although I suppose we could reassess the applications made to determine whether there has been an increase in turnover of hotel social clubs as against other sporting, social, cultural or recreational groups.

From memory, the percentage of turnover from bingo and beer tickets in the Department at that time was far greater from hotel social clubs collectively than from all the other social and sporting groups. That is very significant.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I would appreciate information if it is available and, if it is not, I would appreciate a copy of the working party report. I understand that \$6 million has been allocated in the Federal Budget to assist Australia's defence of the Americas Cup. How much

of that sum, if any, will come to South Australia, and in what form, and will the Federal Government assist the South Australian challenge?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The Department has not been involved in negotiations relating to the Americas Cup. The Premier and the Department of State Development have been involved in negotiations, but I have no information on the matter. It might be more appropriate for me to obtain information from the Department of State Development or the Premier's Department.

**Mr INGERSON:** There is confusion about which CEP programmes are undertaken through the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Department of Labour; are there strict guidelines? There seems to be a duplication of recreational projects through the CEP programmes. Are feasibility studies carried out in relation to those facilities? Because a lot of recreational programmes are being created through the Education Department, is there a cross reference between the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Education Department in the provision of recreational facilities?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** There are six major programmes: five will come into operation this year and one has already commenced. They are River Murray Canoeing, Recreational Cycling, Western Suburbs Unemployed, the Sports City Programme (at which the member for Bragg was present—he will recall the tug-of-war team), the Leisure Activity Survey, and the Sport and Recreation Administration Centre, totalling \$460 910. Some of those programmes will continue into 1985-86. I can give a breakdown of the Federal contribution.

**Mr INGERSON:** That is not necessary.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** They are the six main schemes that are in hand through the CEP scheme for this coming year. There may be other smaller grants that are not noted in the document. Most of the persons engaged in the CEP programme have only commenced in the Department in the past two weeks. Most of the persons engaged in the CEP programme have only commenced in the Department in the past two weeks.

**Mr INGERSON:** There was also the question of the feasibility study relating to the recreational area in particular. Is there any co-ordination in that respect between the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Department of Labour, because there seems to be a lot of duplication occurring in the community at the moment, and is there any communication with the Education Department, because there seems to be duplication in that area as well?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I cannot answer that question, because the CEP programme applications are not always known to us. That is a bit of a problem. In some cases there may be a duplication of effort. It is entirely up to the Department of Labour to make assessments based on applications received. I am not able to answer that question, except to say that perhaps on occasion there is some minor duplication of effort. Indeed, local government also makes applications under the CEP scheme and we, as a State Government Department, are not always aware of local council applications or of the approval for some of the CEP schemes. Therefore, there is a need to pull the thing together, to ensure that there is no overlapping and duplication of programmes, so that at least as a Department we know what is occurring outside of the applications that we make.

**Mr INGERSON:** What is the programme for 1984-85 for the Heysen Trail? What has happened in relation to the public liability area and the problems that have been highlighted regarding public risk liability for people who have accidents on the trail? Also, are there any figures showing the overall usage of the trail?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The answer is that 550 kilometres of the Heysen Trail have been completed so far. The sections completed are from Newlands Hill near Victor Harbor to the Barossa and from Hawker to Parachilna Gorge in the Flinders Ranges. It is proposed in 1984-85 to develop the Crystal Brook to Wilmington, and Cape Jervois to Newlands Hill sections. The estimated total distance of these new sections is 155 kilometres. Three full-time staff will be employed on the project. In addition, three persons are currently working under a CEP project constructing the Crystal Brook to Wilmington section at a cost of \$15 000. The matter of public liability has been considered by the Crown Law Office, and we have received advice. It appears that the problem relates to the trail being on private property. This problem was drawn to our attention by property owners on the northern part of the trail. We have been able to satisfactorily arrange for and get an opinion that obviates any difficulties in this regard. I cannot remember the details of the decision, but perhaps Mr Graham Thompson can assist here.

**Mr Thompson:** What is proposed is that the Government take out a peppercorn rent or lease on adjacent land up to half a kilometre on each side of the trail, which means that the Crown would accept liability for any walker straying from the trail. We do not anticipate any claims. From the advice we have been given from landowners that certainly would be a much more satisfactory arrangement than is currently existing. Concerning numbers, we have had a log book arrangement that has proved most unsatisfactory. One gets groups of schoolchildren going through and they obliterate any data that is there. We are experimenting with a counter system where we would actually hide the counter and count the number of legs that go through. We have been unable to get a satisfactory system that produces reliable data.

**Mr INGERSON:** When is this public liability problem likely to be taken up?

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** The proposal as instanced by Mr Thompson has been agreed to and it is just a question of setting it up and bringing it into operation.

**Mr INGERSON:** In relation to the listing of special previous funding in the Estimates, as recreation and sport is unusual in making specific grants to a large number of

organisations and societies, under the programme performance system it is virtually impossible for Parliament to scrutinise or ask questions on the amounts of money that are specifically made available to those organisations. Is it possible next year to have them listed as part of the programme performance budget, in particular, Life. Be In It, lifesaving, SAJC (which happens to be one this year), the Sports Institute and surf lifesaving. There may be others as we go down the track. It seems that, as there are a large number of special areas of funding, Parliament should be able to look at and question the grants.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** I have good news for the member for Bragg. It is our intention to produce an annual report—an internal document—that will give wider detail on the very questions that the member has asked in regard to grants and the various programmes we have throughout the year. That will cover the previous financial year and will be available in a few months. It will be a guide book for recreation and sport.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** We have appreciated the presence of the Minister's officers tonight and the assistance they have given to the Committee. We pass on our felicitations to the Minister with his Urti infection and suggest he have the day off tomorrow.

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

---

Works and Services—Department of Recreation and Sport,  
\$6 200 000—Examination declared completed.

---

**The CHAIRMAN:** I also join with the member for Torrens in thanking the members of the Committee for their co-operation, the Minister for his frankness in replying and the officers for their co-operation and assistance.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.50 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 4 October at 11 a.m.