

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 September 1988

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

**Chairman:**

The Hon. T.M. McRae

**Members:**

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore  
 Ms D.L. Gayler  
 Mr T.R. Groom  
 Mr I.P. Lewis  
 Mr D.J. Robertson  
 The Hon. D.C. Wotton

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

Environment and Planning, \$35 072 000  
 Deputy Premier and Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous, \$1 055 000  
 Works and Services—Department of Environment and Planning, \$5 652 000

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

Dr I. McPhail, Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.  
 Mr G. Stafford, Director, Environmental Management Division.  
 Mr S. Hains, Director, Planning Division.  
 Mr B. Leaver, Director, National Parks.  
 Mr C. Harris, Director, Environment Division.  
 Mr J. Hill, Director, Departmental Services.  
 Dr B. Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens.  
 Mr R. Tucker, Acting Manager, Coastal Management Branch.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the votes open for examination. I refer members to pages 35 to 39 and 174 in the Estimates of Payments and pages 51 to 70 in the Program Estimates.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** In relation to the Botanic Gardens, I note that the staffing overall has been reduced from 110.1 to 108.6 full-time equivalents. In light of the development of the Tropical Conservatory, how will the requirements of the new development and the existing gardens be met when fewer staff are available?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The honourable member would know that we intend to charge for admission to the Tropical Conservatory. Any income will not flow as quickly as will the demand for money for staffing and that sort of thing. We are negotiating with the Treasury for a float, if I can use that term. I use it quite advisedly because it would be an off budget arrangement that would have to be repaid in time, and my officers are negotiating with the Treasury on that which is why it does not actually find its way into the figures that we have in front of us.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Does the total staffing identified on page 52 of the Program Estimates indicate the total number of people who will be working in all botanic

gardens, including the Tropical Conservatory (which I take to be part of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens)? The conservatory is not a separate entity?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** No.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Will this float from Treasury finance additional staff who are not identified in the Program Estimates?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We are looking for two more staff from that additional finance.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** When will the conservatory be opened; what are the proposed charges and what is it expected to raise in a full year's operation?

**Dr Morley:** The opening is scheduled for April 1989. The schedule of fees for admission is still being worked out by the board, but it is envisaged to be about \$2 per adult with concessions applying. Certain age groups will be charged half price and concessions will apply to school children in school groups. The question of how much revenue is likely to be raised in a year depends on visitor numbers, and that is difficult to estimate. If I could take it on notice, I could probably provide some figures for the member, subject to these variables.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Progress of the arid lands botanic garden seems to have hit a wall. Last year in the Estimates Committee, the Minister indicated that he regarded the whole of the arid zone and the various impacts on the biota of the arid zone as an area of critical importance to the State. I think all of us have read about the importance of research for vegetation for the arid zone and the general need for us to know more about vegetation suitable for that area. In view of the extraordinary efforts that have been made by local people and others to support the arid lands botanic garden, has the Government not been able to find any funds at all this year to allocate to that project?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** No direct funds. We are keen to continue to provide advice, and have urged the committee up there to continue to look to possible private sources of funds. It is important that we see the arid lands botanic garden as an important tool in heightening awareness as to the importance of the arid zone. I would not have seen it as really being in the front line of research into arid land conditions, which seems to be one of the premises lying behind the member's question. It must be remembered that, through the Minister of Lands, Dr Lange from the university is funded for a research station at Middleback into arid lands conditions, and there is a considerable CSIRO input through their people at Deniliquin.

We tried very hard a couple of years ago to persuade the CSIRO to transfer it to Adelaide and there seemed a fair chance that it might happen. It did not come off, which was most unfortunate. Finally, the Department of Lands and some areas of my own department are involved in research. Some of my most senior officers have their academic background in arid lands ecology.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I can only express keen disappointment about that because South Australia is the place if anywhere in Australia where such gardens should be established. It would have important tourism import as well as environmental and conservation value. I know that my own Party places considerable value on it. Will the Minister or the Director advise whether a proposal exists to introduce charges in any of the other botanic gardens or whether any income is foreseen whatsoever from any source, even propagation, from any other botanic gardens?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** No proposal exists for charging for entry, but I defer to Dr Morley in regard to other income that might be generated from the resources of the gardens themselves.

**Dr Morley:** There are alternative sources of income, particularly in relation to Black Hill Flora Centre where, through the board, we are developing new varieties of native and exotic plants of use to the nursery industry. It is possible that revenue can flow back to Black Hill to promote a more effective research and development unit there in service to the community. They are the sorts of revenue earning opportunities that exist. No discussions have occurred for entrance fees to be levied in any other botanic garden.

**Ms GAYLER:** Will the Minister advise us on the role now being played by the Black Hill Flora Centre?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Botanic Gardens expenditure is in three programs. The total employment numbers, when taking into account Government House grounds and the State herbarium, is \$127.6 million. I did not correct it earlier because I knew the honourable member was talking about the gardens as normally understood rather than either Government House or the herbarium. It is important to realise that it is all part of the Botanic Gardens effort.

**Dr Morley:** The role of Black Hill Flora Centre continues much as it was when the centre was created by the State Government, namely, to develop the horticulture potential of native flora, and to undertake studies to help our knowledge of rare and endangered species in South Australia, which is a valuable adjunct to the work the National Parks and Wildlife Service does. New activities at Black Hill include examining the horticultural potential of exotic and native plants and to make the products of those researchers available to the nursery industry and the community. It has also been possible to use Black Hill for horticultural apprentice training in conjunction with TAFE and Federal authorities. Teaching the young about horticulture is of crucial importance. The other commitment made by the Government is to make rare and unusual species of plants available to the public annually in plant sales. Whilst we cannot have plant sales every day of the week because of resource constraints, we certainly have plant sales a couple of times a year.

**Ms GAYLER:** In the light of the repeated media claims that the staffing of national parks in South Australia has been on the slide, what are the staffing levels in our national parks?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The honourable member must appreciate that we have been in an area of constraint at a time when most Government instrumentalities have been asked to look at 1 per cent and 3 per cent cuts. I, as Minister, have not been exempt from requests made in almost every area of Government administration.

However, we have endeavoured to maintain, and where possible strengthen, the field base staff in national parks. Secondly, we have examined the generation of revenue from the parks themselves. I admit that this has not been without some debate and, indeed, controversy, but the Committee will see some of the benefits of that in terms of the figures. That is now paying off, and a significant proportion of our work force is now employed with moneys generated under the General Reserve Trust.

The agreement that we had with the Treasury at a particular time was that those revenues which have been generated by the parks to that date would continue to flow into general revenue as is normally the case with charges for services, whatever they might be, water supply and so on. However, any moneys generated as a result of new initiatives would be paid into a fund using what to then had been a somewhat moribund mechanism which dated back to, I believe, Glen Broomhill's time. That money would then flow back into the parks system.

In 1983-84 there were 201 field based staff with an overall national parks establishment of 259. At that time, the General Reserve Trust was not employing anyone because we had not activated it. The figures I have quoted are the base figures. In the 1987-88 financial year the field based staff was, again, 201. However, there were 35 people employed from the General Reserve Trust. They were being employed as animal attendants, cave guides, seasonal rangers, wetlands guides, and, what are interestingly called seal guides—I believe that relates to Seal Bay. The overall national parks establishment was 264.

This budget again provides for a field based staff from the normal revenue provisions of 201. It also provides 44 full-time equivalents being employed through the General Reserve Trust. That gives an overall total of 273 as the national parks establishment. Of course, the two figures—35 last year and 44 this year—do not represent 35 and 44 individuals because a lot of these people are employed part-time.

We are looking at approximately 70 people who are employed, in some cases, on a full-time, but mostly on a casual basis, which translates to 44 full-time equivalents. I can assure the honourable member that, despite the concern expressed last year when it was felt that it might be necessary to divest ourselves of a considerable number of staff, those fears have not been realised and, particularly through the General Reserves Trust, we are in a rather healthier position in relation to staff than we have been for some time.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I turn to the coastal management section of the Program Estimates and ask what has been the upshot of the seminar held in the past six weeks or so to discuss coastal management with, primarily, local government officials. What is expected to come out of that seminar in terms of concrete results, attitudinal changes, funding decisions and the like, and what follow-up can be expected from the department as a result of the seminar?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will shortly throw the ball to Dr McPhail in terms of the organisational aspects. We are very heartened by the response to that seminar, and believe that it was very important in educating people. There is an enormous mythology about the greenhouse effect. Many people just do not appreciate the fact that the only reason we are on this earth is because of the greenhouse effect—that it is responsible for about 40 degrees Celsius warming of the surface of the earth. As they say, if you do not believe me, go to Mars and see what happens where there is no greenhouse effect operating.

Talking about waiting for the greenhouse effect to happen is really a nonsense, because it has been happening for 2 000 million or 3 000 million years on this planet. Also, quoting wild statistics can be very misleading, because the most difficult data to interpret is the actual rise in the ocean level. Often what one may well be measuring is a subsidence in the continental crust, which is one of the reasons why Australia is fairly important in this whole matter. It is, of course, a fairly stable sort of land mass, particularly on the western shield with very little of that sort of movement occurring.

I am sure that people came away from that seminar with a rather better understanding of the mechanism, realising that it is not something which we have to panic about and jump into tomorrow, or anything like that, in terms of shifting properties back from the coast, but that it is something about which we need to be extremely well informed and need to plan a few things on the basis of a what-if situation. However, in terms of the specifics of where we go from here, perhaps Dr McPhail can briefly explain.

**Dr McPhail:** As one who lives on a sandhill, I am very interested in the greenhouse effect. The seminar referred to was a very sensible and well balanced discussion and included what I thought was a very good contribution from local authorities. Apart from setting the scene in relation to the greenhouse effect as it refers to coastal management, the seminar also began to explore the questions of what shifts in standards, in terms of structures on the coastline, should be thought through, and also how we can begin in the long term to provide within our statutory planning documents the necessary provisions for coastal management based on a predicted change in sea level.

The purpose of the seminar principally was for the Coastal Management Branch and the Coast Protection Board to put before an audience of local government and interested people, engineers and planners, a variety of possible responses in terms of standards and supplementary development plan changes for the future. It was only an introduction and will become the basis for much more detailed work in the future.

I also take the opportunity to say that that is really only one part of a very major greenhouse effect effort that has been developed in this State, and I hope that all interested members will participate in the seminars on 3, 4 and 5 November which will be dealing with the greenhouse effect on a broader scale.

We must remember that we are not just talking about possible changes to the coastline: we are talking about possible changes to agricultural industries brought about through the climatic trends as well as about a whole range of effects upon individuals and their economic activities. This is being sponsored through the Commission of the Future and supported by the department and will provide a context in which all of this can be brought forward. The Coast Protection Board is to be commended for that excellent seminar and the very sensible and sound way in which those various approaches to standards and statutory planning were brought through.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** My next question is a broad policy one, but, following what has just been said, I endorse what Dr McPhail said. I was not able to go to the seminar but I must congratulate the Minister and his officers on what has been achieved so far. I also congratulate the media, because it all appears to have come across in a very responsible and accurate fashion. There appeared to be nothing in last year's estimates answers or allocations to indicate that the Government was working in this direction. I refer to the coastal management program (page 53 of the Estimates) in asking this question. At what stage did the Government embark upon planning for this, and is the Minister aware of what stage the planning in South Australia has reached compared to other States or nations in this region?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** About all I can report in relation to the last part of the honourable member's question is the discussions that have occurred at the AEC ConCom meetings, where at least for the last three meetings, starting with the one in Adelaide, a representative of the CSIRO has attempted to give the Ministers the most up-to-date information possible on this matter. That has involved an international network. I believe there is a series of 13 monitoring stations around the globe, which are busy measuring carbon dioxide concentration and I believe that the other States know about as much as we do.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What are they doing?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I do not know. I have not had any specific reports on that. As to any specific work that has been done by the department, that really has been very recent indeed, although, of course, the department has taken note of the material that we have collected at the AEC

ConCom meetings and in some cases it has assisted in the preparation of some of the discussion papers. But the work that led for example, to the seminar, is of very recent vintage indeed.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I would like to look, as I did last year, at the whole budget and the Government's priorities. The department has about \$36 million in broad terms to spend, of which about a quarter goes on the management of national parks, about one-tenth on development management, one-sixth on native vegetation, the remainder of the responsibilities falling into fragmentary areas. Given the environmental priorities that the Minister outlined a year ago and given that they are spread way beyond this department and through other areas of Government responsibility, can the Minister indicate where the forward emphasis will be placed? I know we do not have triennial funding but at the moment, looking at the last three budgets, funding appears to have been purely historic, based on what was done last year with minor modifications. There does not appear at this stage to be any real shift in emphasis, to reflect what the Minister identified as environmental priorities for the South Australian Government, for which we would be looking to the year 2 000 and beyond. Page 51 of the Program Estimates embraces the whole departmental budget. If we are to manage the environment of this State effectively, where would the Minister like to see more emphasis and, therefore, more resources placed?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The amount of money spent is not necessarily an indicator of the priority placed in a particular area, because some things are intrinsically more expensive than others. It is expensive to cart sand from point A to point B, but one does that because it is a priority. Urban consolidation may be a greater priority, but there may be a cheaper unit cost associated with it. However, I suggest that the whole area of urban planning and urban consolidation (and also the sensible development of the broad acres on the fringe of the city) are things into which we will have to put more effort, which may in turn mean more resources.

In the past two or three years we have done a lot of work which perhaps gives us a much better handle on it than was available, say, to that Government that wanted to build Monarto or earlier Governments that were quite happy to allow the city simply to sprawl unfettered, as it were. We are assisted by the fact that we have a better handle on demography and the probable future expansion of metropolitan Adelaide but, while one tries to get the most one can from urban consolidation, given the perceptions of Adelaide people about what sort of a place Adelaide ought to be (which means that one cannot play the sort of games that Melbourne played in the 1950s), one cannot also ignore the fact that there will continue to be growth on the fringe and that that growth ought to be controlled in such a way that basic services are available to the people who live there.

Mount Barker is very much a fringe area as perhaps are Munno Para, Aldinga, or Port Noarlunga South. All those areas will continue to grow, and it is important that resources are there and proper planning, which minimises the amount of resource that is needed to provide a particular form of service, must be undertaken. A good deal of work has to go into that.

The whole area of native vegetation continues to be a vexed problem and we have made approaches to the Commonwealth about assistance in that matter, because members will be aware that South Australia missed out on the rain forest money (which went to practically every other State) on the simple ground that we do not have any rain forests, so we do not think it is unreasonable that some

mallee money or something like that should be available to assist in that matter. This would enable us to complete the program more quickly than would otherwise be the case. The program has always been seen to be a finite one in respect of which eventually ever stick of unprotected native vegetation in the State will have been applied for and will have been either cleared or in some sort of a heritage agreement or arrangement between the private owner and the Government. I suppose that we are still looking at something like a 10 year program.

I mentioned briefly the whole matter of coastal management. This area is important to us, not only because the beaches are a prime recreational and tourist asset for the most heavily populated part of the Adelaide metropolitan area but also because inevitably they are losing sand. This device that we have of shifting sand from the better covered beaches to the less well covered beaches is all very well, but it assumes that it is an enclosed system when that is not quite the case. Although most of the sand which has been in the offshore deposits or the sandbars comes back to the beach every season, some is lost into the general gulf environment and it is so widely spread that it is a little like a very high level of entropy; there is nothing much that one can do about it and it is just too costly to get it back. That is why we have to look increasingly to sand deposits away from the littoral environment.

We have looked at sand deposits on Torrens Island and as far afield as Mount Compass. More work will have to be done to identify sand sources. There are still possibilities in offshore sand reservoirs, though again, if one goes to the very fine grain sand, little is achieved, because it moves up the beach so quickly and, therefore, much more work has to be done in that area.

I would also like to do more in the national parks area in terms of very specific management work relating to particular species. Two types of species are fairly important. One refers to the so-called pest species, or those species that come under the National Parks and Wildlife Act because they are natives and yet are in pest proportions. Obviously, from time to time the primary producing community looks to us for control measures in those areas. One measure has been continuing for a long time, and I refer to the red and grey kangaroos, but do we need to extend that sort of effort? The second area relates to the species that are extremely rare and possibly declining. As a result, further management has to take place.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Given that the Minister emphasised urban consolidation as a priority, it seems strange that the development management line (program 9 at page 37 of the Estimates of Payments and page 35 of the Program Estimates) indicates that there is a reduction of 12 per cent in real terms in the funding, that staffing is down overall from 98.1 to 87.4, and that, in the urban and regional development project management line the staff is reduced from 7.9 to 4.9. Have I read the papers correctly? Have I not picked up something? If I have read them correctly, how is it possible for the Government to embark on what is a very demanding program, with fewer staff and fewer resources?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I think that there are two aspects to this. First, there is the basic planning which one can do with a reasonably small staff and, secondly, there is the more development oriented work, where the staff numbers tend to fluctuate from time to time. In the past 12 months there has been less work in the inner western region. We are not too worried about that, because the inner western region has now built up a fair head of steam, so the reduction in effort is predicated against a fairly high level of

effort in the previous 12 months. It will come again. We have the capacity to move people in and out as we need resources in a program like that. I point to the Northfield development as another example. With our present resources, we would not be able to do a great deal at Northfield, but we will be able to obtain resources, which will be a charge against that project, as the project begins to build up a head of steam.

Perhaps the Director-General may like to comment on the figures and then we might say something about the way that the inner western suburbs program, which has been our major thrust up to date, has progressed.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Before he answers, where do these people go? Is it by attrition? You appear to have lost three people, from 7.9 to 4.9, in the urban and regional development project management. I presume they are full-time employees of the department.

**Dr McPhail:** I will refer to something that the honourable member has already referred to in Parliament, and that is the difficulty in comparing figures in this year's Program Estimates with last year's Program Estimates, based on the very substantial reorganisation that has occurred within the department. Consequently, to simply take the figures at face value would require you to follow through the changes that have been made to other divisional arrangements. A number of staff from the Planning Division were transferred to the new Environment Division to provide the base staffing for that operation. That staff is still there, simply working elsewhere in the department.

Unfortunately, that will flow through a number of the lines that will be examined today. Therefore, it should probably be recognised that what was called the conservation program division last year has now been totally divided up, and its four parts have been placed in other portions of the organisation. That means a considerable difficulty will arise when comparing the figures. We will be only too happy to work through them with you, but to say baldly that there has been a decline of this nature is deemed to suggest it has been a loss from the department. It has not: it has been a transfer of people and function to other parts of the department.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** The function is important, given the Minister's emphasis on the priority for consolidation.

**Dr McPhail:** The function is important, and I will ask Mr Hains to comment in a moment. We will be able to point out that we have actually obtained a specialist staff member to work full-time on the urban consolidation matter as well as adding to the already professional resources that are devoted to it within the division.

**Mr Hains:** The transfer of the staff to the environment division was, as Dr McPhail has already noted, coupled with a transfer of some of the functions. In particular, the major reviews that were previously being done within the development management line on the Murray River, the Adelaide Hills and the Flinders Ranges, were transferred over as activities to the new Environment Division, so the actual impact on staff and programs for the continuing operation of the urban consolidation and other programs within the development management line has not been affected.

In relation to the overall level of staffing for what is now the Planning Division in the department, the amount of staff being allocated to the various lines has not been changed significantly from the previous year except we are trying to use staff more effectively and efficiently. As Dr McPhail has suggested, we have a staff member on secondment at present from the Department of Local Government, work-

ing full-time on consolidation. He will soon be joined by somebody who has been working predominantly in the inner western program who will also be giving some assistance in that area. We are trying to get better use out of the staff across the board.

The inner western program is proceeding very well, although last year it had something of a hiccup by virtue of the low level of land sales that were occurring in the area. As you know, the inner western program is predominantly fed by a budget line that comes from the sale of land, and fewer properties than anticipated were sold last year. The activities were consequently reduced to that figure. We anticipate it will be significantly improved this year and that many very substantial parcels of land will be sold, consequently rejuvenating that program.

**Dr McPhail:** One of the savings in staff was Mr Hains himself who actually constitutes a saving because we now no longer fund the full-time Chairman of the South Australian Planning Commission.

**Mr GROOM:** I place on record my congratulations to the Minister for the competence and skills with which he handles this portfolio. Referring to page 65 of the Program Estimates and the clean air regulations, I receive constant letters from constituents regarding the clean air regulations. Without presuming the final outcome of the regulations, what factors have led to the updating of those regulations and what is intended?

**Mr Stafford:** The update procedures that have been followed relate in the main to concerns that the air quality branch has had with the introduction of the pot belly stove and problems associated with the burning of fuel in those devices. We have also looked at the emission of smoke from diesel powered vehicles. They are the main areas in which we are contemplating some amendment to the regulations. There is still some further coordination to be carried out between our department and the Department of Transport in relation to the emission of smoke from diesel vehicles.

In relation to the problems that we are dealing with concerning pot belly stoves, we are trying to coordinate activities, not only through the regulation mechanism but also working jointly with the Australian Standards Association and the building industry in trying to have pot belly stoves or similar devices complying with guidelines that will at least limit the emission of smoke from those devices.

**Mr GROOM:** Further on that page is the notation:

Completed Sea Surface Temperature analysis of Gulf waters.

What is the rationale behind that? Is it an ongoing program, and what factors come together to require an analysis of the gulf waters to take place?

**Mr Stafford:** The activity referred to is the actual measurement and analysis of sea surface temperature using the NOAH satellite system and the analysis of data received from that to identify what have been recognised as sea surface temperature fronts which tend to form at the entrance of both Gulf St Vincent and Spencer Gulf. The department has been interested in the formation and effect of these fronts because it is believed there is a relationship between the formation of the fronts and the salinity and movement of water into and out of the gulfs. If we are looking at the possibility of some form of marine pollution on a fairly large scale, it is important for us to know what is the draining mechanism of the two gulfs. This is one means by which we can at least start to approach that problem. The project is not ongoing. In fact, the final reports in that area have now been completed and we do not intend to continue activities in that area during the present financial year.

**Mr GROOM:** Referring to the 1988-89 specific targets, it is stated:

Establish an interdepartmental working party with the Highways Department for the purpose of establishing agreed road traffic noise standards for South Australia.

What is intended there?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** There has been a good deal of discussion at ATAC and AEC about this whole question of noise from moving vehicles. It is a very difficult one. If it were easier, it would have already been attended to and recognised in the statutes of the various States. I am sure this is one of the activities that arises out of those reports of those two bodies, but again Mr Stafford might like to comment.

**Mr Stafford:** The major endeavour is to try to minimise the annoyance that results from excessive levels of road traffic noise for people living adjacent to main or arterial roads and even minor roads in the metropolitan area. The Noise Abatement Branch has surveyed extensively in relation to this problem and reports have been produced which show that high numbers of residents living in the metropolitan area are at present exposed to noise levels which in some quarters are deemed to be above guidelines used for similar situations overseas. The implication of the excessive noise levels stems back to the cost of construction of the highways. There needs to be some rationalisation of the annoyance and cost effects involved in this area. We are working with members of the Highways Department on such problems.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I refer to staffing in acknowledging the reorganisation of the department. The staffing variation overall is minimal. I achieved a total of 607.5 full-time equivalents for 1987-88 and 606.5 for 1988-89. That is made up of a 110.1 down to 108.6 for Botanic Gardens; 27.7 down to nothing for heritage conservation; 16.5 for Aboriginal heritage conservation; 39.8 down to 13.6 for conservation policy and program development; 11.2 down to 11 for coastal management; 15.1 down to 15 for State Herbarium; 264.4 up to 273.3 for National Parks and Wildlife; 36.1 down to 30.7 for pollution management; 98.1 down to 87.4 for development management; 5 down to 4 for landscaping and gardens; zero up to 28.4 for native vegetation; and zero up to 18 for State heritage conservation.

The items that interest me are the reduction for pollution management, which seems to be so specialised that it is hard to explain in terms of reorganisation. The Director-General has explained the development management reduction. I would like the native vegetation management explained. The conservation policy and program development has seen a major alteration that I would also like explained.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** One of the pieces of information will be news to me because, in discussing this matter earlier in the week, it was put to me that the figures on pollution management were wrong, so I am eager to find out whether that is the case or whether there is another explanation. We are therefore looking at pollution management and the increase in native vegetation and conservation. I will ask Mr Hill to comment.

**Mr Hill:** On the subject of pollution management staffing comparisons, the implications of the reduction from 36.1 to 30.7 has been affected by 2.5 FTE's with changes in organisational structuring to which the Director-General previously referred. Commonwealth funded projects were involved last year which are not ongoing and our involvement in the lead monitoring program at Port Pirie has been completed in terms of staffing aspects. An additional 1.5 FTE's showed up in last year's numbers but do not reflect

in these numbers. A .5 of an FTE is involved in the Commonwealth funded projects.

**Dr McPhail:** There is only a staff saving requirement of one in that division. The bulk is through internal organisational change and the reduction of our responsibility for the staffing of the Port Pirie lead monitoring program, which is now the responsibility of the Health Commission. We are involved in it on a professional basis, but not responsible for its staffing any longer. The honourable member has given me an entry into a discussion on departmental organisation. The increase under the program entitled 'Heritage and Conservation' is the creation of the new environment division, so the 18 staff relate to that new division. Native vegetation management has become such an important program in the department that it is now listed as a separate program, so the 28 involved represent the staffing of the Native Vegetation Management Branch within the Conservation Land Management Division of the department.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** But the same number of people.

**Dr McPhail:** Yes. Native vegetation remains the area of greatest administrative effort within the department and represents the single largest expenditure for any branch and single largest staffing of any branch within the department. It has been put into the Conservation Land Management Division because it represents very much the off-park effort or non-park land management and conservation effort of the department.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I refer to Aboriginal heritage staffing and National Parks and Wildlife Service staffing in terms of explaining what appear to be major variations in the program estimates. I refer, first, to the National Parks and Wildlife Service staffing. On page 54 of the Program Estimates, we see a dramatic difference in the column arrangements between 1987-88 actual expenditure and 1988-89 proposed expenditure. I acknowledge the overall increase in staffing. What are the reasons for the major alteration? Park management development and protection had 210.4 staff last year. This year it appears to have been divided between 'Resource protection—park management' and 'Visitor management—recreation facilities'. Is it a matter of semantics or a major management initiative?

**Mr Leaver:** It is dividing up a large chunk of expenditure control into specific programs to give a more accurate view on how much has been spent in these areas.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What is the cost of the operation of the Aboriginal Heritage Act and the staffing arrangements? Staffing for the heritage conservation area is down from 11.7 per cent to 8.4 per cent. Then, under aboriginal heritage conservation, it is up from nothing to 15.5. Can the Minister explain that?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We are not expecting that there will be a full year effect of the administration of the Act. There is every chance that the Act will be proclaimed by the end of this calendar year.

**Mr Hill:** In relation to variations at subprogram level, that is the product of the full-time equivalents which were budgeted to the Aboriginal heritage subprogram but, in fact, were debited in the outcome to the program management and conservation policy programs.

In the general logistics of developing this information the time frame under which we operate, and in particular, to get accuracy at this subprogram level, is such that we do not have the opportunity to undertake significant dialogue with the divisions about the way we budget these programs. We reach some conclusions, apply them and, if at the end of the day they, in their judgment, choose to debit those

costs differently, they will be reflected as variations at the subprogram level. As far as I am aware there is no variation to the actual amount of resources applied to the Aboriginal heritage subprogram.

**Dr McPhail:** There has been no change to the level of resources devoted to Aboriginal heritage.

**Ms GAYLER:** One of the key objectives for 1988-89 is the completion of the Mt Lofty Ranges review (Program Estimates page 61). As the Minister would be aware part of my electorate is in the Mt Lofty Ranges. What resources is the department devoting to the review? Will the Minister comment on the press reports this week stating that the Local Government Association is advocating that the State Government withdraw from policy and development control oversight in the Mt Lofty Ranges and vacate the field to the 21 individual councils? My preference would be that the department does not vacate that field.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It would be cloud cuckoo land. As the honourable member has indicated there are 21 local government authorities and with the best will in the world it would be very difficult to get consistency of policy throughout that area with that number of local government authorities. We cooperate very well with local government in these areas. If you are not talking about the hills face zone or the catchment areas then, for the most part, development control is in the hands of local government. However, successive governments have made the judgment that, in relation to those two very large areas which sprawl across local government boundaries, it is reasonable for there to be one set of policies and for there to be one decision maker which, in these two instances, is, of course, the South Australian Planning Commission.

I was a little surprised to read the press reports because I thought it had been regarded as a bipartisan policy that no matter how much we might argue about the specifics—and from time to time argument does arise about specifics—nonetheless the general philosophy of having consistent policies in these areas, with the decision making occurring through the South Australian Planning Commission, should proceed. As the honourable member knows, in most cases consultation does occur. I would not imagine that the outcome of the review is likely to drastically change that. There may be other things that drastically change: it may be that we will want to redefine some of those areas currently regarded as catchment areas; or, there may be areas that are regarded as catchment areas that the E&WS will say can be taken out of that classification because, in fact, they have no desire to build water storage facilities in those areas. That may well be good news to some of the landowners in those areas. There could be many other things coming out of the study.

**Dr McPhail:** The Mt Lofty Ranges strategy review is a very cooperative exercise between Government, local government and community representatives from the Mt Lofty Ranges. It is supervised by a steering committee comprising the heads of various Government departments involved in that area and a representative of local government. The committee is managed by a working group which has on it a member from local government. Therefore, local government is a full partner in the exercise, and all information and policy development processes are open to local government through its representatives and they have participated extremely well.

Separately, of course, like many other bodies, they have prepared their own policy document, which was provided to the Minister yesterday. That represents local government's position on various policy issues and, of course, each department is also preparing its position on policy

issues. However, the main purpose of the Mt Lofty Ranges strategy review is to come up with a cooperative policy framework for management of the Mt Lofty Ranges which would then apply to Government agencies in their day to day operations, to local councils in their operations and to all other users of the Hills. It would be foolish to say that it is an easy process because the Mt Lofty Ranges probably have a classic set of conflicts between a variety of uses and a variety of perceptions as to the value of the Hills to particular people, industries or activities. However, so far it has been an extremely active and cooperative arrangement.

The data collection and information collection process of the review is drawing to a close. It is now entering a stage at which a consultative management plan is being prepared. Officers within the system try to seek words such as 'consultative management plan', or 'draft management plan', because the minute the plan is made public it becomes 'the plan', regardless of how tentative it might be. Therefore, we are trying to put as many tentative titles to it as we can so that when it goes out it is seen as a document. It is anticipated that the plan will go out in February next year. We hope to have a final report completed in June 1989.

Within that framework it has been an extremely cooperative exercise and, as a result, such things as the watershed supplementary development plan and some of these other temporary measures can be turned into final documents which are generally accepted within the Hills community.

**Mr Harris:** In terms of resources, we have a core group of some seven people working virtually full time on the review. They are drawn from agencies such as local government and from within State Government departments such as E&WS, Mines and Energy, Agriculture, Lands and, of course, Environment and Planning itself. The working group is headed by an Executive Manager, Arthur Tideman from the Department of Agriculture. In terms of input of resources from Environment and Planning, we constantly have between two and three people working on the review, although it peaks and is sometimes as high as four or five. The working group itself can sometimes expand to a dozen or so people at any one time, but there is always that core group of six or seven people.

**Ms GAYLER:** Under the same program, 'Conservation policy and program development' another objective for this coming year is to establish a state of environment reporting system. Can the Minister give us some idea of what is intended and whether that reporting will be by way of public reports?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Very briefly, it is at the printers. We expect it to be a public document very soon. This is a policy which we announced at the last State election, and there, was some sort of 'for instance' document prepared very hurriedly which gave people an idea of some of the areas that would be looked at. At the time I used the term 'audit' because it seemed to me that that is what it was: an audit of the condition of the State's environmental resources. We announced that that would come out on a two yearly basis. A good deal of work has gone into it. The supervision of the preparation of the report has been in the hands of the Environment Protection Council to give it that bit of independence from bureaucratic control.

As I say, it will be available fairly shortly. The attempt has been to provide a body of data which can be handled in two ways: at one level it is a body of fairly technical information which can be picked up and used by researchers in the tertiary institutions, and so forth; on the other hand it is also intended to be a set of data which can be interpreted in such a way that the reasonably well informed and

intelligent person in the street can pick it up—that is, a person who does not necessarily have a technical background in some of these areas but who can read it and get some idea as to whether we are going the right way in terms of the control on the environment and, indeed, whether we are telling the truth when we say we are going the right way.

**Ms GAYLER:** I cannot find in the documents any reference to the development of initiatives in wilderness legislation, but I understand that the Minister has given it consideration. Can the Minister advise the Committee what is intended in the next year or so?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Yes. We would see this as part of our national parks effort because, of course, some of these areas which would be regarded as wilderness areas are already within the National Parks and Wildlife system. The problem with wilderness, as I see it, is identifying what one means—what one is talking about. We are trying to grapple with that. A scientist at the university has done some work on a set of parameters which can be used for identifying wilderness quality, and I have discussed with that gentleman the way in which we might be able to use that tool.

He identifies factors such as remoteness and biophysical conditions of the area to which one is referring, and a series of indices can be applied. One could, therefore, give a wilderness rating, if you like, to the middle of the Simpson Desert on the one hand, or the middle of King William Street on the other. Once we have a better handle on that information and my officers have discussed this with him and with the Wilderness Society, we will be in a better position to know whether we should be looking at separate legislation for wilderness areas, which is the way New South Wales has gone, or whether we can use what is already available to us within the National Parks and Wildlife legislation by simply zoning areas which are already under the Act as particular wilderness areas. Those would be areas which are rather more remote from the normal points of human access.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** My questions come under the broad program of 'Development management'. I was interested to read in the *Advertiser* yesterday the concept of a land swap plan to protect the Hills. The Minister will probably not be surprised to know that, since that announcement appeared in the paper yesterday, the phone has run fairly hot with people trying to determine what it is all about, particularly because of some of the comments that were made. Can we have some definition or description of how the scheme is intended to work? It is reported that the Director-General stated that the original parcels could be used for purposes which might be considered more appropriate than at the present time. We probably cannot be specific in this, but I would like to know what the Director-General means by that. He went on to say:

This would prevent developments going ahead in undesirable areas (watershed areas and scrubland) of the Adelaide Hills.

I could be excused for suggesting that the Mount Lofty development might come into this somewhere. It quoted Dr McPhail as stating that the Government believes it would be extremely difficult to take from people existing development rights, and I concur in that. The article continued:

'What we are looking at is transferring these rights to a more appropriate site,' he said.

What we really want to know is what is meant by 'more appropriate site'. The article went on to say:

He emphasised that the proposal of transferring development sites was only being looked at . . .

I am under the impression that that is already happening, although I may be wrong. A particular gentleman has been advertising in the local paper for some time now, suggesting that he is able to carry out or initiate an investigation into such land swaps, so I suggest that is not just being looked at but, in some cases, particularly in relation to the case to which I have referred, it is already happening. What I am looking for is some description of how the plan is intended to work.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am sure that Dr McPhail will be only too happy, as the author of that statement, to comment on it. Of course, the statement was intended to be by way of reassurance to people. What we are looking at here is a possibility that the review may well identify areas which were subdivided at some stage in the past—not necessarily right down to urban style subdivision but of reasonably close subdivision—against certain presumptions about the way in which the environment worked, what is appropriate to be put in the Hills, and what is not. The review comes out and suggests that those sorts of land uses that are fostered by that intensity of subdivision are no longer appropriate. The question then arises as to what the Government does about it. One of the things it can do is do nothing, and that will draw a good deal of criticism from people who would say that these land uses are inappropriate and we must do something.

You could go to the other extreme and do things which are very tough: you could compulsorily acquire land or you could down-zone areas so that people lose at least a component of development rights. The Director-General was trying to point out that we want to avoid those very extreme measures if we possibly can, and there may be some middle way. In any event, I invite him to speak for himself.

**Dr McPhail:** I thank the Minister for so eloquently explaining the position. I feel there is very little that I can add to his explanation. However, let me say that, although I am only vaguely aware of the gentleman to whom you are referring, there is absolutely no relationship between his activities and anything within the Mount Lofty review. What has been discussed within that Mount Lofty review, both of the working group, the steering committee and at the community advisor committee level, is simply the question of what happens to individuals who find, as a result of the review, that their use of land might be in some way constrained. It was considered that there might be value in thinking through, either a land banking approach, which might take in that land and provide more suitable sites elsewhere for those people who might be affected, or using the concept developed in the City of Adelaide, the notion of transferrable floor area, where we are thinking of a transferrable development right. In other words, that part of the value of the land which had been diminished, by the new rules, if new rules came in, would then be available to that individual to use elsewhere in terms of the provision of extra land or even be turned into some monetary form.

All of this is purely discussion within 'the group', it has been advanced by some local government members, and that made it a very important local initiative. It has gone no further than that, and it was one of those things that was simply seized upon as a good point to make in a newspaper by the person reporting it. It is one of a whole range of issues that is being discussed, but one of the underlying themes in our review and one of the major concerns is that, if there are changes as the Minister has said that result in down-zoning or constraints of use, or the like, as a result of policies derived from the review, we have to think of ways in which the rights of the individuals can be compensated.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I do not recall the radio station to which I was listening at the time, but when I was driving down yesterday, one of the radio stations quoted you, Minister, and I would think fairly well out of context. It placed a fair bit of emphasis on the fact that one of the possibilities that could be considered was compulsory acquisition, and gave that a reasonably high profile. I think that is what people are particularly concerned about.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I was certainly interviewed by a large number of journalists, either with camera or tape recorder in hand, and my recollection was that I certainly mentioned compulsory acquisition, but exactly in the context in which I have mentioned it this morning.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** My second question is in two parts, the first of which relates to some media speculation that has been around for some time regarding the possibility of a Japanese consortium establishing a city. This has been considered, I understand, in a number of States, South Australia being one of them. Can the Minister say whether the Government is considering such a proposal; what negotiations are taking place; whether the negotiations have reached a stage where the development proposals are being considered; and whether his department has had any involvement in any of those negotiations?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am happy to ask each of my officers here whether any of them have had any contact with it. I have had very little contact with it at all. For the most part, the work has been done through Minister Arnold's department. My understanding is that what is probably emerging is something rather more like a technology park with a reasonable residential component and certainly not a city. I have never really been able to understand how the journalists could run a story that there was the capacity for a city. At one stage there was a reference to land north of Flinders University. There is Laffers land, of course, which is available, but the land that is available there is for something rather less than what you would call a city or even a suburb. But I, personally, have had virtually no contact with it. I doubt very much whether our offices have much to do with it at all.

**Dr McPhail:** We have had some involvement with it, but the multi function Polis, which has to be one of the uglier names that has been put together, is a proposal from the Japanese Government. I am not sure what the initials stand for, but it is the Minister of International Trade and Industry, which has been promoting this concept. The appropriate Federal department, DITAC is conducting negotiations within Australia in relation to the possible location of this multi function Polis. All the States in Australia are in competition with each other regarding the possible location of this centre.

As the Minister has said, the position of the Commonwealth Government has been very strong. It cannot be a Japanese sort of enclave sitting somewhere in Australia. If it is to develop, it has to be a sort of international technology park with an international population blended into a local community. It was originally considered that Queensland had the front running because of the offers that it was prepared to make to bring it there, but apparently that has changed over recent months and Queensland has become a competitor like the other States for this development.

Within South Australia it has been managed, as the Minister said, through the Department of State Development, and one of Steven's officers is a member or a consultant to that body in relation to the planning aspects of it. But, beyond a contribution to the planning aspects, we do have not have a great deal of input.



**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Is the State Government going out and trying to attract such a venture?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Yes, but I must say that some of the specifics of the details are not known to me.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Committee would be disappointed if I did not raise the matter of Mount Lofty development. Can the Minister say exactly where we are with that ghastly proposal?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The environmental impact statement has been prepared and has gone on public exhibition. As is required under the legislation, the comments from the public which have been brought forward as a result of that public exhibition have been collected together and sent back to the developers, and I think we are awaiting their further response. So the ball is now in their court. They then have to respond to those public comments, and the plan can then be recognised. That means that it was in a form for assessment, so it would then go to the departmental officers for assessment.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Have the proponents indicated when they would like to see the development commence?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I think not. As I said, the ball is very much in their court. The sooner they get back to us with their response to the public comments, the sooner the matter can be assessed. They cannot get any planning approval, of course, until that assessment takes place.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I refer to page 68 of the Program Estimates. In relation to native vegetation management, one of the targets for 1987-88 was the completion of a book entitled *Growing Trees for Farms, Parks and Roadsides*. I understand that is the Jackie Venning book, which has now been published and fairly widely circularised; it has certainly been widely advertised. I note that one of this year's specific targets and objectives is to undertake revegetation trial plantings on selected farms in consultation with the United Farmers and Stockowners. What has been done so far to foster that liaison with the UF&S? I presume that we are only at the dissemination of information and seedling stage, but how successful has the program been?

#### Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr D. Conlon, Manager, Native Vegetation Management Board.

**Mr Conlon:** Jackie Venning has run that part of our program. Some 14 farmers have been identified in the Yorke Peninsula, the Lower North and the Murray Mallee Plains. Discussions have taken place with just over half of them. Jackie has actually visited them and discussed tree planting on their farms. The other half will probably be contacted before Christmas, and that program is working quite well in conjunction with the UF&S.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** There has been no resistance to the idea of replanting and, in general, have the farmers been fairly happy to cooperate in the venture?

**Mr Conlon:** The farmers were quite happy to cooperate. They were identified by the UF&S in consultation with Jackie Venning, so it has been a joint venture.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I refer to relationships with local government authorities, particularly in country areas, and the need to maintain corridors of native vegetation on country roadsides. Has the same degree of liaison been effected with local councils and with the same success? Are there any problems in convincing councils to maintain some of those corridors and, if so, what steps can be taken to draw country local government authorities' attention to the

importance of those corridors to the survival of remnant populations of native animals?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is a very important principle. A Roadside Vegetation Committee has operated since before my time. The success has been a little mixed, but it has certainly been worthwhile.

**Dr McPhail:** Generally speaking, councils have been fairly cooperative about the management of roadside vegetation. The difficulty has arisen when councils have been permitted to clear roadsides for safety purposes or for the prevention of pest plants or pest animals. In some cases, I think it is fair to say that the clearance has been enthusiastic. It has particular problems because, in many cases, it just stirs up the ground and makes it easier for rabbits actually to colonise. It also provides quite a good seed bed for spreading some of the pest plants. Generally speaking, we are developing and getting good cooperation from most councils in relation to the guidelines for roadside vegetation management.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** As a supplementary question, substantial areas of the State are still designated as stock routes. I suspect that the majority of the old stock route network has been leased to adjacent pastoralists. Are any steps taken to have those stock routes annexed by or ceded to adjacent pastoralists or other lessees? Might it not be appropriate to impose various conditions on those transfers, if they do occur, to ensure that native vegetation is retained and that they are not subjected to abuse by over grazing or clearing?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Minister of Lands is probably in a better position to answer that question. She would have the control of the leases and, if my geography is correct, for the most part the stock routes would be in that area that is not subject to native vegetation controls because, although there is subtle land clearance associated with grazing, no actual land clearance occurs in those areas.

**Dr McPhail:** Local government can lease dedicated but unformed roads to adjoining landholders. Local government tends to lease those in two forms: either for agricultural purposes, or for grazing purposes. Those that are leased for agricultural purposes can be cleared and ploughed. As the Minister said, in relation to stock routes, they are the responsibility of the Minister of Lands. I believe that most roads tend to follow the old stock routes, and that is where one finds the 80 chain road dedicated area. It is on those roads that we tend to have some of the most valuable areas of native vegetation.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** My third question relates to policing illegal clearance. When I have flown over some areas of the State, my attention has been drawn to clearance of native vegetation. I have wondered whether or not that was legal clearance and whether or not it was in accordance with any agreement reached between the landowner, authority, and the like. I have no way of knowing whether or not those agreements exist, but on a couple of occasions I have observed practices of clearance that led me to suspect that they may have been illegal clearances. In some areas on Kangaroo Island it appears that every couple of years the landowner clears a strip around the contour of a hill and one gets diminishing reserves of vegetation on the hilltop. On Eyre Peninsula the practice seems to be to create sort of hollow doughnuts of clearance inside quite large portions of native scrub, so that the scrub is hollowed from the inside out towards the edges.

There may be quite valid reasons for clearing in that way but, having seen it from the air, I suspect that the clearance was not entirely legal. Have any prosecutions resulted? Am I correct in my assumption that those practices occur and, if so, are they reasonably common? If they are reasonably

common, why is it not possible to pick up that pattern of clearance from satellite surveillance? Some of the military satellites are reputed to be able to read a headline on a newspaper, so surely it would be possible to pick up 100 acres of illegal clearance. Why do we not use satellite information on a similar basis to the Landsat, which has been in existence for 20 years, and why is it not possible to pick up instances of illegal clearance more quickly than we have been doing?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will ask Mr Conlon to comment on the statistics available about illegal clearing. I am advised that at this stage the resolution that is available to Australians, given the amount of money that the Federal Government is prepared to put into it, is not yet sufficient for us to be able to pick up the sort of things that the honourable member is talking about over a reasonably short space of time. I guess over a ten year period you may be able to pick it up from satellite technology, but you have lost the ball game by then, so to speak. Our reliance has been more on aerial photography. Very early in the piece we assembled a complete aerial photograph of Kangaroo Island, for example, which gave us a very good baseline as to what vegetation was there at a given point in time. The other thing is people from time to time simply ring up and say, 'We think you should have a look at some activity that is occurring at a particular property.' That is the more typical way in which allegations of clearing are drawn to our attention.

**Mr Conlon:** Perhaps I could comment on the way we detect illegal clearance. We rely upon the satellite images and we get a copy of them each 12 months and check them against the previous 12 months and identify what clearance has occurred. From time to time we receive reports of people clearing illegally and, when that occurs, if we get a concentration in an area, we have in fact flown over the areas. We have flown over parts of the Mallee and the West Coast. That is the way our surveillance operates.

The only prosecution that has been successfully mounted was a decision made under the Planning Commission. No prosecutions have resulted under the Native Vegetation Clearance and Management Act, but about a dozen cases are with Crown Law in which we are seeking to take action against people who we believe have cleared illegally.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Referring to page 174 of the Program Estimates, could the Minister provide the broad category of components of capital expenditure for each of the six lines listed there? No doubt there are a number of components, but the three substantial ones are \$2.89 million for flora and fauna and park management; \$2 million for coastal management; and \$5.7 million for development management. Could we have an indication of the main substance of that capital expenditure?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I may defer to my officers for some more detailed advice. In coastal management, we have been given an additional sum of money to be able to do a very intense sand replenishment program at Glenelg North. This is something that came up in the context of the Jubilee Point debate, but the groyne at the Patawolonga has demonstrably interfered with the long shore drift. This can be seen by the very fat beach that occurs to the south of the groyne and the very thin beach to the north of the Patawolonga, and also the recession of the sand dunes that has been occurring at an alarming rate at West Beach. We believe that a very intense amount of activity has to occur there.

Some of it will occur as a result of getting some sand from Henley Beach, immediately south of the River Torrens outlet where there is a sort of groyne action operating as a

result of the dynamic movement of the water. A small amount will be taken from the Largs Bay area, I believe, which has been one of our traditional sources, although we will not be having as much activity there as in the past. A third area escapes me for the moment, but I can provide that information for the honourable member.

We are looking at a three year program for getting more sand on the beach. That will also involve the exploitation of the area identified on Torrens Island, and the possibility of some use of sand from Mount Compass. I believe that some of that has occurred. The coastal management line is very much beefed out by that additional amount of money available for the three year program of sand movement.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I am not even aware of what the \$1.1 million last year would have been spent on. Was that all sand management?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Not entirely. Perhaps Mr Tucker could provide some specific details on how the money was accounted last year. Most of the increase is certainly the sand management that we are now undertaking, but Mr Tucker can provide information on the major components of last year's amount of \$1.184 million.

**Mr Tucker:** In approximate terms, \$400 000 would have been spent on the annual sand replenishment program. An additional amount of about \$270 000 was provided for restoration of areas which were damaged by storm. That sand went mainly to the Brighton/Seacliff area. The remaining amounts went to the normal lines of coastal investigations and other coastal works in country areas.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Under the National Parks and Wildlife Service, there are some land purchases.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I notice a reduction in that line. Could you account for the reduction? I assumed that some of it was capital works. I was not thinking about land acquisition.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There is a reduction in land purchases of about \$250 000. Rather than take up the time of the committee, I will provide to the honourable member the information of the land purchases. The fauna facility at Monarto has largely now been completed, so we do not have to do that again. Some expenditure on communications does not have to be repeated this year, so that is a considerable reduction. There is also a reduction as a result of the completion of the Belair landscaping program. Does the honourable member want an indication of the major development projects that would be accounted under this?

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Yes, involving each of the items, and also an explanation of why there appears to be no capital funds allocated to heritage conservation this year by contrast with last year?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is simply a change in function, through development management.

**Mr Leaver:** It relates to the acquisition of those properties in North Adelaide which were one-off deals.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The honourable member wanted a detailed dissection of the \$2.2 million. Mr Leaver has that information in front of him.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** That could be provided in writing, similarly with the other items, except in respect of development management to which Mr Hains referred earlier. I would appreciate a more detailed explanation, because I was not aware that the sale of land financed development. I would like clarification and elaboration of that.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The difficult part about the development and management line is that for convenience, when dealing with capital, the Treasury people include the inner western suburbs details here, and that fluctuates so

much. That is really why there is always a bit of a problem with that.

**Mr Hains:** Within the capital lines of development and management relating primarily to the planning and development fund in the inner western program, that program draws its income for the redevelopment of the inner western area primarily from the sale of land from the Highways Department that was purchased for the north-south corridor. When the north-south corridor was abandoned, proceeds from the land were used as a fund to generate the redevelopment.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** That money did not go back to the Highways Department or into general revenue, but went straight into the development fund of the department?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is a little more complicated than that. We obtained the approval of the Commonwealth for the money not to go back into the Highways Fund, and the political sound and fury about that is about three years back down the track, if not further. An arrangement was made with the Minister of Transport that a proportion of the funds go back to the Highways fund. I cannot remember the exact figures, but not all of it went into the development fund. A reasonably small proportion goes back to Highways.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** If all these other details can go on notice, that will save time. At page 66, the Program Estimates state that the Planning Division will process 3 800 development applications and 20 supplementary development plans to the first exhibition stage. About 18 months ago in debate on an amendment to the Planning Act, I was critical of delays in the processing of supplementary development plans and development applications. What is the time lag now in relation to supplementary development plans? I understand that one around Bordertown has been in the pipeline for several years, with a high degree of frustration developing. Is the Minister satisfied that the staffing is sufficient to process plans efficiently in terms of time? Are delays caused largely at the local government end through difficulties there, and have the new regulations for definitions made a difference (or is it too soon to tell) to the speed with which plans can be processed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am satisfied that we are reasonably well set up to handle them. There are about 71 in various stages of preparation at present. We are able to handle the traffic. All sorts of reasons exist for delays occurring and sometimes the local government authority—usually the authors of the supplementary development plan—may have its own very good reasons for not wanting to hasten. In recent times, there has been a call from one local government authority dear to the heart of the member for Morphett for the Government not to process an SDP, notwithstanding that it has been around for about five years. In most cases we accede to the request of local government in these matters because it is its plan and in a sense its business, although we have a statutory function to comply with and operate and we are only too happy to do so, which means that from time to time we make amendments to those plans.

**Mr Hains:** The question was really in two parts, one being about processing SDPs and the other about our role in relation to development applications. Since the commencement of the Planning Act, allegations of delays from local government have been a problem with which the department has had to grapple. We regard our processing of SDPs as a matter high on the agenda in terms of our attempt to improve performance. We have for some time been getting on top of the situation. Delays still occur for all sorts of reasons—not always our fault. Often councils

start counting off the days from the day they first appoint a consultant and then say it takes 10 years to get a development plan through, notwithstanding that for six of those years it was being considered by the council, for one year by the department and another three years somewhere else in the system.

Development plans are a complicated area where so many people have a role in them—all our Government agencies, councils, and members of the public. There are statutory processes, and Parliament itself has a role and there are many sources of potential delay in the process. We have had SDPs go through as quickly as six months, while some have taken a long time. We are trying to improve our performance significantly in this area and looking for ways to telescope the process.

The case referred to of Bordertown I can only comment on. I understand that the cause of delay in Bordertown has been predominantly due to concerns about matters of policy and disagreement about them. As to development applications, the changes to the definitions in the regulations will not have a direct effect on any delays occurring in that area. I do not believe that I have heard a suggestion that the processing of development applications by the Planning Commission is a specific cause of delay.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I was not suggesting that it is.

**Mr Hains:** If the honourable member is referring more generally to the system, it is not a commonly expressed problem. The processing of development applications by local government and the Planning Commission is generally honed down to a fine level in terms of statutory periods for public consultation and it has to become involved in the meeting cycles of these various authorities. The prime cause of delay is often a tendency for authorities to defer consideration for further information or some other reason. The Director-General would identify with this because he is very concerned about the tendency towards deferral. We are certainly looking at it in relation to the performance of the Planning Commission to ensure that all possible information is supplied at the very first meeting.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Is it proposed to amend the Planning Act? Is the Minister happy with the way the environmental impact procedures are working under the Act? I refer to the fact that there have been a number of articles written by Mr Chappel which have been very critical of the legislation. In a recent article he stated that the Joint Industrial Committee on Planning in close consultation with its members had clearly identified the problems in the system and concisely set out their unanimous solutions. He continued:

Following subsequent fruitless discussions with officers of the Department of Environment and Planning, that is where the matter rests.

He further states:

The JICOP has clearly identified both the faults and the remedies; if the department is unable or unwilling to act on them, then independent consultants should be engaged to do so.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is intended to amend the Planning Act to implement the recommendations of the review of environmental impact. That will come before members in due course. It is currently being drafted. In fact, I think the basic recommendations have already been made public. I am happy to lay them before the Committee in any event.

It is suggested that there should be an intermediate range of environmental impact assessment, called a 'public environment report', and that many of those propositions which

are subject to full EIS procedure would, in fact, be collapsed into that lower level of environmental assessment with the decision-making being handled by the South Australian Planning Commission. That is the basic thrust of the legislation: to have fewer propositions referred to the full environmental impact assessment process. I am not aware of any other amendments to the planning legislation that are currently being considered. However, all planning legislation seems to demand amendment from time to time. The honourable member will recall the condition of the old Planning and Development Act before he brought in new legislation. It had been amended over and over again, over a long period.

I have a great deal of difficulty coming to grips with Mr Chappel's criticisms because it is not easy to line up what he is saying with what, in fact, is in the Act. In that particular article, for example, he suggests that in some very fundamental way the way in which we treat property rights in the Planning Act is quite different from the way in which they were treated under the Planning and Development Act. No one that I know can explain what the difference is. I am sure the honourable member would back me up in saying that for the most part that very fundamental concept remains unaltered as between the two pieces of legislation.

It is true that quite some time ago I entertained a deputation from the architecture and land development field. They put some matters before me. Most of them were certainly not in a form that we could immediately translate into propositions for amendment of the legislation. They were referred to my officers, and there was further discussion with these people. The fact that nothing really arose out of it (Mr Chappel was perfectly right when he said nothing has come of it) was not as a result of any lack of desire on our part to accommodate the general concerns of these people. The problem was coming to grips with their concerns. Planning development control is not an easy process to understand. The proposition they put before us suggests that it may have been misunderstood.

**Ms GAYLER:** It is clearly important to the development industry and to new home buyers that land supplies be maintained at an appropriate level in order to keep supply up and to moderate price increases. How is the department responding to that need? What steps are in train to ensure that as housing development picks up in this State adequate land supplies are maintained?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This is a problem that we are endeavouring to address as expeditiously as possible. The problem will not be resolved by the Urban Land Trust releasing more land immediately as broad acres for subdivision. That will happen shortly in certain areas. One has to accept that given that that is yet to be released that will have no impact in this financial year. It is more a matter of the capacity of the broad acres which are currently in private hands to be translated into blocks of land.

I have had discussions with the development industry about this issue. We have been urging the development industry to proceed with the subdivision of the areas that they currently have in hand. There has been some response but it is for them to say why the response has not been more vigorous. One of the issues they requested that we check very thoroughly is the response of the instrumentalities. There has been some concern about the performance of the Electricity Trust in the southern suburbs. That concern relates to the purchase of equipment for transformers and purchase of cable. I know that my Director-General is in close contact with ETSA on this matter. A meeting will occur, or has occurred, in order to resolve this problem. We understand that any problems that may be in land titles in

the E&WS are rather more easier to address and are being addressed.

The average price of land is, of course, some sort of indication of what is happening with supply and demand. In the calendar year 1987 the average price for vacant serviced allotments in the Adelaide metropolitan fringe area was \$27 130. In the March quarter of 1988 that price had gone up to \$28 205. For the June quarter that price had, in fact, dropped slightly to \$28 093. However, that decline will not be sustained and, indeed, if there is no acceleration of production, there will be some increase in prices.

The number of vacant allotments used by private building in 1987-88 in Adelaide is estimated to be 3 900, compared with production of 3 444. Therefore, production in that period was falling behind actual use of allotments. Developers stocks fell from 3 518 in June 1987 to 2 875 in June 1988—reflecting what I have just indicated. However, following the recent increase in sales some of this stock is subject to contracts and fewer than 2 000 allotments are currently available for sale.

The level of private dwelling commencements in the Adelaide statistical division in this financial year is about 6 000. That will result in consumption of about 4 550 allotments. Developers say they plan to produce about 5 000 allotments which would be sufficient to maintain the current stock levels. Therefore, our job is to ensure the servicing provisions are there to ensure that that reasonably high level of production of 5 000 allotments will be achieved.

**Ms GAYLER:** Supplementary to that, I would be interested to know the timing of the proposed Northfield development and when it will begin to have an impact on those figures.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Mr Hains can address that.

**Mr Hains:** The structure planning for Northfield has already commenced. Stage 1, which is a broad outline of the servicing of the area of Northfield, has been completed, and the structure planning through a consultancy should be completed by the end of this calendar year. At that time, decisions will need to be made relating to the mechanism for land release, but we hope to achieve the disposal of the first lots of land in 1989.

**Ms GAYLER:** Does the Minister have available information on the land bank of the Urban Land Trust? Does it include land in the existing urban area in addition to fringe land, and is the trust yet making a financial contribution to the State budget?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There are two forms of contribution which the Urban Land Trust has made. One is that its financial arrangements for the most part are handled by the South Australian Financing Authority (SAFA) so, given that SAFA makes a considerable subvention now to the State budget, there is an element of subsidy there. In addition, the Urban Land Trust has been purchasing considerable broad acres from the Housing Trust, ahead of its need, so that the Housing Trust has more cash to put into its provision of homes for low income earners.

These have been the major ways in which some sort of dividend has been paid indirectly to the South Australian taxpayer through the Urban Land Trust. We must keep in mind that we cannot treat the trust as a milch cow: it will continue to have a very important role to play in the purchase and holding of broad acres and, for that reason, needs considerable reserves. I am not aware of any land holdings of the Urban Land Trust other than on what would broadly be termed the fringe. All its holdings at Hallett Cove have long since been disposed of. They were the last of the areas that they subdivided under the old Land Commission arrangements. It holds considerable land at Seaford.

I am not aware whether there is any land left at Woodcroft. There is certainly open land there, but it is mostly in private ownership.

The Urban Land Trust only ever held 40 per cent of Woodcroft anyway as broad acres, and the rest was in private hands. It has considerable land at Munno Para and at Salisbury East, and those are the areas to which I was referring when I said earlier that some of this land would be made available in the very near future, probably on the superlot principle, to help the lot production equation, not in this financial year but in the one to come. There remains the question of the development of Seaford, and I do not anticipate any necessity to release any of that land within the next 12 months.

**Ms GAYLER:** In relation to the Golden Grove joint venture development, I am advised that the partners have been able to cut the holding costs and time delay between production of allotments, settlement on those allotments with individual purchasers, and the construction of houses on that land, with an overall financial benefit to the purchasers. Is the Minister prepared to have his department look at the ways in which that has been achieved to determine whether it is also applicable in other areas?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Indeed. Does someone want to comment?

**Mr Hains:** We are happy to look at it.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** My next questions relate to national parks. Acknowledging the staffing allocation for this year and the proposals for some acquisition—although, I take it, not very substantial acquisition—there seems to be a general view, which I am inclined to share although I have not by any means seen all the national parks, that, given the size of the park areas of the State and the nature of some of them, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for South Australia ever to achieve the kind of staffing which would ensure really good management of such large areas.

The resources required are so vast, given the area of land. For example, in places like Danggali, which presumably is being managed almost by remote control but which was once a substantial sheep station, what do you envisage as the long-term prospects for management of these very large areas, given the likelihood of continuing financial constraints at least in the immediate future, and the fact that we are just not coping with noxious weed, vermin control and general land management in an ideal way?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Of course Danggali has not been ignored. At Danggali there has been an establishment for most of the time that it has been under the system. When I was there, a considerable fencing project was taking place around the park. Given the size of the park, that is a very considerable project, and I guess that that is the point the honourable member is making. I have always maintained that, after all, the really urgent management problems relate to parks with a high level of visitation. That is the more important aspect, rather than the area of the park. If the honourable member wants to take Danggali as an example, I will be happy to defer to Mr Leaver to talk about that, either specifically or generally.

**Mr Leaver:** It is a challenge. Many of these areas are vast and remote in hectares, but they are also fairly remote in geographical circumstances. Most of the large parks in the State are ex Crown land, and never at any stage in European history did they receive any high level of management, even before they became parks. That is not to say that some of these remote parks do not have pressing management needs, particularly in the State's North East, where the levels of tourist numbers in those parks and the problems associated with noxious animals are major problems.

We have tried to tackle it in a number of ways and, with the Government's approval, have implemented a number of user pays options. We are looking at further user pays options for those remote parks where the visitor will be asked to contribute to the management of the areas. Those funds, through an agreement with Treasury, will be directed back to the area from which they are collected. The area for which that possibly has the most relevance in the near future is the Cooper Creek/Coongie Lakes area which is already receiving about 30 000 visitors a year, almost all of whom are from interstate. At the moment, they are making no contribution at all to the management pressures that they are creating.

So, it is hoped, at least in that circumstance, to extend the user pays principle to enable those areas to be at least basically managed in terms of visitor facilities, rubbish collection, and so on. It really depends on the park in question as to what suite of opportunities one can use to bring management pressure to bear.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** The Director has led into the next question that I was about to ask. Referring to page 27 of the estimates of receipts, it appears that the actual receipts for last year were significantly down on the Estimated Receipts and I would like an explanation of that variation. It appears that the estimated receipts, for the current year in terms of admission charges (and I assume that that covers national parks) are still further down on the actual for last year. Some publicity has been given to the effect of charges on visitation to Belair. Can the Minister say what the effect has been in all circumstances where charges have been made and why there appears to be such a significant downturn in estimated receipts, particularly when the Director has just indicated that the Government is placing some value on the likelihood of revenue from this area to assist in the management of the parks.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I have some figures which I will ask Mr Leaver to interpret to the Committee.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Could Mr Leaver refer particularly to the fact that an estimated receipt in that last year of \$549 000 turned into an actual of \$362 000, which this year is an anticipated \$237 000?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is precisely the point we are addressing.

**Mr Leaver:** We put a proposition to the Treasury that we would take on the management of certain key areas almost as an independent business arrangement, rather than the traditional arrangement whereby funds were allocated for the running of those places. In particular, I refer to the Cleland Wildlife Zone within the Cleland Conservation Park and to the caves of the South-East. We put the proposition that, if they reduced our allocations by the amount of revenue they were getting from the area, so that the net effect to the Consolidated Account was zero, that we would then manage those areas separate from the normal budgetary processes as business arrangements.

That was agreed to and those areas are now managed under those business arrangements through proper business plans. That resulted in a drop of some \$186 000 to the Consolidated Account in terms of revenue but that was matched by a commensurate drop in allocation to the department. That is probably the main reason why both there and at Naracoorte a shortfall of receipts is shown: because those receipts no longer go into the Consolidated Account. They show in the General Reserves Trust.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Under 'General Reserves Trust' that should be shown as a commensurate figure.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I do not recall seeing anything.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Can we look for that, while you go on with another question?

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** In yesterday's Budget Estimates Committee for the Tourism budget, I noted under the aims and objectives of the Tourism Department that an assessment of development opportunities in national parks was one of the agency's objects. At the recent seminar organised by the Environmental Protection Council, a developer, in addressing the seminar, said that there were limited numbers of development opportunities. He obviously meant major private enterprise development opportunities in South Australia's parks. However, what the Director has just said, what Tourism South Australia is doing and what I hear from various sources within various parks about the Government's proposals for restaurants and other developments causes me to wonder just how far the Government intends to go.

Can the Minister say what parks are being assessed in addition to those which are already having development opportunities either implemented or planned; what is the extent of the proposals; whether the Government's development policy embraces something like a new restaurant at Morialta, for example; or does it extend to turning the Chowilla station into some kind of a visitor attraction? Can the Minister give a broad response covering the major and minor factors?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am happy to. First of all, that developer is right. Developments on the Flinders Range scale are very limited. At this stage we are looking at three that are somewhere in that ball park. One is, of course, the land adjacent to Wilpena, which we specially purchased to add to that park; the second is on Flinders Chase, Kangaroo Island; and the third, of course, is the member for Heysen's favourite project up there near Mount Lofty. We had a look at Innes as a possibility, and put it out for the reaction of the development industry. However, there were no takers, which was some sort of indication of the possibilities there. Personally, if we are talking about that scale of development, I cannot see other opportunities around the State. They may arise, but I really cannot see them.

At a lower level of course, if it involves a small restaurant here or there, I guess there are some possibilities, we may want to look at something like the honourable member has just indicated to me. There must be two constraints on anything that we do, the first of which is the environmental acceptability of what one is trying to do. The second is whether it can sustain itself—whether it can make a quid. Unless it meets both of those two criteria, quite clearly one really cannot take it any further. Again, Mr Leaver has just indicated to us that we are looking at the possibility of generating some revenue from the reasonably high level of visitation to the arid North East of the State, but I certainly would not see that in terms of a five star motel or anything like that. He may like to comment.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** That is just admission?

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

**Mr Leaver:** The Minister of Tourism was talking about what we are calling the tourism development strategy for the North-East. We have a suite of very large parks up there that are used in a broad variety of ways, ranging from Dalhousie, mount springs, right through to the Cooper Creek, Coongie Lakes and including the Simpson Desert, Lake Eyre, and so on. Those areas are becoming tremendously attractive to visitors to this State. It seems to us to make a lot of sense to be able to try to anticipate what sort of demand will be placed on this area in terms of visitor facilities, and in this respect I am talking about the whole suite of visitor facilities, from basic access information right

through to perhaps more formal camping arrangements. It seems to us to make sense to assess this, to look at what the market is doing at the moment and what it is doing elsewhere in Australia, and to come to some sort of strategic plan for those areas so at least we can get in front of the sort of pressures that are being put on the areas and at the same time provide an interesting and productive experience for our park visitors.

This is the sort of study that we are looking at with the Department of Tourism, and it would be very premature even to suggest that the end result of that is a large scale tourist development. That is certainly not the way we are going about it. We are trying to assess what the visitor use patterns and the needs are, and hopefully come up with some sort of strategic plan to come up with some suite of facilities. I think we would be looking in the same context at the Nullarbor area, again looking at visitor use patterns, projected visitor use patterns and the type of facilities that the visitors would need to help them to enjoy their visits to these areas. But, in terms of formal facilities, that is not even contemplated at this stage.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Without wanting to interrupt flow of questioning, if the member for Coles would like to indicate when she wants the answer to the question on General Reserves Trust, I can say that it is now available.

**Mr Hill:** As the Director of National Parks indicated, the page 27 reference is about receipts flowing into the Consolidated Account. Because of the arrangements that have been struck (park admission fees and the like do not flow that way), the PBD estimates indicate the receipts that are applied to programs.

The items to which the honourable member referred are under recurrent receipts, which show an increase from \$2.6 million, to \$3.1 million, to \$3.3 million. In fact, during the previous year the total income to the general reserves trust was \$655 000, and this year it is budgeted to be \$1.213 million. When one takes into account the issues which make up the total dollars of recurrent receipts, there are some offsetting influences but, in the year just completed, the income to the general reserves trust was \$500 000 above expectation, which is the major influence on why the recurrent receipts are \$500 000 above budget. They are anticipated to increase by another \$450 000 in the ensuing year and that is part of the reason why those recurrent receipts are \$200 000 higher than in the previous year.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I now turn to the State Heritage Conservation Program. In the specific targets for this year mention is made of the liaison being established between local councils and the South Australian Heritage Committee in determining what should be entered on the register. I am aware that the question of who pays for what and who has what powers over various things is still very much open to negotiation in the area of local conservation, but what progress is being made towards formulating a fairly watertight system whereby local authorities, specifically local councils, can nominate local buildings, put them on a register and then be guaranteed that they will be relatively sacrosanct from development? When councils have attempted to do this, they have often been defeated by the planning process and it rather makes a mockery of the idea of a local register. It must be given some legislative clout. How far have those negotiations proceeded and what is the future of the local registers?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** For the State register, a council can nominate any particular area or item, as can any individual, but that is assessed by my officers, and the recommendations come through the State Heritage Committee. In relation to the development of local lists, the problem

with which we have had to grapple is that, if the same mechanism operates, you are really only providing a formula for a much longer State heritage list. If the mechanism is the same, in a sense it is irrelevant as to whether it is on a State or local list, because it is still protected in the same way.

A system is being developed whereby it will be possible for supplementary development plans to be drawn up so that a local government authority can identify items or areas that are regarded as sensitive, but the level of protection that will be available will not quite come up to the level of protection that is available for State heritage items under the Planning Act. Demolition could not take place until planning approval had been given for the replacement item, so that provides an opportunity for the local council to insist (if it wants to allow it to proceed) that the replacement item generally harmonises with the streetscape of that area.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** That would stop the age-old tactic of knocking the building down on a Sunday and then applying to erect something in its place.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Yes, which might be totally at odds with the streetscape. However, the council would have great difficulty in resisting that new development, because the zoning may be perfectly appropriate for the development and the heritage status of the old building no longer applies, because an old building no longer exists.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** As a supplementary question, would the fact that such a building is on the heritage list provide the council with adequate grounds for refusing permission to demolish?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is as we would see it.

#### Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr J. Womersley, Manager, State Heritage Branch.

**Mr Womersley:** At present, if something is listed on the register, the property is subject to control in relation to demolition and alterations to it. The council can refuse any action at all on the grounds that it is a heritage building. Under the new circumstances, the council would have the authority to refuse the demolition.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I now refer to buildings in private hands and the issue of tax incentives. I understand from the figures presented in the forward planning for 1988-89 that the State Government will continue to pursue the implementation of some form of Federal tax incentives. In view of the fact that this has been on the agenda for some time, is it possible to give the argument additional mettle by moving towards some form of rebate on State charges; for example, placing a deliberately lower evaluation on the building in order to lower council and E&WS rates? Could the State and local authorities contribute their own tax incentives rather than just depending on the Federal Government to introduce tax incentives?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We do that already.

**Mr Womersley:** The State Government has already amended the Valuation of Land Act to provide that, where a building is listed as a heritage item, it is subject to valuation at its present use rather than at its highest and best potential use, which is usually the case and, therefore, in some cases (and I hasten to add not in all cases) it makes a substantial difference to the value placed on the property. As a result, benefits flow to the owner from the reduction in valuation.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Apparently the Bill was passed in 1985.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** My third question relates to the issues of gazetting, conserving, preserving and policing the historic

shipwrecks around the various parts of the coast. A good deal of the State Heritage Conservation Program is devoted to discussing shipwrecks, so obviously it is an issue which is of considerable concern to the department. What steps will be taken: first, to gazette wrecks that are presently ungazetted; and, secondly, to provide some method of policing those wrecks to stop scuba divers from harvesting what they can before adequate conservation strategies are put in place to preserve and conserve these wrecks?

**Mr Womersley:** This year the department proposes to put forward for gazettal at least another 20 shipwrecks which have been nominated and inspected for protection under the Historic Shipwrecks Act. There are two Acts, one from the State and one from the Commonwealth, that parallel each other and, basically, they operate on the same lines. Most of the shipwrecks that have been inspected are in State waters around Wardang Island. By and large, the scuba divers are not the people who damage these wrecks. We have had a very successful program to persuade scuba divers to do the right thing.

We have had one occasion in the past 12 months where divers came from Victoria and interfered with a wreck in Commonwealth waters. We were able to protect that very quickly and stop that exercise. In most cases it is fishermen who have been doing most damage to the wrecks protected so far. We regularly police the wrecks with an inspection program, and a number of prosecutions have been made over the past few years. They just anchor on it and, as a result, the anchor damages the planking and so on of the wrecked vessel on the bottom of the ocean. Wrecks are good fishing sites.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Referring to page 99 of the Auditor-General's Report, still referring to development proposals in national parks, it is stated that leasing arrangements (for the Wilpena project) are yet to be finalised. I appreciate that it is a commercial negotiation and, therefore, the Minister would be somewhat constrained in giving details. However, perhaps the Minister can say to what extent he would hope and expect that the leasing charges annually would cover the recurrent and capital costs of developing the park in accordance with the new management plan? I say that on the basis that independently several people from the tourism industry and general conservation movement in the Flinders region have suggested that the capital costs associated with that management plan could be as high as \$15 million to \$20 million. What capital costs would result from the implementation of the management plan, and how does the Government intend to recoup those costs through the leasing fees?

**Mr Leaver:** The leasing provisions are under commercial discussion. Nevertheless, it is reasonably safe to say that the cost to Government for any development associated with the lease will be zero. In fact, the lease will require a number of actions by the leaseholder to cover circumstances that are now costing the Government a great deal of money, mainly things such as water, sewerage and power. These will be a cost to the development, as will other things such as public facility services, toilets, barbecue areas, walking tracks, and so on. The developer will not be paying for the proposed education park headquarters in the existing chalet precincts. We will be picking up that cost.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I would have thought that it would go nowhere near \$15 million because the building is already there. Maybe some refurbishment of the building is required for it to be an education centre rather than accommodation. The basic structure is there.

**Mr Leaver:** That is right. There will not be any accommodation up there. That is being catered for within the

existing development for school groups and so on. The big capital cost will be in the greater park area. Any figure could be added to that. If it was decided that all roads should be tarred at \$150 000 at least per kilometre, you could very quickly run up a figure of tens of millions of dollars. However, if you accept safe but low standard gravel roads, then the figure is significantly less.

The most urgent works program required and for which we would use rental money would be, I guess, the clearing of the backlog (many years of work would be required) to bring the area under some sort of stability with respect to visitor use. In particular, things such as walking trails within the Pound area, proper car parking in the Pound precincts, and probably some work on historic sites in the Pound area. Those would be the urgent works. A bit further down the track, we would probably look at trying to improve the stability and visitor facilities in the Brachina Gorge and Bunyerroo Gorge area. It is hard to put a figure on the total capital amount because you could pick almost any figure for the standard that you want.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Something has to be done. A management plan has to be implemented. The Government has to make decisions about the level and standard of finishes that will be used, whether it is a restoration project, walking trails or roads. If the Government is negotiating for a lease that will ensure no cost to the Government in terms of its annual expenditure on these items, the service must have some kind of idea of the standard and, therefore, the cost. What would be in today's terms—and presumably it will be mortised over 10 to 15 years—the total of the capital items in the management plan covering all those factors that the Minister and the Director outlined?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Some of the things that Mr Leaver has referred to are not specifically outlined in the management plan. I do not think the plan goes as far as to say that the roads have to be bitumenised, for example.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I do not think any one of us would want to see that happen.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I do not think we would be anticipating that.

**Mr Leaver:** I would have to take the question on notice and try to derive a sensible works program based on level of use and needs. With these things, you could almost project any works program that would be seen as necessary, but what is required as a minimum is another question. We would be after rental in terms of several hundreds of thousands of dollars per annum on today's prices. We would be expecting that whatever we get would be sufficient, not only to provide a works program that resulted in a progressive improvement of the quality of the park—not stability but improvement—but as well, an ability to provide visitor facilities, services and seasonal ranger programs, educational programs, and so on from those moneys that would be a significant improvement over what is there. As park managers, we would be looking for a significant improvement and we would be strongly pressing that case in rental negotiations.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I am puzzled! If one goes into negotiations, one has to know what one wants and what it will cost in order to recoup. I will let it pass at this stage. The Government is presumably in a bargaining position, and the questions can be resumed when that is completed.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There is the matter of the timing of recommendations of the management plan. You do not necessarily assume that it will all be done in year 1.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I would not think that for a minute. While still on page 99 of the Auditor-General's

Report, in respect of Martindale Hall, the Auditor-General states:

The account is also to be credited with amounts determined under a licence agreement relating to financial results of business operations (tours, meals, accommodation, etc.) conducted at the hall. As at the date of this report these amounts had not been determined for the past two financial years.

That seems to be an unsatisfactory situation. Can the Minister explain how it arose, and what the department is doing about it?

**Mr Womersley:** The situation is that the lessees' accountants have, in the past three weeks, presented the reports of the accounting. There was some difficulty between the accountants and their clients in gathering together all of the facts. The department now has the report, and in the next month will make a settlement with the present lessees of Martindale Hall. That will be credited to the account for that fund.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Referring to page 61 of the Program Estimates and the 1988-89 targets and objectives, I highlight the following:

Reassess approaches to State Conservation Strategy. Prepare position paper on Environmental Goals for the year 2 000. Prepare discussion paper on Integrated Land Management.

I see these as all being linked together. What is the position with each of those goals? Are the papers to be completed in the current financial year? Is the Minister able to say whether the discussion paper on integrated land management is likely to involve any rearrangement of Government administrative arrangements presently in place for land management in South Australia.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is a little difficult to answer the last question because at this stage I do not know what exactly will be the scope of the amendments to the Soil Conservation Act. There has been a little bit of excitement around the conservation circuit about some changes of responsibility between the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Lands and the Minister for Environment and Planning. I would not anticipate that it is likely to go very far but, without knowing the exact extent or scope of the soil conservation legislation, it is a little difficult to comment. On the other aspects of detail, Mr Colin Harris may like to comment. The reassessment of approach to the State conservation strategy awaits our consideration of the report, which is currently at the printer. Once we see the results of the audit of the first two years of survey, we may have a better idea of where we are going.

**Mr Harris:** There has been debate for some time about the desirability or otherwise of preparing a State conservation strategy. In the wake of the adoption of the national conservation strategy, a number of mainland States in Australia have decided to prepare State strategies. So far we have not proceeded to that stage and one of the reasons is that which the Minister has just given. We have introduced the state of environment reporting system which we feel may in many respects cover the same sort of ground that a State conservation strategy would otherwise cover. We are, in effect, keeping our options open until the first major report is released and available for community response and reaction.

The proposal to prepare a position paper on environmental goals for the year 2000 is a very new proposal not previously canvassed. We are not very far away from the year 2000 and it may well provide some benchmark to fundamentally reassess where we are going in terms of strategies and environmental protection policies. At this stage it is nothing more than indicated; it is a proposal to prepare a position paper.



**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Page 61 refers to the Murray Valley management review draft management plan being completed and placed on public exhibition last year. What is the timetable for implementation?

**Mr Harris:** The draft management plan has been on public review for some months. About 250 public submissions were received and we are in the process of analysing them. We will modify the draft plan in light of the comments received, and the proposal is to put a final report to the Minister in about November this year.

**Ms GAYLER:** I refer to page 61 where one of the key objectives stated for the coming financial year is the implementation of a trial section for the River Torrens interpretative plan. What is intended, where is that trial stretch of the River Torrens, and does it relate also to visitor use of the O-Bahn if in that vicinity?

**Mr Harris:** The trial section will be not in the O-Bahn area but in the western area. It will be around Lockleys/Fulham in the area of the old reed beds. A number of people have expressed interest in the interpretation of the River Torrens. It is a major cultural natural asset which needs better presentation to the public, particularly schools. Much local interest has been shown from schools in learning more of the river and its natural and cultural history. One of the officers, Ray Harrison, has prepared a detailed proposal for interpretative developments along the river. We are proposing a trial run of the proposals in the area I have just detailed.

**Ms GAYLER:** The area near the O-Bahn could be trialed, too. Page 65 refers to a proposal for 1988-89 as follows:

Commence survey of volatile organic compounds in the Adelaide airshed.

What is the problem and what will the survey achieve?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will take the question on notice.

**Ms GAYLER:** I refer also to page 66 where it proposes further work by the retail task force, which looked at retail developments in metropolitan Adelaide. What were the broad findings of the task force? Is there an over supply of shops and/or shopping centres in parts of metropolitan Adelaide? What did the task force recommend?

**Mr Hains:** The report of the retail task force is a public document and I am happy to obtain a copy for the honourable member. The document has been out for public comment for the last several months and a number of submissions have been received. This is the task mentioned in the program description, and work is to be done in assessing those responses against the recommendations. To answer the honourable member's specific questions, the task force did not find an over-supply of retail floor space in Adelaide, nor did it comment on that question at all. The commentary largely concerned questions of how to handle the proliferation of small scale shops along major roads and out of zones, which was a matter of some concern to planners, industry and to major shopping chains.

It also addressed questions relating to the handling of bulky goods retailing—the sort of retailing that commences in an industrial area but turns into a form of shopping, as has occurred in a number of parts of Adelaide. They were of concern as they were looking towards breaking down the stated Government policies in relation to hierarchy of retail centres. It set up suggestions for further work by the Government and it is that on which submissions have been received.

**Ms GAYLER:** Did the task force examine any information from overseas, particularly the United States, where I understand the market seems to be moving away from super centres?

**Mr Hains:** I was not a member of that task force and to my knowledge it did not examine overseas trends. The point the honourable member has made is a good one, that there are large and dramatic changes occurring in the retail industry, and that we need to make sure the State policy is not so rigid that it cannot accommodate those changes. Indeed, it should respond to changes in retail technology. That matter is still being examined by the department, and we will certainly be considering that sort of issue before we put a recommendation to the Minister.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I think we will see some of those changes in the Remm development.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I note that last year a thatching workshop was conducted by the department. Does the department do much of this sort of thing? Did it charge for instruction, and why was it done? With regard to the publication of the first of four conservation practice notes, which seems to be a more substantial project, what is the explanation?

**Mr Womersley:** The thatching workshop relates to a property called Clayton Farm that the department owns near Bordertown. The farm was owned by the Weasy family from 1870 and it has one of the most intact collections of crude timber buildings with thatched roofs in South Australia. In fact, they are increasingly rare throughout Australia. It was necessary to rethatch these buildings. However, we found that nobody knew how to thatch. Therefore, we gathered together some elderly gentlemen and—

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What did it cost?

**Mr Womersley:** It didn't cost anything. The heritage conservation practice notes are in production at the moment and will be released soon.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What purpose will they serve?

**Mr Womersley:** To better inform the public about the practice of conservation, particularly relating to buildings.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** When will the Government be introducing legislation to give effect to the Government's intention in relation to local government heritage demolition contracts? As I recall, it is a good two years since the discussion paper was released.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Legislation will be introduced later in this session.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What is the broad direction of the draft management strategy for recreation vehicle management control? I take it that legislation will be required: if so, when does the Government propose to introduce it?

**Mr Harris:** The strategy has two main components. The first component is what might be termed a tidying up of various minor legislative matters, mainly relating to registration and insurance. The second component of the strategy relates to the setting aside of specific areas for off-road vehicle activities.

The responsibility for this strategy was transferred to the Department of Recreation and Sport last year. Progress has been slower than had been hoped for for a number of good reasons. The whole matter is currently being reassessed, and there is some thought that responsibility may come back to the Department of Environment and Planning for final implementation. Discussions between the two departments are being carried out at the moment.

**Dr McPhail:** The changes in relation to the demolition control are changes to regulations under the Planning Act. Those changes will be made when we have final agreement with local government on the matter.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** When will that occur?

**Dr McPhail:** This year.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** The Minister and his officers would no doubt have read the article on the first page of the *Weekend Australian* about three weeks ago which identified the extent of desertification in Australia. In the opinion of the department what percentage of South Australia is in the process of desertification? Acknowledging the Soil Conservation Act, what broadly does the Government propose to do about the problem?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We have been most involved in the area of desertification which is associated with salinisation, particularly along the Murray River and in the Murraylands area.

**Mr Harris:** We can provide those detailed statistics for the honourable member. We have quite a detailed breakdown of various areas, for example, a pastoral country requiring active rehabilitation work, areas in the marginal lands, and so on. That information can be made available.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Relating desertification to the greenhouse effect, I realise that the Minister for State Development is establishing a council to examine the broader issues, one of which will be, presumably, a change in demand for commodities, for example, a lower demand for wool product and an increase in demand for cotton products. What discussion is the Government having with the pastoral industry with respect to desertification and the use of arid lands for pastoral purposes?

**Mr Harris:** The forecasting of likely effects from the greenhouse phenomenon is fraught with difficulty. Some of the best predictions suggest that the northern boundary of our marginal agricultural lands might well shift even farther south. On the other hand, there may be an increase in summer rainfall in the pastoral country, and the implications of that are only starting to be grappled with. That may mean a change in species composition, for example, whether summer growing grasses will be favoured in the areas where we have winter growing species at the moment with a winter peak in rainfall.

The department is looking closely at this in the context of the greenhouse phenomenon but it is still early days. The data is difficult. It is still too early to speak with any confidence, but we are looking at all that very closely. Papers will be given, for example, on this very matter at the forthcoming Greenhouse 88 conference.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I want to address the program of pollution management. I note that consideration was given last year to investigating the presence of various environmental pollutants such as tributyl tin, which is an anti-foulant. I note that in the current year there is a determination to establish a data base for chemical species and the reported impact on marine biota. How far has that data base gone? Is tributyl tin part of it and is it part of a national data base which can be used? Which hazardous chemicals are the major offenders in that whole area of pollution of, presumably, the near shore areas and hatchery areas for most of our commercial fish and crustacea?

**Mr Stafford:** The data base as such has progressed very well, even at this early stage of the current financial year. The construction of the data base has run pretty much along the lines that we are looking to obtain information within the data base that relates to both organic and inorganic compounds—various marine organisms and pesticides—which may be found within the marine environment. There is information in the data base on tributyl tin along with most of the heavy metal compounds that are normally found in the marine environment, particularly those which emanate from any of the point source marine pollution discharge within our own State.

That contains information on arsenic, lead, tin, zinc, copper, and so on. We would like, as development of the data base progresses, to try to broaden the user base of that data base. By that, I mean that we would like to introduce it into the educational environment and make that data base available to people who wish to use it within the educational arena, get some assistance from our internal people on community information, and make access to that data base generally available to the public. It covers all the areas raised by the honourable member.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** And the national data base?

**Mr Stafford:** There is no link to a national data base as such from that unit, but we have access to national data bases through the department's library facilities.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I take it that there is no intention to establish a national data base.

**Mr Stafford:** In the marine area, no. The information we have is true for any marine environment, be it in South Australia or elsewhere.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** The local concentrations, and so forth, might vary a bit.

**Mr Stafford:** Certainly, but the effect of the element within the marine environment will remain very much the same. From that point, it is applicable nationally, and we would certainly look at making it available to other marine authorities throughout Australia once was is completed.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I now wish to address the not unrelated topic of the disposal of chemically persistent substances such as PCBs. There has been talk for a number of years about the need to establish a high temperature incineration facility somewhere onshore in Australia to obviate the risks of carrying chemicals and loading them onto the *Vulcanus* to be incinerated somewhere in the South Pacific. That clearly arouses international protests and is undesirable for a whole range of reasons. I understand that the problem has been addressed for the past several years by AEC ConCom. What is the current state of play on that? I am aware that the Northern Territory Government put up a bid for Tennant Creek at one point, although that seems to have fallen by the wayside. There was also a suggestion that the facility could have been located roughly midway between Sydney and Melbourne, as they are major sources of long-lived chemical pollutants.

I think that Yass was one of the places suggested, although it has been suggested that Canberra might be more appropriate. Have any trial burns been done using existing high temperature furnaces in South Australia such as, for example, BHP Whyalla, where temperatures of the order required to break down PCBs and the like can be generated, and how far has the argument progressed on where the centralised facility should be located?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will respond to the question about AEC. This matter has been discussed for some years, and the reason why little progress has been made is, perhaps, obvious: everyone believes that there should be such a thing as long as it is not in their back yard. There have been one or two exceptions to that. As the honourable member indicates, some interest was shown from the Northern Territory. The Western Australian Government at one stage was seriously proposing that something in the Kalgoorlie-Coolgardie area might be put together.

There was also a proposition at one stage for the Broken Hill area. The problem with all these areas is that, while their remoteness perhaps makes them politically acceptable, the cost of transport is somewhat prohibitive. The honourable member is correct: it really needs to be somewhere on the eastern seaboard, if only because that is where most of those substances are located. Therefore, one minimises the

cost attendant upon transporting them from where they are currently stored to where they will eventually be disposed of.

Recently, a ministerial subcommittee was formed involving the Commonwealth and, as I recall, Victoria and New South Wales, to make a further report on the matter to the next meeting of the AEC and to all Governments in the interim if something solid emerged. As to the matter of any trial burns or other specific information arising out of this, I will ask the Director-General to comment.

**Dr McPhail:** We know of none that has taken place in South Australia. The debates on which the Minister has reported at AEC, in particular, have related to hazardous chemicals such as PCBs, organochlorins and also the low-level nuclear waste from hospital services, and so on. I understand that the Western Australian Government is persisting with the development of its furnace and disposal site, but they have made it abundantly clear that they will not accept waste from any other State. The other problem is that, with the very rapid phasing out of organochlorins, it is becoming dubious whether it would be possible to have a facility in Australia which would have an economic operation.

The only other way in which that could be economic would be to import waste from South-East Asia which, of course, has a whole range of other problems associated with it. So, at this stage it seems that the possibility of such a national facility in Australia will be very much in the hands of the ministerial subcommittee, and that is the very level at which it is being discussed, because of its sensitivity.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There is an interesting proposition to incorporate organochlorins in concrete—its own form of encapsulation, similar to what has been suggested with the synrock proposal for radioactive waste. However, the success of that depends very much on the extent to which the materials would leach out of the concrete in time. I think the CSIRO has done some work on that.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Would it be fair to say that the public fear and perception of particularly CFCs might be somewhat exaggerated and that indeed it may be more easy to break them down and destroy them safely than the public perception would have us believe?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Using high temperature incineration? There are lots of facilities that I would be less keen to live alongside compared with a high temperature destructor.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I want to again tap one of the perennials that has not quite reached resolution, that is, the issue of CFCs and the major source I suppose, in coming decades in Australia, namely, refrigerator units, air-conditioners and the like. I am given to understand that there is something of the order of 300 grams of freon and other CFCs and halons in an ordinary domestic refrigerator or car air-conditioner or whatever. Problems arise of course when seals dry out and CFCs escape into the atmosphere.

I understand that there needs to be collaboration and cooperation between the States in this, but what is the present state of the debate so far as national and State level is concerned in ensuring that, when CFCs are drained, they are contained and not allowed to escape, and secondly, in ensuring that fridges that are junked are not allowed to be junked before those CFCs are in fact drained, contained, and appropriately disposed of?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Ministers were given a briefing by one of Senator Richardson's officers at the last AEC meeting. That officer indicated that the Commonwealth would be legislating in such a way as would admit of controls more stringent than those which arose out of

the Montreal convention. In other words, the legislation would be enabling legislation, which would mean that regulations could be brought in and updated from time to time, without having to continually go back to the Parliament.

My understanding is that that legislation is now well in preparation and will probably be introduced some time in October and that it will address the matter of recovery of CFCs along with the other matters to which the honourable member has referred, such as the actual use of CFCs in particular industrial processes—refrigeration and the like. I noticed in the last day or so a reference to volatile substances like carbon tetrachloride, although I have always seen that as a special case of a CFC—it is just that there is no 'f': it is just CC, as it were. There are other substances as well that would come into the same category. Anything which on release into the stratosphere will break down into one of the halogen elements has the capacity to reduce the concentration of ozone in that layer of the atmosphere and therefore has to be looked at with a great deal of concern.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** On the issue of carbon tetrachloride, that used to be used as a drench in the control of Barbers Pole Worm and other intestinal parasites in sheep. I am not very familiar with what is presently administered to sheep in the course of killing off worms, but I wonder whether carbon tetrachloride still has any agricultural uses, or whether we have moved on to more appropriate technologies from there. I take your point that that is certainly a member of the CFCs family.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I really do not know, my understanding was that one of its uses was in dry cleaning, but I believe that has long since been phased out. I am informed it is used in fire extinguishers. I cannot answer the honourable member's question, specifically, so we will try to get the information.

**Ms GAYLER:** Can the Minister tell the Committee whether the proposed Federal legislation or the Federal and complementary State legislation on CFCs will apply also to the producers of these substances? I understand that the concern of the Conservation Council in South Australia is that the controls will apply to industries which use CFCs, for example, those which produce aerosol packs, foams, fire extinguishers, and the like, but that the target reductions may not be applied to the actual production companies, in which case the concern is that production may remain at current levels and we may be shipping overseas that which we are not using locally, to the detriment of other countries.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The honourable member reminds me by her question that of course there will have to be complementary State legislation, but we have decided to wait until we have all the details of the Commonwealth legislation before we determine just what needs to happen here. I understand that the legislation will look at import and production quotas, and it is part of the implementation of the Montreal convention that it should do so.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I refer to page 38 of the Estimates of Payments and the native vegetation management program. Because of rearrangement, it is very difficult to compare that with last year. How much was spent in compensation payments last year; how many landowners are currently awaiting compensation; what is the value of compensation being sought; and is that \$5.1 million proposed for this year to be spent entirely on acquisition or on any other capital item?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Last year, \$2.3 million was spent on new financial assistance payments; \$400 000 was spent on commitments to payments from previous agreements; \$500 000 was spent on management and administration, of

which one of the large components was fencing costs. That is a total expenditure of \$3.2 million. This year, the break-up of the \$5.1 million to which the honourable member refers is \$2.8 million for new financial assistance payments, \$1.5 million carryover from what were new arrangements last year; again about \$500 000 for management and administration, including fencing costs; and \$300,000 interest paid to the SA Financing Authority, because we have this arrangement with them whereby they in effect become our banker in these matters.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** If they are your banker why aren't they paying you interest?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Because we borrow.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What rate do you pay to produce \$300 000 interest?

**Dr McPhail:** We are paying at the semi-government rate, which I believe stands at about 13 per cent at the moment. This money is used to purchase properties that have been declared non-viable because of a refusal to clear and the property has been rendered non-viable. The property is purchased; the cleared land is then sold off to the adjoining farmers; and, if you like, the amount is credited back to SAFA. In the end we will bear the difference between the purchase price and the resale price.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** The time delay in that procedure is what involves the interest charge?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Yes. Last year, nine properties with a total purchase price of \$2 463 930 were involved. This year it is expected that about 200 applications to clear will be lodged, and about 220 clearance decisions will be made by the Native Vegetation Authority, resulting in about 70 heritage agreements covering 50 000 hectares. That includes some carried over from the previous year.

**Mr LEWIS:** What explicit guidelines do you have to determine the value to be paid to landholders for the land and anything on it that may be of a pecuniary value? I refer in particular to the value of standing timber, which in some locations can be used for charcoal production and/or firewood. I refer also to deposits such as gypsum which could be located beneath a stand of uncleared native vegetation.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Valuer General has to strike a valuation for the land as a proposition for development and then a residual value, given that there has been refusal to clear. The legislation then sets out a formula that relates to the difference between those two values.

**Dr McPhail:** The guidelines for the Valuer General have been worked out in detail with the UF&S, which basically has agreed with them. The guidelines relate not only to the residual land value, but also to such matters as the value of standing timber, which has, and can always, be taken into account, as well as such items as the over provision of stands in a shearing shed, which have been built on the basis of entire property use. We can provide the details of the Valuer General's approach to the establishment of the value of the land. Basically, the heads of agreement are supposed to be agreed between the Valuer General and the UF&S. That is usually the case, although sometimes there is a dispute over the way the methodology is imposed. We do not know of any example (and we have not considered such a situation) where there are winnable minerals on a property that, because of the clearance decision, would no longer be available.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Returning to the coastal management program, I again refer to the impact of the greenhouse effect, rising sea levels, and the like. The seminar raised the question of changing rainfall patterns and the fact that Adelaide was moving into a drier winter regime, and may move into a much wetter summer rainfall regime. Further, it could

move from the slow soaking winter type of rain to rather sudden and traumatic summer rainfalls.

The impact of that kind of rainfall on the Adelaide Plains may be quite severe, and one of the impacts may be not so much on the coast itself but, rather, on the water courses and drains, and specifically on First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Creeks. What thought has been given to any changes that may need to be made to building codes, the Local Government Act, the Building Act, and whatever to ensure that new houses constructed near these creeks are built in such a way that the living area is well and truly above the usual 50 or 100 year flood level?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** One of the papers at that seminar addressed that question in part. A local government engineer (Kym Reid) presented a paper which mainly addressed the matter of structures very close to coastal waters. Obviously, that was a starting point, but a good deal more discussion will have to take place. I do not think that we have got very far into it at this stage. Two problems arise out of this. First, a greater summer rainfall could lead to much greater water movement along the coast, or a much more violent coastal regime in summer, whereas at present we have a reasonably gentle sort of summer action which returns the offshore sandbars to the littoral zone. That could be affected in some way.

The other way in which it could be affected is to the extent that there has been erosion of sea grasses in the gulf close to Adelaide, that in part relates to the fact that, with the channelling and sealing of creeks, and with more drains going to the sea, a lot of that rainfall which fell on the Adelaide Plains in former years and which gradually seeped out into the marine environment now races out at considerable velocity. The pure friction effect of that movement of water has some impact on the gulf environment. If one is dealing with rather more violent rainfall activity, that effect could become greater. We will have to look at those matters in the future, but I really do not think that much work has been done on them at this stage.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** The thrust of that paper was that it was probably easier and cheaper in the long run to buy properties that were threatened by rising sea level and to knock them down. That has already been done to one property in the Marino Rocks area. Could the same principle be applied to the many thousands of properties located on the banks of various creeks in the Adelaide Plains, or is it a different proposition?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Very much so, and it could probably not be done.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I again refer to the potential sources of sand and the issue of coastal management. The model, which has been tried and found to work in the Brighton-Seacliff area where sand dune systems have been recreated, grassed, and fenced, appears to create a fairly effective buffer. I presume that the board intends to create a similar situation at West Beach in order to prevent further erosion there.

The problem is obviously where you get the sand from, and you have referred to the problem that the sand is slowly lost to the system by moving out to sea. You have also referred to the need to possibly use offshore reserves and reserves on Torrens Island. What potential is in the other reserve, the Mount Compass sand; how much more is there; what are the relative costs of trucking and obtaining that sand? Given that that is a quarrying operation of Mesozoic sands, has any thought been given to buying commercially other Mesozoic sand deposits such as north Maslins sand and south Maslins sand which, arguably, could be made into reasonably adequate beach sand (aside from the colour)

from the quarrying operations at either end of Maslin Beach and putting those into the system? In other words, doing the same thing from Maslin quarries as has been done from Mount Compass?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** For the benefit of non-geologists, I think the member meant Cainozoic!

**Mr Tucker:** The board has requested the Department of Mines and Energy to include in its present assessment of sands in the Fleurieu Peninsula the needs of the Coastal Management Branch. We are awaiting its report on suitable supplies in that area. With respect to the sands at Maslins, we have been looking at those with a view to supplementing the sand resources for the coast.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** They would be purely commercial arrangements, the same as any self respecting brick layer would make?

**Mr Tucker:** With respect to the Mount Compass sands, it is a possibility that the board may have to purchase land and open its own quarrying operation which would obviously save on costs.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** What dimensions does that add to the cost? How does it compare with the Torrens Island and offshore deposits at Grange?

**Mr Tucker:** Very roughly, the cost of Torrens Island sand is expected to be about \$7.50 a cubic metre. Recently, we acquired sand from the ACI sand mine because it was surplus to its operation. That was purchased at about the same cost as the Torrens Island sand, but only because it was surplus to requirements. If we had to bring it under normal conditions, it would probably cost about another \$4 or \$5 per cubic metre.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** The *Farmer and Stockowner* journal of 27 July carried an article about the prospect of goat meat exports to the Middle East. The article revealed that the value of goats (which had last year been \$3 to \$4 a head) had now leapt to \$15 a head on the export market. I presume that the article was basically run for the benefit of goat farmers in the Murraylands and the like, but what effect might that have on the commercial viability of harvesting operations of feral goats in the Flinders and the near north? Could the \$15 a head provide a developing market in the export of feral goats? If that is a fair supposition, how effective is that likely to be in controlling goat populations at Wilpena and points north?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** You need some economic incentives to try to rid the ranges of what is an environmental menace anyway, namely the goat. We have continued to run a goat eradication program. My recollection is that some years ago, when it was running at a fairly high level, they were \$14 a head anyway, so I would not have thought that this \$15 a head is all that marvellous as an additional incentive. I am told by my officers that we are continuing to run that program, albeit at a lower level than was occurring in the early 80s because the goats are not there to the extent that they were at that time.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** You also need intense drought seasons to bring them down?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** Concentrate, yes. There has been a series of good years in the Gammon Ranges.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** What is the cost of getting goats out of there?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** We will take that on notice. We do not have that specific information.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** The National Trust's submission to the Minister dated 12 July regarding the trust's grant was, I think, a very well argued submission. It seems to me that the fact the grant has remained at the level of \$27 000 for two years, considering the quite dramatic

improvement in the trust's administration and capacity over that period (which would be acknowledged widely), does seem a little on the harsh side, particularly when compared with the grants that the trust gets in the Eastern States, acknowledging that they have considerably more properties in those States. Is there any policy reason for retaining the grant at its present level without even allowing for inflation, or is it purely a matter of financial stringency that has caused the Government to leave the grant at \$27 000 when the trust has demonstrated that it can do so much more than the Government because of its volunteer input in terms of heritage conservation?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I would like to do more. However, we have to keep in mind that four years ago, I think, the trust's grant was transferred to my line from the Premier's line. At that time it was getting \$5 000 from the Government. Last year we also gave the trust a loan of \$40 000 interest free for two years, and we are committed to finding better accommodation for the trust, which will largely be at Government expense when appropriate accommodation can be identified. I would not like the actual figure in the Program Estimates to represent the total of what the Government is prepared to do to assist the trust. We felt that this year, in a climate of stringency, it was difficult to do much better than what is actually published. If the honourable member looks at the figures for Kesab Conservation Council, she will see they have been treated similarly as between the two budgets for last year and this year.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Referring to page 99 of the Auditor-General's Report and commercial arrangements, namely business ventures in which the Minister's department is involved, and which are located on reserves and parks, how many such arrangements or ventures are there, using Belair Caravan Park as an example; where are they located; what number of such proposals for new business ventures of this kind are now being considered and where are they located; and what terms of tenure are contemplated?

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

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Concerning Aboriginal heritage conservation on page 60 of the Program Estimates, it is stated under Issues/Trends:

Increasing concern by Aboriginals for the preservation and protection of sites and items of importance to them.

Increasing demand for cultural resource management.

You indicated that the Act would be proclaimed later this year. There is no increase in terms of the resource allocation. I notice the specific targets for the current year, and ask whether an indication can be given of the cost of each, particularly the second year of the Coongie Lakes project. I do not know what was the cost last year or what it involves.

#### Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr R. Ware, Manager, Aboriginal Heritage Branch.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I ask Mr Bob Ware to reply specifically to that.

**Mr Ware:** The Coongie Lakes project would cost about \$35 000. It is a Commonwealth funded project through the national estates grant.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What is the nature of the project?

**Mr Ware:** It is an archeological survey of the Coongie Lakes area.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What about the other details on the specific targets, including costs?

**Mr Ware:** The Poonindie history project was part funded from last year, and we have about \$3 000 left to complete

it. The Nullarbor Plains second year is a \$39 000 project funded again through the national estates funds. The Aboriginal women's history project was funded last year but will be published this financial year and cost only \$5 000. The computerisation of the Aboriginal heritage register will cost \$5 000 at this stage but could be increased, depending on how long it takes. We are estimating it will cost about \$5 000.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Is that a standard or single computer system into which the information is being fed?

**Mr Ware:** It is specifically for the site register. With the advent of the proclamation of the Act, one of the major functions would be an increase in site protection works. We have increased that budget to \$30 000 for this financial year.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** What about the fish traps project?

**Mr Ware:** That project will cost \$32 000 to complete, and that is a national estates funded project again.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** There is something rather poignant in the notion of Aboriginal sites being registered on a computer. I refer to an item under coastal management relating to marine pollution to investigate requirements for addressing marine pollution in South Australian waters including regulations under the Coast Protection Act. Is the department concerned about the pollution of the gulf from the Bolivar treatment works and, if so, is that what is envisaged as part of that objective for this year? What other requirements does the department envisage as needing updated regulations: what factors are new or developing to cause that?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Part of the question should be taken on notice, but some of the concern that has arisen from a recent survey undertaken by the E&WS Department is sludge disposal in the offshore Semaphore area from the Port Adelaide treatment works. The honourable member would know that some of our sewage treatment plants dispose of sludge into the marine environment and some do not. Christies Beach does not, as a site near the Onkaringa estuary is used. It has been revealed that there is some dieback in areas where sludge is released into the marine environment. Work is to proceed on that with most being done by the EW&S, but my department along with the Department of Fisheries will be cooperating.

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

Auditor-General's, \$3 760 000

**Chairman:**

The Hon. T.M. McRae

**Members:**

The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Ms Gayler  
Mr T.R. Groom  
Mr I.P. Lewis  
Mr D.J. Robertson  
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Deputy Premier

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr J. Abraham, Acting Auditor-General  
Mr P. Deegan, Administration Officer

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Treasurer, in presenting his report, indicated that he is changing some procedures for the presentation of financial information in future to move away from a cash flow budgetary system to, in some cases, full accrual accounting. We discussed that in part at the Estimates Committee last year. At that stage the Auditor-General indicated that he was applying himself to the necessary changes. What is the current situation in relation to that? Will the accrual form of accounting that is to be introduced be four-square accrual accounting which would be applied in the normal commercial world?

**Mr Abraham:** The question of accrual accounting has been around for some time. It is a topic of discussion not only in this State but also in Victoria and New South Wales, in particular. A number of our statutory authorities have accrual accounting. Along with some of our Government departments they are bringing in their major commitments such as identifying long service leave, superannuation and depreciation. That is most appropriate, particularly in departments that are charging for their services.

The Auditor-General is concerned about accrual accounting. The department believes that one needs to look carefully at the benefits that will flow as a result of full accrual accounting being implemented. We support a modified form of accounting in the sense that we believe one should take note of significant commitments. However, we do not believe that we should get down to the degree of reading electric light meters and so on—the minute detail. It is a question of cost benefit. However, we are progressing; we have re-assigned one officer to look at major accounting issues and that includes accrual accounting, rotor return reporting and so on.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** If one talks of commercial accounting complete with profit and loss accounts, indication of stock on hand, outstanding receipts and outstanding debits, will we at any time soon (and that is perhaps the direct intent with the E&WS department) be able to align them to normal commercial operations?

**Mr Abraham:** We have that in place in some organisations in the sense that you will find that the Electricity Trust is a trading organisation and would be aware of its commitments at the end of the financial year and also through its management reporting structure. I believe that the E&WS is investigating accrual accounting. I am not sure of the degree to which it will be implemented. The department is currently recognising its significant commitments in terms of long service leave, superannuation and depreciation.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I should have prefaced my remarks more away from traditional trading organisations which have tended in that direction and which are not necessarily looked upon as total Government departments, albeit that they are. The Education Department, for example, can hide a tremendous amount of outstanding debt by not having paid its accounts for 60 days. It is the same with other departments. There is no clear indication in the figures which are presented to members in the budget of what the likely hidden costs are. That has been demonstrated on a number of occasions and is often referred to by people in the public sector.

**Mr Abraham:** It is true to say that the accounts do not show the amounts outstanding at the end of the year. However, as part of our audit process we examine accounts to ensure that they are not outstanding for any great length of time. That is part of the implementation of accounting processes and, indeed, the Government has indicated to

departments that they must pay their accounts within a certain time. Those procedures are in place.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has it ever been discussed, or is it likely that the Minister might take on board having regard to his Ministerial responsibility, that that figure is shown somewhere in the accounts presented to Parliament, because they are not shown at the moment?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** We will take that up. I will discuss it with the Auditor-General.

**Mr Abraham:** It is a question of economics. I would have thought that if one were going down that path one would want to look at the significant outstanding amounts rather than the minute detail.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Auditor-General, in the preface to his report, again draws attention to two authorities for which he has to provide a qualified report. It is not the first time that he has taken that action. Is the Auditor-General in any way seeking to evolve a satisfactory system which will correctly report to Parliament on the activities of those two departments which are errant at the moment?

**Mr Abraham:** The Auditor-General will only qualify accounts if he does not have sufficient information to be able to provide a full certificate to the department and to the Parliament. We endeavour, as a department, to assist other departments in relation to their systems and procedures. I understand that there are reasons why a qualified certificate was provided. I do not know if it is appropriate to go into that detail at this time.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am referring to the Woods and Forests Department and the South Australian Timber Corporation.

**Ms GAYLER:** On page 75 of the Program Estimates one of the Auditor-General's proposed objectives for 1988-89 is to continue the professional development program for all staff. Does the Auditor-General see his department as having a role in professional development of staff across the various Government departments in the audit area so that a positive approach to improved audit practices and efficiency might result—and I am not aware of whether the department already does that?

**Mr Abraham:** The department has a fairly sophisticated professional development program—which it needs to have, as the honourable member will appreciate. Where appropriate, we invite people from internal audit sections across Government departments, and they sit in with us on this.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** There is reference in the support services section of page 77 to the upgrading of the management information system. I must confess that I do not know exactly what that involves, but the intent of the upgrade is to provide a better basis for the management of resources. Can you explain exactly what that involves, what upgrade is intended and what effect it is likely to have on the management of resources within the department?

**Mr Abraham:** The management information system is designed to record the allocation of hours and costs of the various staff on the audits of the various Government agencies. This is a monthly report, and we can control the actual hours audited against the budgeted hours. It breaks hours down to various cost centres. In the interests of effectiveness and efficiency, we are continually reviewing our operations and want to critically examine what we have now with a view to making it a bit more effective, if we can, and looking at ways and means by which we can make it effective.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Which you are not specifying as yet?

**Mr Abraham:** It will evolve out of the investigation.

**Mr LEWIS:** I would like the Minister's indulgence to have a matter from within the Auditor-General's Report clarified. I refer to page 279, where the financing arrangements for the Electricity Trust are explained by the Auditor-General. This is rather unique, being the first time that any such accounting has taken place in any public instrumentality in any State of this country, so far as I can discover. The Minister may recall that the Electricity Trust somehow or other got rid of its real estate and power generation equipment in a deal with some overseas financiers, leased it back from them, then wrote off the asset and the liability that it incurred as a consequence of that transaction in what is called a defeasement. In doing so, it produced through the Government's banker, SAFA, about \$53.3 million for general revenue.

Am I correct in understanding that \$555 million was the total sum of assets and liabilities involved in the two arrangements for the Torrens Island and Northern Power Stations? After the double swap was done from one hand to the other, we had a sum of \$543 million in the accounts. Then, because of the nature of the so called financial securities—which I think is a bit of a joke—it was only necessary to make available \$490 million, so the net gain up front of \$53.3 million was created. If we look into the SAFA report, we find on page 26 that that \$53 million finds its way—and I am speculating and want the Auditor-General to tell me if I am wrong—into \$256 million as an operating surplus plus \$23 million as a power station financing arrangement accrual, making an operating surplus of \$279 million, from which payment was made into general revenue of \$205 million last year and \$74 million next year. So that \$53.3 million suddenly becomes general revenue to the State of South Australia without anything being created other than what some might call creative accounting. I want to understand whether I have followed that process correctly.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I want to assist this Committee as much as I possibly can, and would not want to lose the approbation showered on me earlier this afternoon when the members suggested that we have really handled the environmental matters pretty well and expeditiously. However, I wonder whether the honourable member is asking this question of the correct Committee. Obviously, we must be very careful that the examination of the Auditor-General's line does not become, in effect, a debate on practically every matter which has been raised in his annual report.

I can understand when the question is either about the resources the Auditor-General has to bring to bear on his statutory responsibilities or the particular ways in which the matters are set out in his report. I would have thought that this was a matter which could perhaps more properly be referred either to the Minister of Mines and Energy, on the one hand, or the Treasurer, on the other. I am quite happy to have my officer answer to the extent of the information available to him which he tells me is limited because he was not expecting to get into this area of questioning.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We have been through this before, and the previous Chairman's rulings have been along the lines indicated by the Minister, that questions to the Auditor-General or his representative must in some sense bear upon his responsibilities and not go to the merits of other portfolio areas where the questions could have been and perhaps could still be appropriately asked. However, the Minister indicated that he was prepared to have an officer answer as best he can.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** If that is in order, we will proceed. Mr Abraham has some limited information at this stage.

**Mr Abraham:** I do not have any detailed information on this point. If the honourable member cares to come and see us, we could explain the whole workings to him.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, because it has never happened before in public accounting anywhere that we have done this kind of deal.

**Mr Abraham:** We could set it out so that it could be understood, if that is satisfactory to the honourable member.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In normal business practice or organisational practice, if funds are to be written off by an organisation, it is subject to the concurrence of the Auditor. My question is asked in ignorance of the finer detail of the Auditor-General's activities, but is the Auditor-General responsible for giving agreement to the writing off of debts associated with Government departments? The question really lies against the fact that in three different areas some \$21 million to \$23 million of public debt has been written off in trading organisations. Was that done with the concurrence of the Auditor-General? That is a simple question but the complexities of it are the reason for the question.

**Mr Abraham:** Generally the Auditor-General certifies. We receive a request from a Government department for the Auditor-General's approval to ask the Treasurer to write off debts. The honourable member spoke about \$23 million. I am not too sure what is meant by that and whether we have given such approval in all those cases without seeing the documentation.

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

Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous,  
\$10 919 000  
Works and Services—Country Fire Services Board,  
\$2 675 000  
Police \$179 800 000  
Works and Services—Police Department \$17 100 000

**Chairman:**

The Hon. T.M. McRae

**Members:**

The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Ms D.L. Gayler  
Mr T.R. Groom  
Mr I.P. Lewis  
Mr D.J. Robertson  
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, Chief Secretary and Minister of Emergency Services.

**Advisers:**

Mr A. Cunningham, Director, Police Complaints Authority.

Mr B. Lancaster, Director, State Emergency Services.

Mr D. Macarthur, Director, Country Fire Services.

Mr F. Bowering, Chief Finance Officer, South Australian Police Department.

Mr J. Patterson, Accountant.

Mr F. Muldoon, Acting Administrative Manager, Country Fire Services.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the Police Complaints Authority, I notice that fairly considerable additional

funding is being made available this year, the line showing an increase from \$223 000 actual expenditure last year to \$347 000 actual this year. Can the Minister indicate the reason for that quite major increase? Is it in any way connected with the arrangement that is being entered into within the Police Force in relation to internal review? I would have thought not, although I am open to suggestions and detail. So, it involves an opening of Pandora's box to know how the role of the Police Complaints Authority has changed to enable it to undertake those additional works, having regard also to the line of \$12 000 for a review of the operations.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will defer to Mr Cunningham but, before doing so I point out that the review is a statutory requirement, and it will be the first review of the operations of the authority. There has been some pressure on resources in the authority because of the level of complaints that have come in. Maybe Mr Cunningham has been too good to his customers, I do not know. But, in any event, there has been some pressure on resources. We have agreed to an additional full-time equivalent in that office, and we have also agreed to keep very close watch on the continual pressure on resources in that office. I leave it to Mr Cunningham to explain the details.

**Mr Cunningham:** One element in this amount may fairly be described as a bookkeeping exercise. That involved the establishment of accounts relating to the setting up expenses of the office which were not used. The actual increase is \$32 000 over last year's expenditure. Most of that, as the Minister indicated, relates to a single further appointment of a staff member to the office. Complaints are being received at an increasing rate. In fact, there appears to be between a 30 per cent and 50 per cent increase in number each year, and that shows no sign yet of plateauing out.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Can the Minister indicate to the committee the particular skills pertaining to the people who man the Police Complaints Authority?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Mr Cunningham might be the man to answer that.

**Mr Cunningham:** The office is very much a generalised one in which each member of the staff supports others. At the level of CO2, the essential work is the receiving of complaints, some interviewing of complainants and particularly receipt of telephone conversations dealing with members of the public. Two senior officers immediately below me, that is, Ms Haskett and Mr Hutchinson, are involved in the interviewing of complainants. The analysis of complaints, the drafting of assessments for my approval in some cases and, in Mr Hutchinson's case, a very substantial administrative load and also dealing with those investigations that are conducted by my office.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Is the Minister or the authority able to say whether there has been any major shift in the nature of inquiries handled by the Police Complaints Authority this year, having regard to the fact that there has been a number of other complaints relevant to police activity. One often begets the other. I would be interested to know whether there has been a wrongful direction to the Police Complaints Authority which in turn has found necessary to put back to the Police Department and vice versa. Will the nature of this work during the past 12 months reflect any major shift?

**Mr Cunningham:** No. There have been some shifts. All categories of complaints appear to have been subject to the same degree of increase, plus or minus some factors. There is no single significant outstanding matter, but there has been a very constant process of interaction between my office and the police at various levels on all matters. There



is continuing dialogue and that has been the case since I started, and will continue to be the case. As recently as yesterday I addressed a conference and workshop of 40 per cent of the Police Force commissioned officers about aspects that had come to light in the complaints process.

**Ms GAYLER:** What are the categories of complaints?

**Mr Cunningham:** In each of our annual reports all complaints are dissected into 26 categories, each of which in turn is dissected into between three and five subcategories. That gives a total of about 100 subcategories which we attempt to set out in the annual report tables. The statistics, which will be included in the forthcoming annual report, indicate an increase in total numbers, but there has been no major shift between one category and another.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will provide a list of those classifications.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Has the authority had to deal with a backlog of cases, or is it dealing with cases as they come up? I hope that the number of complaints has diminished, but presumably that is not happening.

**Mr Cunningham:** Unfortunately, your latter statement is correct. Because of the terms of the Act, the Police Complaints Authority has no jurisdiction in respect of any conduct which occurred before the date of operation of the Act (30 September 1985). A few cases which related to earlier matters were taken up, but the work that we are now undertaking is the steady accumulation from year to year since 1 September 1985. It is increasing every year. That pattern was noticed virtually everywhere. An independent authority was set up to replace an internal complaints system and in all cases an increase has occurred. However, I think that our situation has shown the greatest rate of increase.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Do they plateau eventually?

**Mr Cunningham:** I have heard from authorities which have been in existence longer than ours that a plateau is reached after about seven years. We have been in existence for only three years. On the present statistics, I can see no evidence of a plateau developing. I am afraid that, if anything, the opposite is the case and that the rate of complaints is increasing.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On any occasion on which police assistance has been sought at any level to pursue an inquiry, has crucial information been denied?

**Mr Cunningham:** No, I have never been refused. I believe that I have been given every cooperation. Under the terms of the Act the Commissioner of Police is entitled to agree or disagree with my assessment, and in 5 per cent of all cases he has exercised that power and has disagreed with my assessment. I have never been refused any request, and the responses that I have received have not been grudging in any way. I have been advised that, unless the matters are very sensitive (and that would be explained to me), my request to inspect any police file would not be refused.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has there ever been an occasion when the authority has pursued a particular line of inquiry and then, as a result of additional information, of its own motion it has sought information over and above that required for the original complaint? Under the Act can the authority make inquiries of its own motion? Further, have any deficiencies been identified in the Act?

**Mr Cunningham:** If I had been asked whether any major modifications had been made, my answer would be 'No'. I believe that the workings of the Act could be improved in some minor respects, but they almost amount to technical amendments. I am also aware that the Act is of interest to a very large range of community institutions which may have their own list of amendments. The Act gives me

sufficient scope to exercise my powers. The Act defines certain circumstances in which I may conduct an inquiry, but I cannot do that of my own motion; I must have a complaint. If the complaint is against very senior police officers and relates to policy, procedure, and the like, it will be investigated by my office rather than by the police. In other circumstances (and this applies to about 98 per cent of the complaints that are investigated), the responsibility for investigation rests with the Internal Investigation Branch of the Police Force, but it must supply a report to me and I can direct that further investigation be carried out.

I have done that and, on some occasions, I have undertaken the further investigation myself, not because of dissatisfaction with what had been done, but because I believed that the police investigators had come up against a dead end. I refer particularly to witnesses who would not talk to the police investigators. In that case, I believed that they might talk to me or my officers, and they did. The investigation becomes more of a cooperative exercise, and in all cases the power of assessment rests with me.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Can you unequivocally advise the Committee that there is no matter that you believe ought to be investigated that has not been or is not being investigated?

**Mr Cunningham:** I would like to give a single answer to that question; I regret that I cannot, because of my understanding of my jurisdiction under the Act. I am responsive to complaints made by members of the public and I do not have the power of investigation of my own motion as the Act now stands. It is a distinction which I have been careful to observe, because I understand it was very much a deliberate exercise when the law was passed that it would be in those terms. I am then left in the unfortunate situation, in some ways, in relation to answering that question, that there may be matters being transacted—in fact, I know that investigations are being conducted by the Police Force—that do not come to my notice. They are purely internal investigations arising by reason of things detected in the organisation of the police that are not complaints under the Act.

Whenever that involves matters that may be the subject of a complaint, I am informed and briefed on those investigations, but I do not insist, and do not have the power to insist, that I be briefed outside that limited area. It is for that reason that I do not feel I can unequivocally answer the question that was put to me by saying either 'yes' or 'no'. I do not wish to imply by that that I have any sinister suspicions or the like. I am literally in the position where I do not know. I have no basis on which to form even a speculative opinion, and that is principally because of the way the Act is constructed.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** The Sea Rescue Squadron encounters difficulty gaining time and financial support. People involved in the squadron must supply and maintain their own boat and supply their own petrol. Will the squadron be given additional support under this budget other than the financial support provided in the past, which I understand is a 50 per cent grant towards fuel etc? Will the Minister consider some sort of subsidy towards, for example, the registration of tow vehicles belonging specifically to the squadron and the trailers on which those squadron boats are towed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will ask Mr Lancaster to refer specifically to the final part of the question. There was a decrease in grant funding last year because the squadron did not utilise its total allocated funds (funding being on a dollar for dollar basis). This year, on the same basis, we are increasing the funds by \$9 524, again on a dollar for dollar basis.

**Mr Lancaster:** The guidelines for providing funding to the three sea rescue squadrons in which I am involved, namely, Victor Harbor, South Australian and Whyalla Air/Sea Rescue Squadrons, were changed in 1984 from a straight grant to a dollar for dollar subsidy basis but with 100 per cent for fuel up to a set amount for training and operational uses. At that time operating costs were excluded and they include the registration of the tow vehicle and general operating costs of the unit, such as charges for telephone, insurance and the like. These do not now fall within the guidelines of funding for these units. They are not included in the budget and it is not anticipated that they will be met.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Members of the South Australian squadron have expressed some concern that it is costing them more to provide a voluntary service. One of their suggestions was that perhaps some sort of subsidy towards registration of tow vehicles would be the most appropriate way to help. Having said that, they do accept the dollar for dollar formula for fuel, and I understand that they receive certain help through the Police Department which occasionally assists with fuel and the like.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am not aware that a specific approach has been made to us along those lines. It is up to these people to make the approach and we will examine it at the time.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Under the new Act which was passed 18 months ago and which gave additional support to the State Emergency Service, new regional officers were to be appointed under the new structure. How effectively have the structure arrangements flowed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That question comes under the police vote rather than this one, but this is probably the opportunity for Mr Lancaster to answer it.

**Mr Lancaster:** Ten regional officers have been appointed within the State Emergency Service, and they are co-located, generally speaking, within the police divisions. They have a statutory responsibility, as do the police commanders under the State Disaster Act and regulations in the area of counter-disaster planning. Those SES officers are probably spending 70 per cent of their time on counter-disaster planning and the remaining 30 per cent on coordination of the SES units.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Were the additional authorities that we gave to persons in the State disaster organisation proven to be adequate for all purposes? Were there any teething problems once the implementation of the activities of the organisation got under way?

**Mr Lancaster:** Not at this stage under the State Emergency Service Act. The powers were adequate. They have not yet been exercised in that an emergency order has not been declared. There has been no need to declare one. Generally speaking, at the moment the Act is quite sufficient for our needs.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the regulations created under the Act, has there been an endeavour to communicate at all levels of the organisation the content of those regulations and the necessity for the authorities which are given by certain certificates or licences to individuals? A person contacted my office and said that, if he was called to an emergency, the last thing on earth he would think about picking up would be his warrant to act. I suggested he could keep it in his hat, because he would not go without his hat. That was a reasonable recommendation. Problems were created within the ranks because of a perceived lack of effective communication.

**Mr Lancaster:** We have redesignated the regional officers 'divisional officers', and they are undertaking internal communication sessions with the various units. From a State

headquarters point of view, we have implemented and hope to complete by Christmas a course of seminars for the local controllers of all units throughout the State whereby the implications of the Act and regulations as well as their administrative responsibilities will be explained to them. The activity is designed to take about two days, normally over a weekend, and hopefully they will be fully aware of their responsibilities at the end of that seminar.

**Ms GAYLER:** I express my support for the Government's actions regarding the new CFS board and management and what it is endeavouring to achieve. Can the Committee be assured that the additional funding provided this year will benefit the volunteers rather than create any kind of excessive administration in the CFS board and management?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I can give fairly broad figures. The allocation to the board, in 1983-84, was about \$3.6 million, and it has increased to \$9.3 million under the current budget. A conservative analysis of the final outcome for 1987-88 has shown that only 20.8 per cent of expenditure for that year was spent on headquarters administration costs compared with 25 per cent in 1985-86. So, an attempt has been made to channel additional funds into the field as far as possible. Mr Macarthur is addressing the whole question of modernising the CFS system which must involve some expenditure at the centre as well as in the field. Some of this will come up by way of question as we proceed. That figure on its own gives some sort of indication of what we have been trying to do.

**Ms GAYLER:** Will the Minister advise what proportion of the allocated funds directly or indirectly affect volunteers in the field?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** About 36 per cent of expenditure in the last financial year went directly to the benefit of the volunteers through expenditure associated with the grants to councils and fire fighting organisations and a further 43.2 per cent of the total was spent in support of volunteers through such things as bushfire prevention, training research, fire management, communications, and the like. The board has tried to push the training side, with a good deal of success. The response to the demand for training is almost overwhelming. Although we have provided additional moneys in this budget, to be perfectly open and honest I would have to say that may not be sufficient to meet all of the demands on us from the volunteers. Nonetheless, there has been a considerable increase and the director assures me that this is one of his areas of priority.

**Ms GAYLER:** How many volunteers have participated in CFS training courses in recent years? How has that proportion changed?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Mr Macarthur has some figures and may like to share them with the Committee.

**Mr Macarthur:** As at February 1986 some 1700 volunteers of a total membership of 18 000 had taken part in some form of training. As at the end of August 1988, of an increasing membership of volunteers (now standing at 19 600), a total of 6 000 had undertaken some form of training. In fact, 3.2 per cent of the total membership were involved as at February 1986 with the proportion rising to 15.6 per cent as at August 1988. We have seen a substantial increase in the interest of volunteers in training and in their acceptance of the training programs.

**Ms GAYLER:** The former Anstey Hill quarry, adjoining Tea Tree Gully, is used almost every Saturday, except during winter, as a training spot for the fighting of oil fires. Very dense black smoke emerges from the quarry, resulting in regular calls to my office about the subsequent pollution. Is the CFS prepared to look at alternative sites in light of the suburban expansion that has taken place?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We may be able to assist the honourable member as we are spending money on a site at Brukunga for some of these activities.

**Mr Macarthur:** The Minister is correct in saying that the Mount Lofty Ranges training centre has taken the opportunity to purchase the old feed mill at Brukunga for the very reason mentioned—the problems associated with live fire training in suburban areas. It will be some years before it is developed to its full capacity. The Mount Lofty Ranges fire training centre was originally situated at the East Stirling school by arrangement with the Stirling council. The opportunity was taken to sell some land it owned as a result of a request in earlier days and to purchase the Brukunga site. In time the live fire training, and the associated dense smoke, will be transferred to that site.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am aware that senior people are going out into the regions for training purposes as a relatively new initiative. I am also aware that there has been some criticism in the past that it was a bind on volunteers from the country to train in Adelaide at Brooklyn Park. I refer specifically to those who have to travel some distance. I draw attention to the updating of the Brooklyn Park facility for the purposes of both the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Services. Is the Minister or the Director able to indicate the nature of the program that seeks to bring training to the coal face whilst making use of combined facilities for more forward training?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I point out that by a slip of the tongue the honourable member referred to Brooklyn Park instead of Brookway Park.

**Mr Macarthur:** CFS Training has been broken up into three levels—levels 1, 2 and 3. Level 1 training is done at brigade level out in the field. Hopefully, level 2 can all be done at regional level. We have established a regional training committee in each of the CFS regions and from the volunteers, we have appointed and trained instructors. The advanced levels of training, which we call level 3, and some specialist courses have, until now, come to Brookway Park because the facilities there have been necessary for training.

However, more recently we have had people come to us from Willunga who were prepared to travel and give their time for nothing as volunteer instructors, provided they had the resources to take some of these more advanced training schools into the regions. Therefore, there is a limited amount of training at the higher level going to the regions—in other words taking the training to the people. However, we still have a very great commitment to level 3 and specialist courses at Brookway Park.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It was proposed in 1987-88 that \$4 790 000 would be expended on capital works. In fact, only \$1.1 million was spent. This year there is a proposal for \$2.675 million. It would appear that some major project for which the proposed funds were made available in 1987-88 has been shelved and the funds will not flow through to the Country Fire Service activities. I am also mindful of an increase in funding, and availability of funding, by arrangements which have been entered into by the Government for a number of country areas to obtain new equipment. Is the program running late? Was there a change of emphasis or a different funding structure injected into the program that would explain these variations?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I believe you are referring to the fire appliance replacement program. There was a subvention last year that did not have to be called upon because the anticipated timetable was not met. Those funds now appear in this program.

**Mr Macarthur:** You are correct in your statement that we did arrange with Treasury for a considerable commit-

ment of subsidy funds, plus an allocation of loan moneys, to fund a major equipment upgrade. The funds had to be available to us should the orders come forward in the given time frame. However, for reasons outside our control, or for good budgetary purposes, we held back on the payments of some of the funds by making the ordering of trucks and the component parts more interrelated. The funds that the honourable member refers to—\$1.1 million—would have been spent by now in terms of vehicle purchases. The total sum of money would be committed by the end of June this year.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I believe that a prototype engine which is part of this major re-equipment program was presented to the public at the Royal Adelaide Show.

**Mr Macarthur:** There was a prototype at the Tea Tree Gully competitions.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I believe there was one on show which attracted criticism.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The suggestion is that there may have been an SES vehicle at the Royal Adelaide Show but not a CFS vehicle.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It was mistakenly presented as a CFS vehicle in the minds of some people who were critical of it. In relation to the redevelopment and the different styles of equipment being put into place, again there are those within the service who would say that the service must have horses for courses and that a single prototype, albeit at different capacity, will not necessarily meet the requirements of the hills, *vis a vis*, the plains, the deep sands, etc. What consideration has been given to the design of the re-equipment proposal which would seek to fulfil the requirements of all of the venues to which those vehicles will go.

**Mr Macarthur:** It would be fair to say that a considerable amount of research and commitment has been undertaken by volunteers. Members of the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association went into the concept of the design of the vehicle that is currently being built for the Country Fire Services. While I acknowledge the point that the honourable member made about the different types of terrain, if you asked ten firemen what they wanted in a fire appliance, you would get ten different ideas. I can assure the member that the appliance being built to the best of the ability of the Australian Fire Services meets the criteria set by the chief officers of the fire services right across Australia. It conforms with those safety requirements, and when it is in the field it will do all that is asked of it, if not more.

**Ms GAYLER:** I inspected the prototype vehicle at the recent competition day at Tea Tree Gully. One of the suggestions put to me, in company with one of your officers from headquarters, was that the sides of the vehicle might be higher or deeper than the prototype shown. Therefore, they would be roughly armpit height to provide better protection against fire for volunteers. Has that suggestion been investigated, and if it has not been, could it be investigated? I appreciate that you cannot design a vehicle like this by committee—it would probably look very peculiar. Presumably those suggestions and queries are being taken into account.

**Mr Macarthur:** I can assure the honourable member that the design criteria and all the safety factors have been properly analysed and thoroughly engineered. A consensus of opinion says the height of the sides is quite adequate.

**Ms GAYLER:** From the \$1.4 million capital allocation and the other subsidy allocation, I understand the board has ordered, through State Supply, 90 fire appliances. How many of these will be available to brigades for the coming summer? On what basis are they distributed? Will any be

available to the North East Hills Brigade, which happens to be my own particular interest?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** There will be 40 available before summer.

**Mr Macarthur:** The only undertaking I can give on this question of 90 appliances is that they will go to the areas of greatest need first. There will be approximately 40 deliveries before the onset of summer. Kangaroo Island will get perhaps five, the Clare area will get some because they have a shortage problem and three are going to Gumeracha.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Can the Minister give the Committee an update as regards the introduction of the long awaited legislation? Will he also give us an update on the matter of funding? As the Minister would be aware, on numerous occasions the matter of funding has been raised in the House, as well as the concern in regard to the need to have the matter finalised. I have always believed that those two areas of funding and legislation should be going side by side.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I hope to have a second reading speech available to deliver to the House of Assembly almost as soon as these estimates have been considered and the budget is through to the other place. As to the funding, various discussions have been held, not only in relation to the CFS but also the MFS, but no current decision exists on the Government's part to change the present basis of funding.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Why?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** Certain matters still have to be considered. The honourable member would appreciate that it is not an easy task to identify an alternative funding mechanism. As I said earlier in response to an entirely different question, if it was an easier task it would already have been done. Some past Government would have picked it up already. It is difficult for a number of reasons, one of which is that any change in funding arrangements is probably open to the accusation that it is a new tax, or something similar. There is a matter of political will, quite apart from the matter of the calculations which go into working out an equitable basis for such a system.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I understand that a report containing some recommendations has been before the Premier for some time. Does what the Minister has just said mean that none of the recommendations has been put before the Government or is acceptable at this stage?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** It depends on what you mean by Government.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Before the Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The point I was going to make is that none of these recommendations has been put before the Cabinet. At this stage they are not yet in a form in which they could be properly considered by Cabinet as a whole, which is the only body which can take a final decision in these matters.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Did the CFS call for tenders for supply of rescue equipment for country brigades? I realise that we have had a bit of a kerfuffle about the vehicles, but what about the equipment itself? If tenders were not called for that, why not?

**Mr Macarthur:** Basically, the Country Fire Service Board has been involved only in the upgrading of fire appliances as it highest priority, as well as the equipment on those fire appliances. Both items have been through the tender process. We have not been involved in the supply of rescue equipment, but a couple of brigades, one on the West Coast and one elsewhere, have obtained subsidy assistance for the purchase of rescue equipment, and they did that within their own organisation. The board had no say in it except

the request was for some subsidy assistance to upgrade some equipment, and the board has given a percentage allocation, as it would do under normal funding allocation.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Is it possible to make any kind of estimate of the cost of resources and the increase in resources which have gone into salaries and equipment specifically allocated to the training of CFS members? How much of the budget in salary and equipment is actually allocated to training?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** In 1987-88, \$290 500 was allocated to training. In the broad sense, this would involve the three categories to which the Chairman of the board referred earlier. In this budget it will be \$432 200.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Some years ago a program of establishing regional offices was undertaken by the CFS. Are these owned or leased, and what provision has been made to ensure that officers, as opposed to offices, have adequate facilities for existing and future demands?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** The premises at Gawler are leased and the board is seeking alternative accommodation prior to the expiration of the lease. The Port Augusta premises, where at present there is only one officer, are owned. Port Lincoln and Murray Bridge are leased premises, and are adequate. The Stirling office has been purchased by the board and currently houses the region 1 and bushfire prevention staff. The board also owns the Naracoorte office, and this year \$25 000 of capital funds is going into the upgrading of that office. So, it is a mixed scene: some are owned and some are leased.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** There is no general rule about it being more cost effective to lease than to own?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I think it depends where you are. Generally speaking, in areas where the CFS will have a continued presence for an unlimited time it is probably cheaper to own, but that is not always possible in the short term.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I would appreciate an indication of the expertise which might have been built into the headquarters staff to provide on a statewide basis new techniques and new technology to enhance the service of the CFS.

**Mr Macarthur:** That is a very broad ranging question. Briefly, the CFS board, within the confines of its budget over the past two or three years, has been able to enlist some very competent officers in terms of computer operators and radio engineering sorts of people. Those developments alone have greatly enhanced the ability of the CFS to develop its policies and provide a better service to the community through a better information base.

The computer system person has produced a corporate computer plan which the Government Management Board says is equal to any ever produced. He is doing first-class work, and officers of that calibre have greatly lifted the ability of the board to manage its resources.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Supplementary to that, to what degree are the benefits which have been brought by these officers integrated with an overall State coordinating body involving police and other emergency services?

**Mr Macarthur:** Basically, in the past three or four years we have looked at it from the top down. We have recruited the former Chief Officer of the Northern Territory Fire Brigade, Mr Ferris, and in the operational area we have been fortunate in getting Mr Howard McBeth, from the National Parks and Wildlife Service, plus a couple of officers, one from Woods and Forests and one from another area. They are very competent people to liaise and to develop working arrangements with other services, for example the police and the SES. Most of the responsibility would lie on

the shoulders of the former National Parks and Wildlife Service employee, Mr McBeth.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is probably worth adding briefly that in the area of JESFIC, while on the one hand we cannot altogether recruit with the specific concerns of JESFIC in mind, it is true to say that the extra skills we have been able to obtain through these people have been of considerable assistance to that joint emergency exercise we have with the other agencies.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** One of the initiatives taken by the CFS in the past two fire seasons which has created some public disquiet is to remove from the scheme of arrangements the normal aerial spotting service and replace it with a water bomber service which was both spotting and water bombing. Has there been an assessment of the relative cost benefit of the two services, now that there have been sufficient occasions on which to assess it, and what is intended will be the method of surveillance for 1988-89?

**Mr Macarthur:** It is very difficult to put a cost benefit figure on it in dollar terms, but, in altering the system from having a spotter aircraft and then flying a bomber aircraft after the fire has been spotted, we have certainly reduced the number of flying hours, because we are controlling only one aircraft and we have only one aircraft under contract for that specific weather period. In real terms, it is a quicker response. If the bomber aircraft spots a fire he can drop his load of water and chemical on it without having to have that second aircraft flying. It would be very hard to quantify it in dollar terms.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the volunteer service, which is and always has been a vital part of the Country Fire Services, is the Minister or the Director able to identify to the Committee the present or future structure of that organisation, its attitude, heart, and contribution? I ask that question against the background of those who would decry the authority of the board in removing the initiative of the volunteers, against the quite serious belief by a number of volunteers that they have never been better off and that they are working together much better now and much more effectively than they have in the past. Both ends of the spectrum are still being publicly stated, and it would be interesting to know how the Minister and/or the Director see that situation in South Australia.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I feel that what has been said to me, and almost certainly to Mr Macarthur and the public pronouncements of the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association would very much reflect the second strand in the honourable member's question that things are going well. They have a very positive attitude to the tasks that they have to undertake; they very much welcome the increased opportunities for training that are now available to them and, indeed the upgrading of the training has been in part, of their behest. They have been cheering us along all the way.

The attitude to the general question is illustrated by the reaction of that association to a public meeting which was held in the Adelaide Town Hall some weeks ago and which was called by certain individuals, who, I believe, for the most part were associated with ambulance services rather than with fire services and who claimed that volunteerism was under threat in this State. I personally regarded that as a ratbag attitude. I could not see that it was under threat in any way or that anybody could point to any statement that I, the Premier, or the honourable member had made that would in any way give any credence to that suggestion. It was interesting that the association completely repudiated the meeting and its spokesman said that it would not take part and that it would attempt to dissuade any of its members from taking part.

I have some figures here which have been provided to me and which suggest that the number of volunteers across the State has increased from about 18 500 in 1985 to 19 600. So, to the extent that it is still possible to recruit people into the system, it would suggest that a great deal of personal satisfaction is available to people. I guess that that is the best assurance for the future of volunteerism in the fire service in this State.

**Ms GAYLER:** In the light of what has been said today about expenditure, training and an increase in the number of volunteers, can the Committee have a summary of the state of preparedness, particularly in my area of interest, the Adelaide Hills, for bushfire prevention on the one hand and bushfire fighting on the other? Are we now better prepared than we were during the Ash Wednesday fires and do we have any measures of how better prepared we are?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** By way of introduction to the answer, I make two points: it is important that the legislation to which I referred earlier is in place before the fire season, and it is important that at least some of these 90 appliances are available to the areas of need that have already been identified by Mr Macarthur. As to the specific matter of your question in relation to the near Hills area, I will ask the Chairman of the board to respond.

**Mr Macarthur:** I feel that is a two-barrelled question, one relating to fire prevention and one relating to fire suppression. In terms of fire suppression, the volunteers through the training programs have become far more expert in the way they handle wild fires. They have formed themselves into groups of fire brigades so they work as a team, so that is very much an improvement on the old days of their individual attitudes and reactions. So operationally, I would say that, without any doubt within the location in which the honourable member has her prime concern, the organisation is now far better equipped and trained and working together far more cohesively than they would have been some four or five years ago. In the area of fire prevention, I must say that this is one of the great concerns of the board. This issue must be addressed within the community; it is a community problem and within the proposed new legislation are very strong measures to ensure that the community acts responsibly in the area of fire prevention. That is the real problem that we must address.

**Ms GAYLER:** I am of half a mind to ask about the kinds of techniques that you have in mind as that may pre-empt the Bill, I will pass and wait a couple of weeks.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** A letter of 13 July written by the Minister states:

The relationship between the two fire services, including the duplication of services and the reviewing of boundaries, will be the subject of a special meeting I propose to call shortly with the Chairman of the Fire Services Coordination Committee and the senior officers of the MFS and the County Fire Services Board. The meeting will discuss options for a rationalisation of resources in order to avoid costly duplication and ensure a harmonious relationship between the two services.

Has that meeting been held? I would be particularly interested to receive an update regarding a review of boundaries.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** This matter first arose as a result of some rather unfortunate media comment. I do not suggest that the media misled anybody but, rather, it was the way that a decision taken by the City of Salisbury was highlighted. The impression was given that the MFS would take over the whole of the Salisbury area. There was some misunderstanding about further media comment. People came to me and said that they understood that the MFS had plans to take over 14 fire districts in the Adelaide Hills. That was not so and we were very quickly able to provide assurances that that would not occur. However, it was quite obvious that the unfortunate way in which the whole thing

had come to light led to some degree of suspicion between the two fire services, and that was something that had to be put to rest fairly quickly. We had to identify some better mechanism for looking at alterations to fire districts.

The meeting was very positive and the following things were identified: first, that at least in the short term any proposal to change boundaries would be fully referred to both fire services before I would be prepared to put any recommendation to the Cabinet to change any boundaries. Secondly, the two fire services would cooperate in looking at a variety of areas where some duplication of services may occur. These related to such areas as purchasing, certain forms of equipment and computing. That work is now being undertaken to see what integrated or common services may be identified between the two bodies.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** What about the review of boundaries?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** There is no fundamental review, in the sense that a committee meets to decide the ideal set-up of boundaries throughout the State as between the two fire services. However, there is now a procedure whereby any proposal to change boundaries must be referred to both fire services in order to obtain their advice before the Government makes any decision on these matters. The Salisbury matter has been held in abeyance while discussion occurs between the two fire services. We have told the Salisbury people that the existing boundaries will remain for the time being.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Could any lessons be learnt from the recent Mount Remarkable exercise? Further, will some of those lessons be implemented in the conduct of fire control for 1988-89?

**Mr Macarthur:** The lessons learned from the Mount Remarkable fire were the same ones that were learnt some two or three years ago as a result of two previous fires in the same area. The same problems will continue to arise until the new legislation is enacted and an established command function is available to the organisation. The Mount Remarkable fire is the subject of a coronial inquiry, which will commence very shortly, and I think that a lot of those issues will be canvassed at that inquiry.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In giving evidence to the ETSA select committee relating to flammable materials below wires, the Director drew attention to a very grave problem that exists in South Australia *vis-a-vis* the situation in Western Australia. What are the virtues of the Western Australian scheme?

**Mr Macarthur:** The whole issue of bushfires (which is different from house fires and building fires) must be looked at in the perspective of what form of control we have over them. About 90 per cent of fires can be controlled by fire appliances and by people, but a percentage become uncontrollable, as was the case during Ash Wednesday. The only spectrum of the fire scene over which we have control is the amount of fuel, and that is what we talk about when we refer to fire prevention. We ask people to remove the fuels surrounding their homes so that the intensity of the fire is decreased. Again, I refer to the need to change the legislation whereby the onus will be on the landowner to ensure that his property does not place his neighbour's property at risk. Unless we look at the fuel content and reduce the fuels *in toto*, bushfires, which in the past have caused enormous damage to the State and great heartache in the community, will continue to recur. The issue of fire prevention must be addressed in a more appropriate format than is now available under the existing legislation.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Where will the new equipment be serviced? Will that be done within South Australia?

**Mr Macarthur:** This question has been asked many times. A small component of the \$7.5 million contract has been let outside the State. I can give the assurance that the cab chassis is subject to a substantial guarantee—some four years, I think—against malfunction or component failure by the supplier, CMI Industries, I think. The builders have appointed a South Australian company to undertake any repairs that may be necessary to the body component. There should be no difficulties with any form of servicing, and the appliance is subject to substantial guarantees, which have not been achieved before.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** There are those within the service who believe that a side entry vehicle is much safer than a rear entry vehicle. The question has been raised as to whether the fire blanket cover provided in the contract is adequate for the safety of the persons on board. I fully appreciate the philosophy that applies that they are sent out and we bring them back home but, whilst that sort of fear is being expressed publicly, I would be interested to hear the reaction to those criticisms?

**Mr Macarthur:** As I said earlier, if you asked a thousand different firemen what they wanted in an appliance, you would get a thousand different answers. The consensus of opinion by the design people, those who have put this type of appliance together over many years, and further endorsed by a volunteer committee in this State is that side entry appliances is the way to go. They have said that the fire blanket provision is sufficient. However, in the training programs we do not encourage people to be heroes. If the weather conditions are such that the fire is raging out of control and it is uncontrollable in real terms, those fire fighters are better off away from the scene. We do not want to advance a false sense of security by that vehicle being, in a sense, foolproof all around. We make it as safe as we possibly can, but the training programs educate the fire fighters about fire behaviour so they can retreat under extreme conditions if necessary.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** An attitude has been expressed fairly widely by some people in the local government arena that the Country Fire Services would be better totally controlled by local government. I am aware that that is a very vexed question, even within the ranks of local government. Has a Government view been expressed in relation to that proposition?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I do not know that a Government view has been expressed. I am happy to express one here and now. I think it would be a backward step. I am not too sure that, when it came to the crunch, local government would really want to pick up the responsibility. Almost certainly local authorities would fear that that would mean a greater draw on their own resources so far as the funding of the fire service was concerned. We would almost certainly have to put together some sort of new construct, given the very large number of local government authorities in this State and the variety of environments which they represent, from those in areas of very high fire danger to those where there is very little danger. My feeling is that it would be a retrograde step. This Government does not appear to have been under any great pressure in this matter. The suggestion has been raised from time to time but it has never really been pressed on us.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Very early this year I asked the Minister questions about the involvement of the MFS and the CFS in a fire at Magill. I have not received a reply.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** A reply is on the way. In fact, I approved the text of an answer about two days ago.

**Additional Departmental Advisers:**

Mr B.K. Treagus, Director, Finance and Administration,  
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

Mr D.A. Grubb, Deputy Chief Officer.

Mr W. Kurtz, Accountant.

Mr B.J. McNeil, Systems Officer.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Minister advise the number of people who have been on sick leave in each of the departments for which he is responsible and how many Government vehicle plates have been changed to private plates? Will he identify for the Committee in the various areas of his responsibility land which has been sold over the past 12 months and the value obtained therefore.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will take that question on notice.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I refer to the 1987-88 vote for capital works of \$5.37 million; only \$1.409 million was expended with the deferred amount of \$3.961 million. I take it that the proposed 1988-89 allocation of \$6.9 million includes the deferred sums, because given actual amounts spent last year, there would otherwise appear to be a 389.71 per cent increase. Why was the allocation last year deferred for so long into the year and has there been a change of heart or direction relating to that reduction?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The general rebuilding program that has been flowing through (and I seem to be opening a new fire station with a good deal of regularity) is continuing, but there were some problems, which I will explain briefly. The resiting of the Port Adelaide, Rosewater and Semaphore stations involved delays in relation to acceptance of the station design in the tender process and therefore in obtaining final approval. The effect is that those projects will not be completed until the October 1988-February 1989 period. The resiting of the Gepps Cross station has been deferred until this financial year, mainly due to site foundation investigation being undertaken by Sacon and further discussions about the design of the station, but that is expected to be completed in March to April 1989.

Land acquisition for the relocation of the North Adelaide station has been deferred into this financial year due to problems in obtaining a suitable site. We have only just received approval for the second stage of the Brookway Park State Fire Training Centre. They are some of the reasons why some of the expenditures that we might have expected to make last year were not made and for the high vote this year. Those deferred projects have been carried over. We expect now to be able to maintain the sort of timetable I have indicated.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Minister identify to what degree the new stations will improve efficiency and why have those sites been selected? 'Because they are better' is obviously the simple answer, but is there a means of identifying how the service will improve? Is the building of the new stations totally cost effective?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member is talking about the location and the facilities provided. I will ask Mr Grubb to comment.

**Mr Grubb:** The issues of the location of the stations and reorganisation in the metropolitan area arose from the Cox report and the subsequent working party that was established by the corporation to validate the Cox report and carry out time trials in investigating optimum locations for new stations. The whole of the metropolitan area is classified generally as a B type risk and the response times for the first appliance on scene were established at six minutes (including 78 seconds to receive the call) with nine minutes for the arrival of subsequent appliances. The program was

approved approximately four years ago and there is an ongoing program to gradually build up those stations under the capital works program. Originally, the recommendation for this type of coverage was proposed by Mr Ron Cox and it is a standard generally accepted in most western fire-fighting services.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the services provided by the Metropolitan Fire Service in what we will term rural areas, involving 18 or 19 establishments (an application having been received for a new one at Loxton), is the Minister able to identify the costs of each of those establishments for 1987-88 and the proposed costs for 1988-89? That sort of detail is not immediately available from the documentation and the Minister may have to take the question on notice.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Due to time constraints it might be better if we took the question on notice. The figures I have suggest that the average cost of an auxiliary station is about \$81 220 with a variation from \$36 000 up to \$162 600. Eudunda would incur the lowest cost of the country auxiliaries, with the higher figure being for Mount Gambier. I imagine they are 'all up' figures, but we will obtain more information.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I refer to the construction of four new fire stations and the relocation of crews, and the replacement of the fire boat with a multi-purpose fire and rescue vessel. Taken together, do those two items mean that the level of fire service on the Le Fevre Peninsula might be expected to improve, particularly in view of the development of the submarine project in the area? Is special consideration being given to that in the ordering and construction of this multi-purpose fire and rescue vessel?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Certainly there is little doubt that fire services on the Peninsula will be upgraded as a result of the projects to which I referred earlier plus the work being done on the replacement of the *Karloo*. In relation to industrial establishments, often there are specific demands to be met and in some cases some capacity exists within the organisation to meet some of those demands; when our people address a fire there may be some local capacity from that industry to assist with advice, if not with actual operations. I will ask Mr Grubb to explain what has been done in relation to the submarine project and whether any special arrangements have been entered into.

**Mr Grubb:** The management developing the submarine corporation project have been in touch with the Fire Prevention Division of the service. Part of the discussions has included the provision for suitable facilities for a fire boat. At this stage the *Karloo* and, potentially, a new craft, whatever that turns out to be, should be able to supplement land based fire fighting resources at Semaphore or Taperoo, as it will be shortly, and Port Adelaide.

The efficiency of fire fighting resources on the peninsula will be improved by virtue of the relocation of the Semaphore station to Largs North, whereby it will be in a far better location, more centralised, and will have good traffic routes for access to all parts of the peninsula. Therefore, as part of the overall Cox working party report it is reasonable to assume that the fire fighting capabilities in that area will be enhanced.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I presume that the provision of additional fire appliances to Loxton and Victor Harbor reflects the developing population growth in those areas. In each case, how long are the appliances expected to stem the tide and handle the additional growth, particularly in view of the rate of growth of those towns as retirement areas?

**Mr Grubb:** We have had overtures from both Loxton and Victor Harbor councils for increased protection by the Met-

ropolitan Fire Service. As part of an ongoing program, where it is seen that towns and cities such as Loxton and Victor Harbor are spreading out, where it is considered that we need additional resources to combat the risks that are confronting fire fighters, additional appliances are supplied. The way in which this is done varies depending on the type of risk that is present. It may be that in some cases we would investigate improving the off-road capability with four wheel drive vehicles; in others we would look at general purpose pumper type appliances. It is part of the ongoing program that we keep a track of all stations covered in the country area.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Is the tendency to augment existing vehicles with specialist vehicles?

**Mr Grubb:** The vehicles are normally of a general purpose pumper type and traditionally have been the older appliances used in the metropolitan area and are then passed out to the country areas. At the same time we are ensuring that standards are kept in country areas that are appropriate to the risks involved. Some areas would have relatively new appliances with older appliances as the backup. Others would have appliances of the 1960 or 1970 vintage.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Emphasis has been given to the continued accumulation of data on the risks associated with dangerous substances. I presume that building a data base and retrieval system for information on chemicals would make the task of fire fighting a good deal less dangerous for the fire fighters concerned, but also less safe for the communities in which the fires might occur. Continued emphasis has been placed on familiarisation of crews with local risks at factories and warehouses and so on, that contain dangerous chemicals. What is proposed under that program? How will that data base be added to and how is it proposed that crews will be familiarised with places where dangerous chemicals are stored?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We are collecting a lot of information about building details, site layouts, special risks, the way in which dangerous substances are stored, the availability of water, and so on. That is largely being done by each of the premises being visited by our officers, where all this information can be collected. Each visit is documented by the crew making the initial visit and the information can be used as a basis for training at a later stage. In addition, a data base of details of premises is maintained and can be accessed by the communications centre in the event of a fire or emergency incident.

In relation to information on the chemicals, there is a microfilm system updated twice yearly by the London Fire Brigade. There is also Datachem which is a computer data base containing information on over 50 000 chemicals. This provides information on combatant techniques, hazards, first aid information and details of manufactures and suppliers. That system is now operating. There is a mobile facsimile machine in the fire command vehicle. Copies of information are available at the scene of any emergency and full in-service training on all aspects of the system is being provided to all fire fighters. Therefore, using these two systems, there is no reason why, when our people are responding to an emergency, they should not have the full details of both the hazardous materials stored on the premises and the method of storage.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I take it that personnel in any given situation would have some knowledge of how to decontaminate after a fire at a particular location?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is part of their training and it is also part of this data file.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** In November last year I put some questions on notice regarding the MFS. One of those

questions was: what is the cost of district officer recall to maintain minimum manning, including the provision of sick leave? I have not yet received replies to the questions I put on notice. In fact, those questions arose as a result of questions I asked 12 months ago at the Estimates Committee. I would like to extend that question. I understand that it may not be possible to have the answer provided now. What is the effect of recalls on the fire service budget generally? Are these recalls drawn from within a rank or are people acting up? Does it cost more for recalls within a rank? Can the Minister address the unanswered questions on notice? Is there any reason why these questions remain unanswered?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I apologise to the honourable member. I was fully aware of the matter that he raised in relation to CFS estimates. However, I was not aware that there was a question on notice about the MFS. I will provide that information to the honourable member as soon as possible.

**Mr Grubb:** In relation to recalls and the honourable member's question as to how we try to cover those situations, a lot of it depends on the award provisions at the time in the industrial agreements. As a result of negotiations with wage increases that have occurred in the last 12 months, we have recently been able to have an acting up situation where, if the global total is to the required level—in other words, our total staff on duty are up to a global mark—we can then have the flexibility to have people act up. Therefore, we minimise the amount of recalls that we would have otherwise incurred. Prior to that, we were restricted to having people only from a particular rank carrying out that particular function. Where possible we are trying to keep overtime and recalls to a minimum. However, obviously, with the minimum manning we are required to comply with, we must have a set number of people on appliances at the beginning of each shift.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** In the past couple of months I have put another question on notice asking why those previous questions were not answered.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I am sorry, we will chase them up immediately.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** At page 105, the Program Estimates state:

Continue jointly with the CFS and SGIC on the promotion of public awareness of bushfire and general fire safety.

What is involved specifically in that program, what is its objective and how is it funded?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** One of the things which has been developed in conjunction with the health education and environment education curriculum committee of the Wattle Park Teachers Centre is the children's education kit which will be introduced through the Education Department and through the Non-government Schools Registration Board to all primary schools in the State. Talks have been held with one of the commercial television channels regarding a year round fire awareness campaign, and it is expected that this will start prior to this coming bushfire season. A roadside sign warning of fire danger has been produced, and approaches have been made to local government for councils and corporations to adopt the sign on a State-wide basis.

A second sign designed for use in reserves, parks and other areas where there are such things as public cooking facilities, barbecues, etc., has also been referred to local government for possible implementation. This is something the two fire services are doing in concert.

**Mr LEWIS:** On page 97 of the Program Estimates we find reference to the cost of providing MFS services in rural areas. Following the question asked by the member for



Light, does the Minister think it fair that people in some country communities must pay the same rate *per capita* as those in other country communities who only have CFS services, whereas the people in the communities to which I am referring have to pay rates not only for that service but also for the provision of MFS facilities *per capita* for the entire population of that district council area? Does the Minister realise that this is happening and does he think it is fair?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** It is one of the anomalies of fire service funding and something we touched on peripherally when examining the CFS lines. It is one of the reasons why there have been various attempts from time to time to identify some alternative system of funding. Until such time as an acceptable system arises, we will continue with the present system. That is without prejudice to the possibility of changing some of the arrangements. I indicated earlier that in Naracoorte some time ago the auxiliary was merged with the CFS brigade, but I also indicated that the present position was that any proposition for change in boundaries had to be referred to both services before the Government was prepared to make a decision. It can be done in one of two ways: look at the actual provision of services or look at the funding arrangements. As things are at present, we have inherited a system which we are working through reasonably well. We are open to the possibility of some changes to that system.

**Mr LEWIS:** As a supplementary question, will the Minister consider the notional indication of rate revenue collected from rural areas to which the CFS might apply and notional allocation of the balance to the urbanised part of the district council area in places such as Murray Bridge which, as things are at present, is unfairly hit by this anomaly, especially in view of the fact that there have been approximately three or four callouts a week to each service to the prison at Mobilong as a result of mischief or false alarms of one kind or another—not perpetrated by officers of the Prisons Department. It is pretty tough on the ratepayers of Murray Bridge to have to finance both those services. It double dips everyone's pockets and seems unfair. I think it might be possible to split the two, and ask the Minister how he feels about that.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The Minister is prepared to consider anything, but I can see some administrative problems with the position put by the honourable member. If anomalies arise specifically because of the location of the particular institution, it may be better to try to take that into account in the way in which we fund these various areas. I was not aware that the Mobilong prison was putting particular strains and stresses on our fire service in that area. I will certainly ask for a report and see whether it is an anomaly which we should be addressing. When one looks around the State, there may be other situations, for example, with such things as airports. I know that West Beach Airport has its own firefighting facility, but in country areas there may need to be some additional effort. Perhaps it is not unreasonable that that should be a charge against all of the ratepayers of the State rather than the people in that particular area. That matter will be examined.

**Ms GAYLER:** My first question relates to page 101 of the Program Estimates. Mention is made of the incidence of arson and suspicious fires resulting in property loss and callouts by the MFS. What is the success rate of follow up investigations and prosecutions in relation to suspected arson?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I do not have specific information on the prosecutions. It may be that we can take that question on notice and obtain the information. I have one

interesting and, perhaps, disturbing figure in front of me which I think I should share with the Committee. In the year ended 30 June 1988, 154 fires were investigated in both the metropolitan and country areas, 91 (60 per cent.) of which were determined as having been deliberately lit. David Grubb may have some more specific information relating to prosecutions.

**Mr Grubb:** We do not have specific details, because the fire service is not automatically notified when a person is prosecuted or notified of the subsequent result. I would point out that in relation to the 91 which were determined as deliberately lit out of the 154 fires, there is possibly a lot more malicious ignition or arson within the community. These were fires which were investigated specifically by the Fire Prevention Division, and those were the results of their investigations.

**Ms GAYLER:** Supplementary to that, of those determined to be arson, what percentage are suspected of being arson by the owner or property holder?

**Mr Grubb:** I cannot be specific, because we adopt the attitude that it is our role as fire investigations officers to determine that the fire was not of natural causes. We work in close liaison with the Police Department and once we establish what we think is a case of deliberate ignition, it is up to them to establish who was responsible. So, I am afraid that I cannot help you.

**Ms GAYLER:** My next question relates to major shopping centres where large numbers of people at busy shopping times might be gathered inside the complex. I wonder whether the MFS has any special procedures, plans or arrangements to deal with a fire in such a circumstance. What sort of emergency plans does it have?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** We regularly inspect such premises and indeed, in many cases, the building plans would be referred to us for advice before approval was given under the Building Act. I do not think it would necessarily apply under the Planning Act, but it would certainly under the Building Act. Mr Grubb might like to give you more detail.

**Mr Grubb:** It depends on the design of the building, for example a larger shopping centre and whether it would require an automatic fire alarm in the form of a sprinkler. A centre such as that would receive an A class classification for the risk, to which we would automatically, upon receipt of a report of fire at those premises, responded with four major appliances. Most shopping centres like this have evacuation procedures that have been implemented voluntarily by management, and liaison with them via the commercial safety code requires them to have available within the premises people who are trained as fire wardens. They attend a course that is conducted by the Fire Prevention Division of the fire service.

In the event of a fire in those types of premises, it really gets back to crews, as soon as they appreciate that they have a working incident, upgrading the alarm to bring on further appliances, equipment and men. Our normal standard operational procedures would work from there. Assuming that the fire prevention measures have been installed within the building work, in accordance with their design, and that the people who have been trained to look after the evacuation and general fire safety carry out their duties, the result may not be too bad. However, obviously, with panic that can occur in situations such as that, the end results can be quite tragic. We are currently looking at and developing legislation that would require all premises of that type to have an evacuation procedure and to carry out drills on a regular basis. However, further work is still to be done in that area.

**Ms GAYLER:** So people management becomes the main problem?

**Mr Grubb:** Yes.

**Ms GAYLER:** My next question relates to rescue and emergencies. I would like to know what is the role of the fire service in motor vehicle accident rescue and what mechanisms are in place to ensure coordination between the various emergency services in motor vehicle accident situations?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** In the event of an emergency, Metropolitan Fire Services support tenders from Adelaide, Elizabeth and St Marys are turned out to any rescue incident occurring in the metropolitan area and outside of the gazetted metropolitan district to a nominal 40 kilometres. I guess it is true to say that our people are the front line troops in these matters. They operate in cooperation with the police and SES, which, of course, is within the general aegis of the Police Department.

A rescue resources directory has been compiled to indicate the nearest resource available within and adjacent to all townships and areas within South Australia (of which these are approximately 720) and, generally speaking, we have to ensure that our people are properly trained and equipped to be able to provide an immediate effective response rescue service including people who are trapped in a motor vehicle after an accident, or who are endangered by fire or the escape of a dangerous substance, any of which could follow a motor vehicle accident. I do not know whether the honourable member has seen one of the spectacular demonstrations by the fire service of the jaws of life. If she has not I am sure we can organise it. Our people seem very much to enjoy using that piece of equipment—in the demonstration situation only, I hasten to add.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the programs set out on page 101. We see under the 1988 objectives an ongoing aerial observation and intelligence course. Can the Minister say what is proposed, why it is deemed to be necessary and what is the cost of the program?

**Mr Grubb:** First of all, as part of the Metropolitan Fire Service's responsibilities for assisting with intelligence and JESFIC (which is the Joint Emergency Services Fire Intelligence Centre), which is staffed by police, MFS and CFS officers during a major bushfire, we were of the opinion that anything that could be done to improve the real time intelligence would have to be of advantage to the community. Because of the opportunity to have some people trained in the only course that we were aware of for aerial observers at Fiskeville in Victoria, I arranged for two district officers, who are relatively senior people, to attend a course that they had programmed in November last year to bring them up to speed on this subject. The only costs incurred in that were the airfares to get the people to Melbourne and back again. We were not charged by the Country Fire Authority for their carrying out that function. The course consisted of theory and practical upsets in terms of flying, and to us this seemed a pretty good way of teaching our people new skills.

In terms of the ongoing provisions we appreciate that we have the State Rescue helicopter. However, in the circumstances that we are talking about it is reasonable to assume that the Country Fire Services would be using that for a combatant role in directing their agricultural planes for water bombing and for their people on the ground. Therefore, we did not want to interfere with that process: we wanted to provide an intelligence cell that did not detract from their combatant efficiencies.

We discovered that the Fisheries Department, during that time of the year, has a contract for a helicopter and, as a result of discussions with them, we arranged that when possible (that is, when the helicopter is in, or close to, Adelaide during those sorts of days), if we need the heli-

copter for the emergency services for intelligence, we would be able to get it from them at the same price that they would have to pay for it. In other words, we would try to ride piggyback on their contract. That is the basis of what we have done.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On page 104, again under the 1988-89 targets and objectives, it is spelt out that there is a fire equipment servicing section. Is it possible to say how competitive this is compared to private industry in relation to providing service, and whether it has been effective in gaining additional customers albeit, realising that customers would be against the best interests of private enterprise?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I do not think that my information quite answers the question, but we have some information about how we operate in this area and we will make that available.

**Mr Grubb:** It can be said that the Fire Equipment Servicing Division competes with private industry. Several years ago (I suggest towards the end of the 1970s) the fire service at Adelaide made it plain that we were required to ensure that the FES Division operated effectively and did not incur any additional costs to the community. The great advantage to the community of that organisation is that it sets standards in terms of ensuring that the equipment that is being maintained within the community is to an Australian standard, where appropriate. At the same time, we have the philosophy that, whilst it needs to break even or come out slightly in front, which will enable it to be relatively healthy and continue to keep abreast of the additional costs that are necessary to keep up with the improvements in that type of industry, we do not intend it to develop into a large concern which preoccupies the fire service management with trying to run a commercial enterprise as such.

We feel that, by having that group operating within the community, it also provides a check in terms of pricing because, if we can offer a service involving equipment such as extinguishers, hoses, etc., at a certain price, it ensures that the rest of the community will compete at similar prices to try to win contracts. However, we do not have the actual figures with us.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** At page 107 of the Program Estimates, one of the 1988-89 targets is to continue the program of appliance modification in accordance with health and safety requirements. What does this involve? What sort of modification has taken place on appliances? Why are the costs associated with this action considered to be necessary, and how much safer are the appliances as a result of all the work that has been carried out?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is mainly to do with the relocation of air sets and equipment from the cabin area to locker stowage, as well as modification of the fire appliance steps and grab handles. This is all with a view to reducing accidents and improving safety standards. I do not have with me the actual costs of the program. In total, \$94 000 is provided in this budget for a series of initiatives which includes not only what I have just referred to but also matters such as hearing protection, fire station engine room ventilation, inoculation against contagious disease and radiation survey devices. We will try to obtain a little more specific information but, in round figures, the \$94 000 relates to all those matters with which we are required to deal under the code of principles of the Act.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** In relation to page 105 and the fire prevention and supervision of emergency safety standards program, I recall that two years ago an additional staff position was approved specifically for the purpose of improving fire safety in health premises, such as hospitals and the like. I note that in the specific targets and objectives

for 1987-88 the inspection and monitoring of health buildings has continued. As the program has run for two years, what progress has been made on this important area for the safety of personnel working in and around Health Department buildings?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** In the past financial year 181 surveys of health buildings were undertaken by the service; 58 reports were formulated from plans supplied; 43 detailed replies have been forwarded as a result of these inquiries; 51 in-office consultations have been conducted; and 10 evacuations were followed up with further fire service input. So, a good deal of work has been done in that area.

**Ms GAYLER:** In relation to page 101, metropolitan fire suppression and control, reference is made to CFS/MFS relations. What is the extent of the cooperation and mutual assistance between the CFS and the MFS?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** First, the mutual aid plans are formalised through the fire services bringing out standard operational procedures dealing with dangerous and radioactive substances, emergency rescue, bushfire and mutual aid procedures, aircraft emergencies and civil disturbances. The organisations that are parties to these standard procedures are the South Australian Police Department, the CFS, the RAAF and the Department of Aviation, the State Emergency Services, St John Ambulance and the Metropolitan Fire Service.

Regular exercises are carried out by the Joint Emergency Exercise Writing Team to maintain skills and assess the effectiveness of these procedures. There are also the shared facilities in relation to training. I suppose in that respect the major beneficiary has been the CFS, because that is where a considerable amount of effort had to occur by the very nature of the fact that it is a volunteer-based organisation, whereas the MFS is a fully professional service and, therefore, rather than its being an invitation to be trained, there is a requirement to be trained. Those are the two areas in which there has been a very high level of cooperation in recent years, and I believe that that will continue to an even greater degree.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Page 105 of the Program Estimates states that one of the broad objectives is to minimise the danger to life and property losses by encouraging the inclusion of fire prevention features in structural design and building practices. Until quite recently (in fact, it might still apply) the Adelaide City Council was requested to provide assistance in relation to fire prevention in buildings. Notice has been given that that will change, and the Adelaide City Council suggests that such a change will cost the building industry about \$90 000, because the council will no longer be able to provide such direct assistance. Officers will now have to go to headquarters and then back again, whereas previously they could be dealt with directly at the Adelaide City Council. Is the Minister aware of this situation, and has the effect that it will have on the industry been analysed?

**Mr Grubb:** Because of the volume of work that the Adelaide City Council has traditionally undertaken in relation to major projects that require a considerable amount of time and a lot of money in terms of the developers being at risk, we have found it to be more expedient for an officer to visit on a weekly basis the Adelaide City Council's Building Surveyor's office, where he has discussions with the Building Surveyor and the Senior Building Inspector about drawings, and, where possible, drawings are approved at that time. If it is considered that more time is required because of the complexity of the particular building, those plans are brought back to the fire service, where the officer works on them at his desk. The Adelaide City Council's

concern was brought to my attention and, as a result of that, I contacted the Building Surveyor. However, the action that was necessary to solve the problem had already been implemented prior to my talking to him so, although that was an issue, it was very quickly addressed by the MFS so as to ensure that the problems did not occur.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** I have some information further to the request from the member for Heyson in relation to the \$94 000 for vehicles and equipment. The amount being spent on the vehicles for occupational health, safety, welfare etc. is \$20 000, of which \$3 000 is for the relocation of what is called the BA equipment, and an additional \$17 000 is for inertia reel seat belts. The amount of \$20 000 relates to the vehicles and the balance is for the hearing, protection, radiation survey devices, etc.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Program Estimates indicates that guidelines have been drawn up for the inspection of places of public entertainment and licensed premises. Subsequently, there is an expectation that some action will follow. Does the Government intend to proceed with this, and what will be the cost?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** If the premises comply with the standards, it will not cost them anything. I guess it costs us a little bit to send out our officers to inspect the premises. We are looking at exits, exit signs, emergency lighting, positioning of hose reels and extinguishers (and making sure they are provided), hydrants and that sort of thing. The inspection is usually done under normal trading conditions. To date the inspections have been conducted only during normal office hours, but the service plans to introduce out of normal hours inspections in the near future. What I am saying is there has been a mismatch between when our people work and when these places are open for inspection, and that is being addressed.

An additional staff position is included in the budget for this purpose this year. We will then commence the after hours inspections. Hotels that offer accommodation—I guess they all do under the Licensing Act—are inspected by the Building Fire Safety Committee which can recommend additional fire safety measures other than those required under the places of public entertainment licensing regulations. I will defer to my officers for specific examples of where additional expenditure has been required by a place of public entertainment as a result of inspections carried out by our people.

**Mr Grubb:** As the Minister said, the actual cost to the owner of the premises or licensee would depend very much on the standards of safety. In this forum questions have been asked about what the fire service is doing in terms of inspecting places of public entertainment etc. Because of industrial restrictions, we have not been able to do anything about it, because the award provisions prevented us. In the past 18 months we have been able to negotiate so that we can have officers rostered to work various nights of the week until midnight. They go out and see what is going on and, I suggest, encourage the management of premises to use more efficiently the fire safety features that they have in their premises. We really do not know about things like locked exits unless we receive a complaint from the community. We do not get the opportunity to learn about that. The actual cost to the fire service this year will be \$48 000, the all up cost for the officer plus the allied costs to the people out there. It depends on how good or how bad they are.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is a user pays system?

**Mr Grubb:** They will not be charged by the fire service. Under the Act we are responsible for fire prevention and we have the authority to inspect any building or premises

to ascertain whether people are complying with our Act or any other Act. We are checking to ensure that places of public assembly and so forth are complying with the Building Act. They will not be charged for that although, if people are in default and do not do anything about it, there is the consideration that that there should be a system of fines that will eventually be imposed. At the moment that has not been developed.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Auditor-General's Report (page 400) indicates that at June 1988 there were 191 country auxiliary firemen whose salaries comprise an annual retainer and payment based on actual fire duties. I would appreciate some indication on the retainer fee plus the cost of the fire duties payments.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I will provide that information for the honourable member.

**Additional Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D. Hunt, Commissioner of Police Department.

Mr D. Hughes, Director, Administration and Finance.

Mr J. Humphries, Manager, Resources.

Mr M.D. Wall, Chief Resource Analyst.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** From the Estimates of Payments I note a relatively sizeable increase in the amount available to the police this year to \$20 353 600, or 12.77 per cent. In the crime prevention area, there is a 14.91 per cent increase, and for police capital works \$25 736 000 is proposed compared with \$15 915 000 actually expended in 1987-88, an increase of 61.71 per cent. Notwithstanding this increase in funding, if one looks at the Auditor-General's Report one sees that there is a reduction in the number of police on duty as at 30 June 1988. There is a public perception that the police are not as available or that there are delays in the police attending particular incidents.

I can cite couple of examples. A triple murder occurred in the Riverland last Christmas/New Year period and Star Force police were in the area but were withdrawn before the culprit was apprehended. During the following morning, another person was injured. As recently as this week, a person was killed in a motor accident at Penola in the South-East. The accident occurred at 6.45 a.m. but the accident investigation police were unable to attend until 3.30 p.m. The deceased's body was in the car until 4.30 p.m., and for most of this time traffic was diverted around council roads, the main road being closed. That, I am told, is creating some public concern in the area. When the question was asked, 'Why were the accident investigation police not flown down because of the seriousness and urgency of the situation?' the remark is alleged to have been made, 'That there was insufficient money to allow for that immediate reaction.'

It is against a background of incidents of that nature which might be individual and which might not be common that I ask the question about the public perception that police presence is not as freely available as one might expect it to be.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** In formulating this year's budget the Government decided that the whole area of community policing should be exempt from the general requirement of agencies to have to find savings of 1 per cent to 3 per cent, or whatever it might have been. We were endeavouring in that respect to respond to that perception. However, there was always a problem in matching supply and demand in terms of the number of cadets being provided through the Academy. The honourable member would be aware of that period of reasonably high attrition about three years ago when we were running into problems because the Academy

was not able to produce the replacements for those leaving the service. We were able to beef up that side of it, but now, for reasons about which we should all be happy, the attrition rate has dropped considerably and we are running at a little below 4 per cent, which is quite comparable with the rate in the public sector generally. That meant that last year the mismatch was working in the other direction, so for most of the year the Police Department was over strength because of what had been going on. This year the figures represent a movement back to the agreed strength of the Police Department.

It is a little difficult to comment on specifics, although in relation to the matter in the South-East, I am assured that we would not refuse the use of the aircraft in those circumstances and I can only say therefore, in relation to those allegations, that I will try to obtain more information for the honourable member. I guess on any occasion where people experience a response which is less than they would like it to be, the tendency is to assume that the Police Department is under-resourced. Our force does compare favourably with the police forces in other States.

The honourable member also mentioned the increase in capital payments. In anticipation of a more detailed question I will briefly explain what is involved. The \$26.73 million is made up of about \$7.6 million for the Communications Centre, which will eventually cost us about \$12.37 million; about \$3.3 million for other communications equipment; \$600 000 for computing equipment, links to JIS and so on; \$8.7 million for motor vehicles purchases (and that is up considerably on last year—in fact there are an additional 32 vehicles); and \$5.5 million for a number of building projects.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** What was the attrition rate over the past five years so that we have a comparison?

**Mr Hughes:** There is attrition from active strength and attrition within the cadet area. Attrition from active strength over the last five years is as follows: in 1983, 103; in 1984, 117; in 1985, 119; in 1986, 179; in 1987, 157; and, in 1987-88, 141.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I refer to community policing and the police presence generally. There has been some public exposure of apparent changes in relation to the J & K Divisions and the deployment of those persons. I would appreciate an overview of the action taken and the perceived advantage against the background of the allegation that that is wasteful of certain strengths and likely to leave some specialist areas less well attended than in the past.

**Mr Hunt:** For quite some time we have been working towards making our police facilities better able to cater for organised crime, white collar crime and corruption. It became apparent that some rationalisation of the crime command was required. Two or three things had to be done. Before we could enter into programs, as we are beginning to do now, there had to be some reapportionment of the staffing facility. Part and parcel of that was the need to change the way in which the command operated, particularly in relation to the Major Crime Squad.

If we were, quite properly, to delegate greater managerial responsibilities and to disperse skills more widely, we had to have more skilled people in suburban areas to pick up the more serious crimes occurring in their own area and become more self-sufficient under the regionalisation and delegation processes. That would provide the opportunity of amalgamating the Special Crime Squad and the Major Crime Squad, thus increasing from 36 to 50 the number of people who could deal with what we call the organised crime/major crime components. We have now done that and we are organisationally placed and, on a skill basis,

better able to launch into other programs and training to deal more purposefully with matters which would properly come under the heading of organised crime and corruption.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I refer to the changes that have been undertaken in the knowledge that, for example, in the Drug Squad a set period of three years has been determined as the period for deployment. Is it intended that in these other areas there will be a tenure and, if so, will it be as short as three years or for an extended period? What is the general thinking at the moment?

**Mr Hunt:** As a general probability there ought to be some sort of tenure, if only for the purpose of future development of the officers themselves and to give them wider scope. It ought not be, as unfortunately has been reported in some places, that this move has been brought about because of corrupt levels or to prevent corruption within the organisation itself. We do not take that situation lightly. But in conjunction with the intelligence units, the National Crime Authority and the Australian Bureau of Intelligence, we have been gearing ourselves to deal with corruption in the wider community in the way it should be done.

**Ms GAYLER:** I refer to page 85 of the Program Estimates where the greater movement of criminals throughout Australia is referred to. The trial of crime boss David John Kelleher, widely reported in the *Advertiser* in recent days, demonstrates that State boundaries are no barrier to criminal activity. I note that his South Australian contact was a former constituent of mine. How is South Australia's Police Force dealing with the problem of criminal migration between States? What cooperative efforts exist between State forces, Commonwealth bodies like the Federal police, the National Crime Authority and, in the case of migration from other countries, customs?

**Mr Hunt:** The notion of criminal movement throughout Australia is a problem that has been exercising the minds of all police departments, law enforcement agencies and customs services throughout the country for quite some time. Over the years, with the advent of the commissioners' conference, the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence, the Crime Command Conferences, the joint working parties and quite a number of other organisations and regular meetings of minds on this problem, a very cooperative approach has been developed. Part of the end result is a computerised link with all intelligence networks in the country and, indeed, overseas. It is in that way, and also by joining together with joint task forces and sharing information, that we are able to come to grips with the problem of people migrating from one State to another.

In relation to the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence (ABCI) and the National Crime Authority, there have been a number of initiatives. In 1981 the ABCI was formed and South Australia shares that involvement with all other States. In fact, for the current year I am Chairman of the board of management of that organisation, which is located in Canberra. In 1983 we allocated another eight members to be posted to the ABCI in South Australia for the purpose of investigating organised crime. Part and parcel of that is an ongoing relationship between the ABCI and the National Crime Authority. Officers are seconded to both the ABCI and the NCA. One officer is on permanent secondment—that is, as permanent as can be, on a two year renewal basis—in Melbourne. As I indicated earlier, one of the benefits of that personal liaison from one State to another is supplemented by the computerised intelligence system which is in place.

**Ms GAYLER:** What progress is expected during this financial year in establishing more neighbourhood watch areas and to provide secretarial support for the scheme? I

note that the Minister addressed the annual seminar of neighbourhood watch in August and gave an indication of support for extending the scheme. The Minister would be aware that in Tea Tree Gully there is strong support both at the existing neighbourhood watch level and at the local police level for expanding the scheme.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The first commitment was to provide somebody who would be able to undertake full-time secretarial duties. That person has been selected and negotiations have been held with the neighbourhood watch organisation, which found that person satisfactory. That officer will commence duties almost immediately and will operate from within the Crime Prevention Services area of the department. We have been able to immediately identify resources which will enable a 50 per cent increase of provision of new neighbourhood watch areas this year. Therefore, we will be looking at about 90 rather than 60 which is, when you think about it, one neighbourhood watch scheme being implemented every four days. Of course, this will help considerably in enabling us to meet the very high demand for neighbourhood watch services in the community.

There is also the rural watch program which we have been moving into. This scheme will begin with a couple of pilot programs, one at Peterborough and one at Mylor. They will be operating within the next few months. We would expect that the success of those schemes will, in turn, lead to considerable demand in the rural areas for more of this type of service.

**Ms GAYLER:** I note that one of the specific objectives for 1988-89 is to coordinate and implement recommendations of the State Government's task force relative to child sexual abuse. What does the department have in mind in this very difficult area?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Of course, the Commissioner is a member of the South Australian Child Protection Council, which was one of the recommendations of the task force. That council first met on 8 July last year to consider the ways in which we should be proceeding. Three sets of recommendations need to be dealt with, and we are giving priority to them. The first was a review of departmental policies and procedures under the auspices of the State council to ensure that we are all moving in the same direction.

Then there was a series of recommendations relating to the formation of child abuse inquiry teams to investigate joint police and Department for Community Welfare approaches to interviewing child victims in order to reduce the number of times a child is interviewed, given that the child is probably in some sort of trauma in any event. No matter how sensitively these interviews are conducted, some additional trauma is probably involved. Thirdly, the task force recommended that the State council ensure all relevant departments and agencies establish training and skills development in the area of prevention and the alleviation of child sexual abuse as a priority. The council's workers have access to financial assistance to enable them to undertake that work. Of course, we are cooperating in that area. I will provide the honourable member with further details by letter.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I understand that there are currently about 60 cadets in training. The Minister mentioned earlier that numbers in the Police Force had been brought up to the level foreshadowed. However, there certainly is a perception in the community that there is a staff shortage in the Police Force. How are the training courses scheduled? When will another group of recruits be taken on within the training program?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That is part of an ongoing program.

**Mr Hughes:** There are currently 70 cadets in training. The process used to determine the number of cadets that are taken in at any one time is that we project attrition over the next two years and recruit against that, based on an approved active strength agreed with the Government annually. It is when fluctuations occur, and with the attrition that I mentioned earlier, that the process of predicting whether or not we are taking in enough cadets for training becomes very difficult.

Since August 1987 we have had more cadets coming out than our attrition rate, and are in a situation of being over strength at any one time by up to 50 active police officers. This situation will continue through most of 1988-89. We are currently over strength by about 50. We believe that that will peak by December at almost 70, reducing throughout the financial year to a line ball situation at the end of the financial year.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I should add that December is not a bad time to be peaking, because the summer months are usually those more related to, if not serious crimes, then certainly to people getting themselves into trouble when they are out of doors.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I understand that a request has been made for all patrol members, metropolitan and country, including one and two man stations, to be vaccinated against hepatitis B. Is this practical? It has been put to me that the cost has decreased substantially from in excess of \$100 to approximately \$23, due to technology having produced a synthetic vaccine. What approach is now being adopted by the Government?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Initially, hepatitis B vaccinations were provided to 175 members in high priority positions, those operationally exposed to suspected carriers, and they were placed on what is called the three course immunisation program. In May of last year specific funds were provided for the immunisation of a further 383 members located in high risk areas. As at June of this calendar year, 1 746 members have completed or are in various stages of completing the immunisation course of three injections. To 30 June this year, therefore, \$151 999 has been spent on the program. A further \$38 000 has been provided initially in this financial year to enable the completion of the three injections by those already in the program, and for up to 200 officers transferring into high risk areas.

Consideration is being given to the requirement for post-immunisation blood testing and immunisation of other members at risk, and this will be funded from the round sum allowance. It is, therefore, a little difficult at this stage to give any more details, particularly about how much we will spend on the program, but we understand its importance, and priority, and we will do what is necessary.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I take it from that that it is not intended that all patrol members be vaccinated.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I doubt whether at the end of this financial year we would be able to say that that has happened. We will be concentrating on the high risk areas for the time being. The other aspect is in relation to cost. The cost on which we are still operating is an all-up cost for the three injections of \$109.50. We will take up the matter indicated by the honourable member, but I am not quite sure where this \$23 figure came from.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Is it a fact that the Police Department is seeking to have provisions of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act not apply to police officers engaged in operational policing? If so, what are the

exact intentions of the Police Department, and how far has any research into the matter progressed at this stage?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We do not have a great deal of information on this. I believe that discussions are to take place with the union, but what is not clear to me is how the matter was initiated. Perhaps we had better obtain more information on that. I expect that for the most part we will be endeavouring to comply with all the requirements of that Act. There is a sense in which police officers, like firefighters, are in a particular situation of hazard. One cannot altogether get out of that, despite the existence of such an Act. If we do so, we vitiate our capacity to do our basic job. We will obtain more information on that point.

**Mr GROOM:** What impact has the opening of the Bank Street Police Station had on the policing of the entertainment precinct of the city? The community has a far greater feeling of security as a consequence of the location of that station. Can the Minister indicate how many staff are attached to that station?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The station has a strength of 31, largely provided by a reallocation of resources from Angas Street. A number of programs arise out of that: one is a 12-month pilot program in Hindley Street, jointly developed by us with the Department for Community Welfare and representatives of the Aboriginal community.

It consists of a cautioning system for juvenile offenders and the operation of a youth support group. The aim of the cautioning system is to develop and reinforce the authority of operational police. The youth support group, staffed by paid Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal workers, will be available during peak demand periods to liaise with youths (particularly Aboriginal) to prevent the development of circumstances likely to lead to police intervention; to liaise with youths (particularly Aboriginal) in response to police calls for assistance; and to liaise between police and youths generally. These will be extensive training of police and youth support group personnel, which will commence in January 1989. The pilot program will cost \$280 000—\$264 000 will be allocated to DCW and \$16 000 to be provided by the Police Department from within its existing budget. The strength is 31.

**Mr GROOM:** At page 87 of the Program Estimates is the following statement:

To continue with an expansion to the schools liaison program in cooperation with the Education Department.

I have always seen this as an important facet of police responsibility as it enables children to see police in a more personal and protective light. What is the function of the schools liaison program, what is the role of the police and what is intended in the future?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It is all part of the community policing concept that was introduced some years ago. What is called the 'Police Education Program' was first piloted during 1984-85 at Underdale High School where it was regarded as a great success. It has been extended to 22 high schools throughout the State, and it involves 44 police officers. It is primarily educational, of course. It is aimed at improving police/student/teacher perceptions through the social interaction of all these people.

Selected police and teachers work with one group of students throughout the school year. Children are usually drawn from year 10 and we deal with basic criminal justice material, road and vehicle safety, firearm safety, the courts system and other related topics. It seems to be going well. We would like to extend it even more quickly but, as is always the case with these matters, there are resource implications.

**Mr GROOM:** On page 88 of the Program Estimates these statements appear:

Conduct a review of the operational/staffing procedures for prosecutions. Prepare training curriculum for practising prosecutors to update knowledge.

As this is an important facet of police activity and training, will the Minister explain the review contemplated of operational staffing procedures and the training curriculum involved?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** It sounds like a question for the Commissioner.

**Mr Hunt:** The purpose and objectives of the review are twofold: first, to ensure that sufficient prosecutors are available to service the court workload and to be as efficient and effective as possible; and, secondly, to ensure that the workload of each prosecutor is not so great that he cannot devote his greater time to some wider learning and to increasing in his own skills. In the past prosecutors have been so overloaded with their caseloads that there has not been time to devote to further and wider learning. That is one of the major thrusts of being able to build up the knowledge strength of prosecutors who do an excellent job, but there is always the need to do better.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before calling on the next question, I will close the line 'Capital Works—Country Fire Services Board, \$2 675 000', and declare the examination completed.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I have a series of personnel related questions concerning the attrition rate and the view expressed that some senior constables who were to be disadvantaged in relation to the new salary package were going to leave the force. In a breakdown of those who have left the force, has that occurred? In other words, is there post-resignation counselling of officers to determine why they leave? In that respect it may be possible to identify to the Committee, if not tonight, in the not too distant future, the reasons for people leaving during the 1987-88 financial year. Some would be because of age, some because of disciplinary action, etc. but I seek a breakdown more specifically of those who may have left because they were disaffected by the apparent salary arrangements.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** No one was actually going to lose salary as a result of the changed arrangements, but there was a group who would not have been advantaged as much as the rest of the force, and that is where the problem arose. I remember receiving a deputation from the Police Association on the matter and having it referred to my colleague the Minister of Labour. I am not aware of exactly how the matter was finally resolved, but the Commissioner may be able to provide more specific information.

**Mr Hunt:** At this stage I have a qualified answer, but I can get that information for the honourable member. The problem arose during negotiations on restructuring. Wage levels were agreed between the association and DPIR, but there remained a gap of some 200 personnel who were less advantaged than other members. However, it was known that that situation would cure itself within a given time, which I think was two years. There were—and still are—other areas to which those members could transfer if they so wished, and individuals are considering that kind of arrangement. We do not have any particular statistics as to what component of the resignation or attrition rate is composed of senior constables first grade.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** I have some figures which relate to general categories of separation. Mr Hughes will supply that information and then the honourable member can indicate from which of those categories further information is required.

**Mr Hughes:** There were 34 age retirements, 19 invalid retirements, 90 resignations, one dismissal and one death—

a total of 145. Of those, 145 were from active strength (to which I referred before) and four were inactive. In addition, we had 11 cadets separate.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** Clearly it is the 90 that the honourable member is interested in. We will try to obtain more information.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The problem with respect to the cost of housing for those members of the Police Force in country areas was occurring at about the same time as the salary problem. I believe that they are still paying the same amount or in the same proportion as they were previously. Is that a determined position by Government, or is it still fluid, and can the Minister identify the Government's thinking on that matter at this time?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** The Government has always made it clear—and I have considerable backing from the former Minister of Labour on this matter (and I am sure that I have it from the present Minister, but as yet he has not had to address his mind to it)—that the police are in a special position in this respect because these matters associated with housing are part of the award. Therefore, any global approach to Government-provided housing for State employees must take particular account of that matter. That has been conveyed to the Minister of Housing and Construction, who has the overall responsibility here, and that is why there has been no movement.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Have any officers knowingly contracted, as a result of their police activities, hepatitis B or AIDS? How many officers are currently off duty suffering from stress and what are those stressful circumstances alleged to be?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We have information about one member who contracted hepatitis B, apparently as a result of a fight, while he was arresting an individual at Peterborough. After that he became ill, visited the doctor, had a blood test and was diagnosed as having hepatitis B. Apparently that member did not follow the policy laid down in the hepatitis B exposure procedures which, as I understand it, allows for fairly rapid post-exposure treatment where there is a chance that they may have been infected by a person with a fairly high incidence of the disease. So far as we are aware that person subsequently resigned from the Police Force.

We have no knowledge whatsoever of anyone contracting AIDS as a result of any of their normal activities with the force. We have taken some initiatives in relation to training to assist our people in this matter, for example, providing better mouth-to-mouth resuscitation equipment combined with St John training. I could go on with those sorts of matters.

We have a number of programs that are designed to increase the awareness of members about stress and its impact on their health and work performance. It is something which the Police Welfare Office and the Police Psychology Unit cooperated in developing. A weekly meeting occurs between the Senior Police Psychologist, the Police Medical Officer and the Senior Police Welfare Officer to assist in the management, treatment and rehabilitation of employees suffering severe stress reaction.

The committee obviously, in confidence, works towards the resolution of the individual's problems by rehabilitation, recommending alternative placement or invalidity retirement (whatever seems to be appropriate). There are also what are called post-trauma intervention procedures, and one can well imagine the sort of circumstances that could arise where a person may, perhaps in an extreme case, have seen a fellow officer or close friend shot down. Every attempt

is made to get to that member and provide appropriate treatment at that time.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Supplementary to that, have any members of the force who have been disciplined or shifted in their employment reported in later, suffering from stress?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I would be very surprised if there had not been.

**Mr Hunt:** Recently a number of people have been put in that situation and have not attended work because of claimed related stressful factors. Our Personnel Department follows up and makes sure that the necessary medical certificates are provided. It also consults with the police medical officer, under the general aegis of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Committee within the department, to consider what is appropriate for those people or anybody who is off on stress or other related illnesses or long-term illness. There is some knowledge of those kinds of cases, and the Personnel Department takes a great interest in them.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** How many people have been involved?

**Mr Hunt:** I cannot give you the figures at the moment, but it is not a large number. If you want more exact figures, we could obtain them from the records of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Committee.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Recently, the Victorian police announced the purchase of 73 Magna GLXs from Mitsubishi, which is an Adelaide based company. Given that \$8.7 million has been allocated in the budget line for the provision of additional police vehicles, has any thought been given to the purchase of Mitsubishi vehicles, especially as the Victorian police will use those vehicles not only for general duties but also for patrol duties? The Magnas are locally produced and perhaps they would be cheaper to run and purchase than the available alternatives.

**Mr Hughes:** We are considering what vehicles will be used for future patrol purposes, because the Commodores that we currently use as patrol vehicles have gone out of production and we now have a new EA Falcon and a new VN Commodore. Both are quite distinctly different from previous vehicles. As a result, we propose to purchase an equal number of those two types of vehicles so that we can assess their performance in the field for a period of at least six months before making any decisions about six cylinder or five litre patrol vehicles.

We currently have 111 Magnas, which is quite a significant increase in four cylinder vehicles, because several years ago we had no four cylinder vehicles whatsoever. In addition, we have 11 Camiras. At this stage, because of the special requirements that have been laid down for operational purposes, Magnas have not been considered as general patrol vehicles. We will monitor the Victorian situation closely but, at this stage, no serious consideration has been given to moving to a four cylinder vehicle for general patrol purposes.

We are taking one step at a time. We are now running five litre vehicles. The move to a six cylinder vehicle will be quite significant and, from an operational point of view, we want to obtain the views of the people out in the field about the new Commodores and the new Falcons before considering any further steps. However, I think that any moves are unlikely in the immediate future.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** As a supplementary question, I take it that, if the Victorian police felt that the Magnas were adequate for patrol duty, you might stay in touch with them to ascertain the performance of those vehicles.

**Mr Hughes:** We will monitor the Victorian situation, but at this stage we have not considered moving to a four cylinder vehicle for either general or traffic purposes.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** My question concerns page 85, crime detection investigation services, and the intention in the current budget year to coordinate and implement recommendations relative to domestic violence. A number of reports have seen the light of day in recent years, including the task force on child sexual abuse, the report on victims of crime and the domestic violence task force. One could add to that the recent select committee on the firearms Bill. As a result of all of those, including the recent evidence given to the select committee, what role are firearms seen to play in domestic violence? What countermeasures have been proposed, particularly in relation to operational procedures of the Police Force? In other words, has any thought been given to revising operational procedures in light of conclusions of the aforementioned report and the select committee?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I ask the Commissioner to address the question relating to operational procedures.

**Mr Hunt:** Because we have had the benefit of a computerised firearms registry and licensing system, before tasking anyone to a domestic violence situation we are able to advise the patrol before its arrival whether there is a possibility of firearms being registered in the name of that person. This trend and practice has been carried on by Police Forces interstate and overseas and, for quite some time since our registry has been operating, we have been able to give an indication to the patrols that there could be the likelihood of firearms at that address and whether there is a propensity to use firearms in a way in which they are not intended. Operationally, we are aware of the safety factors of the members of the Police Department.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Have any of those reports changed the department's view of the role of firearms in domestic violence or in threatened domestic violence to children and women, in particular?

**Mr Hunt:** Yes. I suppose it affects our thinking when recommendations are made for amendments to firearms safety and education generally within the community and for licensing. Public safety was one of the foremost factors when the Firearms Act was reviewed in 1977, 1978 and 1979.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** For a number of years, the department has had a re-entry policy to enable officers who retire relatively early in their careers to re-enlist at a later date. I understand this was introduced with a view to re-recruiting female officers who may have left to have children. My understanding is that that policy precludes anyone over the age of 30 or thereabouts from re-entering the force. In the light of the tendency of women to have their families later in life is that bar on people over the age of 30 deemed to be appropriate? Has some thought been given to raising that age, particularly in view of the amount of money spent training both male and female officers?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First, we need to determine what percentage of males and females seek re-entry and, because that information is not available at this stage, we will undertake to get it. The honourable member has a point. The statutory upper limit has been in place for some years and has been generally supported, but these things need to be re-examined from time to time. My reason for asking for that information is to determine whether we are addressing a demand that, in fact, is there. The first thing to do is to get that information and then do a bit of work on it.



**Mr ROBERTSON:** It seems to me that it might stand on its own feet in terms of cost benefit analysis. Such an enormous amount of community resources goes into training officers that it seems a great pity to lose officers after a few years when they could be enticed back into the force at a later date if they were not cut out by a bar of real or imagined efficacy at age 30.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** We will obtain more information for the honourable member on that matter.

**Mr LEWIS:** Referring to the traditional role of the policeman's wife in country postings, in the first instance we need to realise that the New South Wales Government has taken some initiative in this regard by recognising the very real contribution that is made to the policing presence and effort in the absence of the officer when she takes messages on the telephone and other inquiries made to the station, noting what the caller has as a concern when seeking to communicate with the duty officer.

Does the South Australian Government recognise that there is a benefit to the policing service and the community provided by wives historically that ought to be addressed in the same way? Is it not a bit sexist to simply leave it to the wives? There may be husbands of women officers who could be appointed to country postings, if they were ever seen as having the appropriate qualifications to cope with the rigours, especially in physical terms, of such postings. Thirdly, and even more importantly, nowadays many policemen have chosen not to marry until they are much older and more advanced in their careers to the point where they are given country appointments at a sufficiently senior level to make them officers in single or two-officer stations. If he does not have a wife, the entire duties fall to the one spouse of the two officers.

Finally, what consideration might be involved if it turned out that a husband and wife combination of police officers was posted to the same police station where there are two or three officers? That would be the fairest way of doing it. Otherwise, if one went to a country posting and the other presumably was posted to a station further afield, that would impose even greater stress on the marriage relationship since there would be an inordinately greater amount of travelling time involved. How is the Government currently addressing those problems?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** First, in an ideal situation, it is probably to be regarded as undesirable that the spouse should be involved, because even something as innocent as taking telephone messages may have some element involved which can properly only best be addressed by somebody who has had some training in police work. Having said that, we have to concede that in remote locations that is unrealistic, and in fact the department is very appreciative of the support offered to it by police partners.

The Police Partners Association is fairly active. I was its guest speaker on one occasion, not so very long ago. We liaise with that association fairly regularly. It has not at this stage made a formal approach to the department for anything like payment for partners of officers in country areas. For that matter, so far as I am aware, the New South Wales Government has not as yet adopted a procedure. As I understand it, there is a recommendation, but that has not yet been fully adopted.

A project is being undertaken in the department to identify factors relating to the conditions of service of country police officers and their partners, particularly in remote areas, and to recommend improvements where needed. Some progress has already been made on such things as the security of premises, telephone diverters and communications in general. That work will continue and liaison is occurring

between the officers undertaking the work and the Police Partners Association. We will endeavour to keep the honourable member informed.

**Mr LEWIS:** In my district the level of police staffing is the lowest of any area in the State, yet multiple problems are created by a large urban area (there are more than 1 000 Housing Trust homes in Murray Bridge) right next to intensive animal industries of a variety of kinds. There is now no stock squad and no rural watch, yet deaths and so on occur. I am concerned that there is also the complication of the necessity to police leisure activities along the river where drunken people drive speedboats through swimmers and so on. That puts enormous stress on such a small work force, given the number of people who commute in and out of the areas and those who do not understand the mores of country living. Will we get a fairer go?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** The Commissioner tells me that the need for three additional appointments has been identified and they will occur as soon as is practicable, given the necessity for transfers.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I understand that the Commissioner is State Coordinator of the State Disaster Committee. How prepared is South Australia for the possible re-entry of Cosmos? Much concern has been expressed, but I would like to know what precautions have been taken.

**Mr Hunt:** The general state of preparedness of State organisations such as the State Emergency Service for any kind of disaster is competent. With regard to Cosmos and any other such phenomena that might occur, we have a network of information which is fairly good. There is usually a high predictability regarding any of these foreign objects. Obviously, given some descriptions, the area in which they fall can be fairly wide and we get down to only .2 per cent predictability regarding where they might eventually land. However, two days ago I noticed a communication from the State Emergency Service stating that the Director will brief a combined group of emergency services on this aspect within a few days.

With the network of information available from overseas and Canberra, such as the natural disasters organisation and other sources, and the organisation that exists in South Australia to counter disasters, we are as prepared as we can be for any eventuality.

**Ms GAYLER:** My question is about victims of crime, specifically victims of domestic violence. I ask this question bearing in mind that about 55 per cent of homicides are of a domestic nature and having yesterday attended a seminar on domestic violence which, in large part, was initiated and supported by the Tea Tree Gully police along with other service organisations in the community. What is the Police Department doing about implementing the recommendations of the Domestic Violence Task Force; and to what extent is the department reinforcing the fact that domestic violence is a crime? Is there any substance in the suggestion that some police officers are reluctant to proceed with restraining orders and/or criminal charges because of the excessive paperwork involved and, if so, can anything be done about it?

**The Hon. D.J. Hoggood:** I would be most disappointed if, in a genuine case of domestic violence, officers of the department were not prepared to proceed simply because there was a bit of work involved. Generally speaking, of the 274 recommendations of the final report of the South Australian Domestic Violence Council, 50 impacted directly on the department, and we are working through those as quickly as we can. The work is undertaken within the Victims of Crime Branch. A good deal of work is being done to reassess current policies and procedures and partic-

ularly to identify the need for urgent upgrading of the restraint order computer system. There is an examination of possible crime prevention strategies, as well as liaison with agencies such as women's shelters, the domestic violence service, the domestic violence prevention unit, and Crisis Care to ensure a uniform approach to these issues. Also, there are initiatives dealing with training and education programs and research.

Suffice to say, we do take the matter very seriously. Where a criminal activity is involved we make clear that we regard it as criminal activity and treat it as such. That is notwithstanding the fact that often it is difficult to identify blame in some domestic situations to which the police are called. That will always be a classic dilemma for a police officer.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Earlier the Minister indicated that he was aware of the need for every endeavour to be made for police to work in an occupational environment that was safe and adequate for the purpose. I notice that in some of the documentation there has been a delay in providing driving skills to some members of the Police Force. I do not know whether that has played any part in a spate of recent accidents involving police drivers. Is the Minister or the Commissioner aware of any other areas of police activity where equipment is used regularly that is likely to lead to occupational danger to personnel?

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** We will obtain that information for the honourable member and provide it later.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to that issue, can the Minister indicate whether the police are totally satisfied with the operational virtues of the emergency helicopter and whether tenders called previously will be acted upon, thus placing police into a unit of higher capacity? That will be advantageous to the public generally.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** First, the tenders are being examined by the Committee, and I expect to receive recommendations fairly shortly. As to the present helicopter, we have always maintained and I think we have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that, provided that it is operated within its operational limits, it is safe. A couple of problems have had to be addressed. One was the winch, and getting a better system for it, which is proceeding. The other was some problems with the night sun, which seemed to relate to excessive vibration. That has been resolved simply by not having it on the aircraft in daytime, which reduces the amount of vibration to which it is subjected, and considerably lengthens the life of that equipment.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the examinations completed. I lay before the Committee a draft report.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I move:

That the draft report be a report of this Committee.

Motion carried.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the Committee adjourned without fixing a day.

At 9.57 p.m. the Committee concluded.