

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 20 September 1989

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
 The Hon. B.C. Eastick
 Ms D.L. Gayler
 The Hon. R.G. Payne
 Mr D.J. Robertson
 The Hon. D.C. Wotton

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: The procedure will be relatively informal. I will notify changes to composition of the Committee if and when they occur. If the Minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and two copies must be submitted no later than Friday 6 October to the Clerk of the House of Assembly.

I propose to allow the Minister and the lead speaker for the Opposition to make an opening statement, if they so desire. I will adopt a flexible approach in giving the call for asking questions, but on the basis of about three questions per member, alternating sides, and allowing for supplementary and follow-on questions also. Subject to the convenience of the Committee, members who are outside the Committee but who desire to ask a question will be permitted to do so once the line of questioning on an item has been exhausted by the Committee itself. An indication in advance to the Chairman will be necessary. Questions must be based on the lines of expenditure as revealed in the Estimates of Payments. However, reference may be made to other documents, for example, Program Estimates, the Auditor-General's Report, etc.

Environment and Planning, \$41 143 000
 Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous,
 \$1 278 000
 Works and Services—Department of Environment and
 Planning, \$6 200 000

Witness:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan, Minister for Environment and Planning.

Departmental Advisers:

Dr I. McPhail, Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.
 Mr J. Hill, Director, Departmental Services.
 Mr N. Johnson, Chief Finance Officer.
 Mr G. Stafford, Director, Environment Management Division.
 Mr C. Harris, Director, Environment Division.
 Dr B. Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens.
 Mr B. Leaver, Director, National Parks and Wildlife and Conservation and Land Management.

Mr N.P. Newland, Deputy Director.

Mr M. Harvey, Acting Director, South Australian Waste Management Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditures open for examination, and invite Ms Lenehan to make an opening statement.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: In my time as Minister for Environment and Planning I have come to appreciate the wide sweep of interests and responsibilities of this department. At the same time, community awareness of environmental issues has promoted an unprecedented interest in global and local environmental matters. This means that my department and its officers are not only involved in the management of a broad range of legislation and operations, particularly in national parks as land managers, but also they have been called upon to participate heavily in the various forums and debates on environmental matters. In addition, the increased acceptance that issues are not simply local but national, indeed, international, has meant that the interests of my department have also involved expanding activity in relation to the Murray Darling Basin, national land care programs and the Australian and New Zealand Environmental Council.

Interests have been as diverse as involvement in discussions on Australia's international position on ozone depleting and greenhouse gases at one end, to participation in the Prime Minister's housing summit at the other. In 1988-89, my department operated almost exactly within its allocated funding and staffing. On a strictly cash basis, there has been an underexpenditure of some \$7 000 in a total budget of some \$60 million. Because certain of the funds are rolling in character, the accounts show variations in expenditure from that predicted, but these simply reflect the nature of the activities over a period of years which are not able to be accurately calculated as a single year result.

The urban renewal fund, which is the basis for the highly successful inner western redevelopment program, is one case in point. Also, in 1988-89, a figure was provided for the sale of the Kingsmead and Belmont properties, acquired for heritage protection purposes. These sales were finalised in that year. The settlement has occurred in this financial year. I was delighted that not only have these buildings been saved, they have been purchased by owners who are clearly committed to proper restoration while the State received a return that not only covered the purchase price, but also its holding costs.

In the national parks and wildlife area, 1988-89 was a year of considerable achievement. The parks system grew to some 11.1 million hectares, which is currently expanded through the addition of the Nullarbor and Anstey Hill to some 13.74 million hectares, which is approximately 14 per cent of the State of South Australia. This included the nomination of the Innamincka and Simpson Desert regional reserves under legislative changes, earlier agreed to by Parliament, which enabled multiple use within a long term conservation framework. This has represented a major commitment to accommodating prior uses, particularly the mining industry, in a way that is constructive and directed towards conservation of these outstanding areas. Although the use of this category has not been without its controversy, it has been, I believe, a creative and innovative approach.

Also, in 1988-89, the first full year of the operations of the General Reserves Trust has been completed. With the agreement of Cabinet and Treasury, all funds raised by entrance fees, and all other charges within the parks system, are returned to the park, where funds have been raised to be used for works and activities.

The result of the general reserve trust operation has been the employment of the equivalent of 25 full time staff. Some of the activities included in this program are seasonal ranger employment, seasonal program at Flinders Chase, Innes and other parks, increased guided tours at cave parks, and upgrading office facilities at Belair and Cleland parks. The general reserves trust has also provided incentives to the highly decentralised park management which has responded with many creative approaches. Throughout the recent period of restricted public sector resources I am pleased to report that the field staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service is at an all time high. The number of field staff is 240.7 full-time equivalents (and these are funded positions), compared with 216.8 last year.

In 1983 the South Australian Government took the courageous and far-sighted step of introducing legislation to manage the clearance of native vegetation. Initially highly controversial, there is now general acceptance in the community that this was a correct step to take not only for the preservation of habitat but also for land care and global atmospheric reasons. Following an extensive review with the United Farmers and Stockowners general agreement was reached on the operation of legislation and form of payment which should be made to farmers who accepted a decision not to clear their land and to enter into heritage agreements with the Government.

Interim acquisition to the park system was some \$5.6 million. In 1989-90 an additional \$3.5 million has been allocated for a total expenditure of \$9 million for this year for the purposes of this program. Continuing discussions with the United Farmers and Stockowners looked towards further refinement of the administrative processes and relative early completion of the program. In the planning area the development of debate is one of the most active. In the South Australian system the formal players are the State Planning Commission, the Advisory Committee on Planning, local councils and my department. However, a wide range of others expressed their views either in response to the ability to make submissions or lodge applications or through general community activities. The 1982 Planning Act provides a framework within which each debate can be handled by the relevant planning authorities. Strong pressure exists from some to remove appeal rights and to restrict the role of councils while others argue for extended community consultation and much more localised control. The Planning Act must provide a framework within which these various forces can resolve matters of development control fairly for all concerned.

Stronger policy statements have been made in the development plan. In 1988-89 a marina development strategy based upon the identification of suitable sites on the metropolitan coast indicated clearly to the community when marina developments could take place. This is also part of a rational strategy for a boating industry based on day sailing destinations and the recreational use of the Gulf waters. It was in this context that the Sellicks proposal was rejected following clear and early warning to the developers. It is in this same context that the Marino Rocks proposal has been announced. Urban consolidated principles were introduced into the plan with the support of the Local Government Association and all except a few councils. This now provides a framework for local government and in the preparation of residential amendments to the plan.

Nevertheless, the debate over the assessment of major projects is vigorous. I have issued a White Paper suggesting changes to the Planning Act which would bring together many of the arguments advanced. Many submissions have been made but a number of key submissions, particularly

one from the Local Government Association, are not yet available and consequently I will be extending the time for comment to permit these to be received. However, it is still my objective to have the amended legislation in Parliament by the end of this year. I would hope that all those who have expressed and continue to express strong views from one perspective or another will be able to see the need for balance between necessary development on the one hand and environmentally sound decisions on the other.

For the assistance of members, I would like to inform the Committee that the department went through a fairly substantial restructuring in February 1988. These comparisons for the two financial years have been made more complex by these changes. However, no significant changes to total resources have been made. The variations therefore reflect divisional rearrangements.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Light wish to make an opening statement?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: No. In the interest of getting some questions on the record, at 11.17 a.m., I would like to add just one rider to the arrangements entered into. We will first look at the Botanic Gardens line so that Dr Morley can leave the Committee. Before turning to that matter, will the Minister make available to the Committee information about whether she has a car or cellular telephone rented or paid for at taxpayers' expense, when it was installed, what the cost of acquisition and installation was, and the operating costs in the last financial year and this financial year to date? I seek a breakdown of costs to indicate local, STD and ISD calls as well.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, I do not have a car phone, but the Department of Lands does own a portable telephone to which I have access for use, as do other members of the department. I cannot give the honourable member information in detail about the other questions, but I would be more than happy to provide that. I do not believe that we have any ISD facilities. Certainly, I have never used any ISD facility, and I do not know whether any breakdown is kept between local and STD calls. However, whatever information is available I shall be more than happy to provide.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now start the round of questions.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Was that not a question?

The CHAIRMAN: It was a preliminary question which I have allowed.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I refer to the figures provided at page 143 of the Estimates of Payments in respect of the Botanic Gardens. There has been an effective increase of funds available of 5.86 per cent. It is also indicated at page 389 of the Program Estimates that there is to be a 2.6 person full time equivalent increase in staff. We are aware that the new conservatory is coming into full existence from an involvement point of view. Can the Minister indicate to the Committee in what way the traditional role of the Botanic Gardens will continue to function having regard to the additional expense of providing for the conservatory and an additional 2.6 FTE persons at a point where we are not even meeting inflation in the funds made available to this department?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will be asking the Director of the Botanic Gardens to flesh out the reply, but I understand that we have made extra funds available. Additional operating resources have been made available for the new tropical conservatory. These are additional funds and we are not asking the Botanic Gardens to find that funding from its normal budget. I ask the Director to elaborate on that.

Dr Morley: The board of the Botanic Gardens was delighted to receive Government support for the develop-

ment of a bicentennial conservatory to celebrate the bicentennial year. The board has always been adamant to the Government that it could only entertain such a possibility if additional resources were made available.

This would be for manpower and operating costs. These have indeed been made available by the Government, as the Minister has indicated. The board has sought to rationalise some of the activities in the Botanic Gardens in terms of the tropical plant display facilities, so as to economise on manpower and that has also involved a rationalisation of the nursery operations of the Adelaide Botanic Garden. This means that, in effect, the Botanic Garden nursery will no longer exist and the staff that were required to run it will be split, part of the staff going to Black Hill flora centre, where the Adelaide Botanic Garden nursery facility has been relocated.

The rest of the Botanic Garden nursery staff have been consolidated to provide public plant display facilities, and they will be supplementing the additional staff made available by Government to run the tropical plant displays in the Bicentennial Conservatory, Schomburg Range and, later, the old palm house. In a nutshell, additional resources have been made available by the Government and internal streamlining by the board has permitted certain economies to enable the garden to maintain its traditional standards of maintenance and excellence.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Program Estimates show that there has been a 5.86 per cent increase in actual funds made available, from \$3 506 930 to \$3 712 300, with an anticipated inflation rate in excess of 6.9 per cent. In fact, no further resources are available over capital which has already gone into the production of the conservatory.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: An extra \$156 000 was made available to the Botanic Gardens (and that equated to two full-time equivalent salaries) to provide additional operating resources for the new tropical conservatory, so I do not know what the honourable member is getting at.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: These figures do not equate with inflation. The Director has indicated that operations are winding down in other areas to allow for that new initiative to be taken.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I take it that the honourable member is suggesting that we should have allocated even more resources to the Botanic Gardens, in excess of the increase that was allocated in the budget. At the end of the day that must be a decision taken by a Cabinet and Treasury. We have made adequate resources available to the Botanic Gardens and, as has been clearly articulated by the Director (Dr Morley), with the extra funding and reorganisation of some of the functions of the gardens, we are able to operate a quality service and to provide the functions needed to run the Botanic Gardens to the standard that people in South Australia have come to accept, and that will continue into the future.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It has been demonstrated that we have not kept up with inflation and that the reorganisation of procedures will allow the conservatory to come on stream, and the Opposition is thankful for that. Is it possible to identify whether, with the opening of the conservatory, further capital expense will be required to provide ancillary services to the conservatory, such as additional parking, drainage or any other as yet uncompleted subsidiary works?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask Dr Morley to answer the question.

Dr Morley: Additional costs are anticipated but they relate primarily to the rehabilitation of the STA depot, which is another of the Government's innovations in returning park-

land to the community. We hope that in the future more extensive water storage tanks can be built to catch rainwater from the roof of the conservatory. That is the sort of long-term economy that we are seeking. The only place in which we could build those underground tanks would be on the STA depot. Those sorts of developments are contingent on the vacation of the site. One or two other things must be done in the conservatory, but that is further down the track and they will not be of great financial significance.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Were those additional costs contemplated in the original costings for the project, or have they emerged subsequent to the original undertaking?

Dr Morley: They would be refinements to the original concept.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Regarding Dr Morley's reference to additional land being made available from the STA depot, a further .4 hectares at the southern end of the conservatory was made available in June to enable the construction of the sculptured pool, pedestrian access and appropriate landscaping, and an additional \$210 000 was made available for that redevelopment, which included the demolition work. The funding provided also for the preparation of landscape design for the whole of the Hackney depot when it is made available to the Botanic Gardens. Thus, the Government is honouring its commitment to remove the temporary car park and move forward with the restoration of the Hackney bus depot to public ownership and use. I believe that that answers fully the honourable member's question.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Program Estimates (page 395) state that an additional \$232 000 has been made available in the budget for the tropical conservatory. Will the works referred to by Dr Morley be completed within that allocation, or will there be an ongoing capital expenditure in subsequent years?

Dr Morley: There will not be any substantial capital investment in further years.

Ms GAYLER: How are the tropical plants settling into their new environment in the tropical conservatory?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I thank the honourable member for her interest and I congratulate her on the fact that she raises so many issues relating to the environment, this being yet another. I have visited the conservatory and the staff shared with me their delight at the way in which the tropical plants have grown and the misting system is working effectively. From my own experience I believe that the plants love their new home and are thriving. However, Dr Morley, the expert in this area, may like to add scientific information to my first but pleasing impression of the conservatory.

Dr Morley: The plants are doing well. I would like to invite all members of the Committee to visit the conservatory; we would be delighted to show them that the plants are making progress.

Ms GAYLER: I note from the Program Estimates (page 389) that it is anticipated that receipts for the Botanic Gardens will increase substantially this financial year. From where will that increase come?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: First, entrance fees are to be charged. I understand that the trust's income includes bequests and other donations, but Dr Morley may like to elaborate.

Dr Morley: An entrance fee will be charged for people who wish to go into the conservatory. We do not know how many people will wish to go through in a year, but we have almost 700 000 visitors a year to the Adelaide Botanic Garden. We estimate that approximately one-seventh of those would wish to go through the conservatory. The adult entrance fee is \$2, a child \$1 and \$5 for a family. That is

one area where we expect to gain some receipts. Another area where we expect to gain receipts relates to the board's initiative into sponsorship. Members of the Committee will be interested to know that the Adelaide Botanic Garden is at the forefront amongst Australian botanic gardens seeking sponsorship much along the lines that American botanic gardens have done for 10, 15 or 20 years. Substantial benefit comes to the State through these successful sponsorship deals that have been worked out by the board with particular companies.

Ms GAYLER: In light of those comments about the entrance fees to the tropical conservatory, is the Minister prepared to consider recognising the Government's new senior card as well as pensioner concession cards for the purpose of providing seniors with a concessional entrance fee to the new tropical conservatory? The Government's seniors card has been welcomed amongst older members of my electorate, and I know many other members' districts. I know that the Premier is interested in other organisations recognising the seniors card for the purpose of providing concessions for the elderly.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, concessions will be provided, but at this point the conservatory has not been officially opened. A definite policy with respect to how those concessions will operate, or who will be eligible, has not been formulated. I would certainly be prepared to consider the proposal that has been put by the honourable member, and I am sure that the board will be prepared to have a look at that as well to see whether concessions can be offered; in fact, they will be offered but what the concession will amount to and the range of people who will be eligible for that concession has not been considered yet.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As a former trustee of the Botanic Gardens, I would be happy to take up Dr Morley's invitation. That concludes the questions relative to the Botanic Gardens. When does the Minister expect the dolphins to be removed from Marineland?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I cannot give the honourable member an answer to that. I remind the honourable member—as I have done in Parliament on numerous occasions—that the owners of the dolphins are Allert Heard, but specifically Mr John Heard who is dealing with the relocation of the dolphins and the medical and health requirements that are necessary to ensure the health and well being of these delightful animals. I cannot answer that question: I could certainly make inquiries from Mr Heard and either informally or formally let the honourable member know whether there is a proposed date of relocation, whether the medical tests have been finalised, or when it is proposed that they will have the results of those tests. However, I cannot give any more detailed information than that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I acknowledge Mr Heard's involvement, but I believe the Minister would accept that in her portfolio area she has responsibility for the well being of these animals whilst they are in South Australia.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, to the extent that I am responsible for the well being of every animal in South Australia, which is a fairly onerous responsibility, might I remind the member for Light. I am sure the honourable member—being a veterinarian by training—will probably understand it is a fairly enormous responsibility. However, to the extent that I have the responsibility as Minister for animal welfare, yes, I do have that. However, I am not responsible directly for the actual ownership or, I suppose, in any way more than I am for every other animal. I have obviously tried to be helpful and tried to facilitate—

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes; I have not, but if I did I would have to declare that, wouldn't I? I take the honourable member's point. I am the Minister responsible, but to that extent I am also responsible for every other animal in the State.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In this capacity is the Minister able to indicate whether she sought advice from the Government's Animal Welfare Advisory Committee about the ability of the Marineland dolphins to survive their relocation to Queensland? If so, what was the committee's advice, and, if she has not consulted the committee, is she able to tell us why she has not and whether she will now do so?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I remind the honourable member that the animal welfare section currently resides with the Department of Lands. I would be happy to provide that information later in the day under that portfolio area. I remind the Committee that there is no funding line for the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee under the particular lines we are examining. I would be delighted to obtain that information and provide it to the Committee if someone would like to ask that question this evening when we are discussing Lands. In fact, it does not come under the Department of Environment and Planning. We could perhaps discuss at some other time the merits of it coming under the Department of Environment and Planning, but at this point it is still officially located in the Department of Lands.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I appreciate that there is some overlapping of responsibility under these two hats that the Minister wears: one being the involvement with native animals and their well being, the other in relation to the Animal Welfare Department. Did the Minister receive a report in June from Dr Obendorf relating to the current health and fitness status of the dolphins at Marineland? What was the cost of this report?

Ms GAYLER: On a point of order, as the Minister has just pointed out, the Department of Lands lines are the area where the animal welfare responsibility is dealt with, not the Department of Environment and Planning. So, those questions should more appropriately be asked this evening when Lands officers are available for advice.

The CHAIRMAN: Do any of the proposed payments that are read out this morning under the Department of Environment and Planning lines relate to the welfare, maintenance and purchase of animals or any related matters?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: They do, but not specifically to these dolphins; they relate to animals under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, but with respect to these particular animals, no. That comes under the Department of Lands.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Chairman, I was drawing attention to Program No. 6 which relates to flora and fauna and park management. I am not talking about park management in this sense. I am looking at fauna in the broadest possible sense, and the Minister, when in another place, has stood to defend the interests of the dolphins.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am delighted to acknowledge that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: But she has not got a mortgage on the interest of the dolphins.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, certainly not.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: We all have. It is in that context, recognising the balance between the two, that I sought this additional information from the Minister because she has answered in another place in relation to her overall involvement.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Certainly, but there is no funding allocations under this particular department. I am more

than happy to answer questions all day on dolphins. I would be delighted to do that. However, in terms of the point of order raised by the honourable member for Newland, no specific funding line relates to these particular animals which are being referred to by the honourable member for Light.

I have a general responsibility for all animals in this State. There are funding responsibilities under some of these programs that would relate to animals in terms of the national parks and other parks, but there are no funding lines relating directly to these animals in the lines that we are considering.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask for the Committee's cooperation to see if we can reach agreement on this. If the Committee had not timetabled the lines in the way that it had—if it had just left it to me—I would have read out all the lines and then everything would have been open to discussion, pell-mell. Of course, in the old days that is exactly what happened; questions criss-crossed in all directions. I did not do that because the Committee agreed to split the proposed payments into three segments. The Committee asked that I split the payments in that way. Given that, I can only ask for some cooperation to reach agreement. Is it, or is it not, convenient to discuss the dolphins at this time, or does the Minister want to wait until this afternoon when more appropriate advisers are present?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Because of the way in which the honourable member asked for this division of portfolio responsibilities within this timeframe, I have organised for the officers from the Department of Lands to be here at 7.30 tonight. We will discuss animal welfare under that section. There is a section under the payments line for animal welfare. I can answer the honourable member's questions off the top of my head, but I do not have the relevant papers and reports with me here, nor do I have access to my adviser on animal welfare, because I took the honourable member for Light's suggestion and implemented it in those terms, rather than having a cast of thousands of public servants sitting here when they could be most productively working in their department.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can assure the honourable member that it gets smaller as the day goes on. I do not think it is a very responsible way to run Government or the Estimates Committees, to have every adviser for every area attending, given the huge number of areas, for example, in the environment and planning area. I do not think it is appropriate to then add the advisers from the Water Resources and Lands portfolios. This is the way the Committee has been organised. If the honourable member wants questions answered this evening, I am sure that if he is not available one of his colleagues would be delighted to ask them on his behalf and I will answer them fully and thoroughly.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am quite happy for that to take place. However, when the Minister has been speaking as the Minister for Environment and Planning in the past relative to dolphins, she has really been talking as the Minister of Lands.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I probably got the call in the Parliament as Minister for Environment and Planning as the Speaker has recognised me as such. Maybe the Speaker did not realise the prime responsibility for these dolphins lies in the portfolio area of Lands. It may be an issue that needs to be taken up with the Speaker. I have a general responsibility for the dolphins as Minister for Environment and Planning, but there is no funding line allocated under this line for that purpose.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I refer to the Minister's responsibility for waste management, and the positioning of the

regional rubbish dumps. There have been a number of occasions in recent times when there has been some public disquiet, not the least of it is currently raging relative to the Carpenter Rocks area, which the Minister has visited, and upon which the community is still waiting to learn whether the original site will be the site utilised, or whether there is an alternative site. If so, what is that alternative and what is happening in general terms in relation to that project?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have visited that area, but I do not have the specific details that the honourable member has requested. However, I am very pleased to ask Mr M. Harvey, the acting manager of the Waste Management Commission to answer the question.

Mr Harvey: The proposed depot at Carpenter Rocks is still under consideration. The Waste Management Commission commissioned the Department of Mines and Energy to undertake a drilling survey to ascertain the ground water characteristics of the area. The results gained from that survey are currently with the E&WS and we are awaiting its advice. Our future action is contingent on those results.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can assure the honourable member that we can probably answer that question in more detail when the officers of the E&WS appear later in the day.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I take note of the advice that will be forthcoming in due course and I appreciate it. Will the Minister provide to the Committee an indication of what regional sites have been determined in South Australia, or those areas that are in contemplation and almost complete? I appreciate that that may be sensitive information and I am fully appreciative of the difficulties; it is necessary to be absolutely sure before a final statement is made. In 1984 a considerable amount of public consultation took place; there has been a reorganisation of the commission since then and there is now a new chairman of the commission. There was a 10 year plan, not a lot of which would appear to be in the final form. However, the general direction has been given. It is on the basis of that continuing involvement that I seek further information.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Given that the honourable member has asked for a number of things in his question in terms of identification of regional areas for that activity, I think it would be more appropriate to provide him with an answer at a future date.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I take it that that information will be provided in time for inclusion in the *Hansard* report?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It will be within the timeframe that has been set.

Mr ROBERTSON: I refer to the announcement made this morning by the Minister and the Premier in relation to a housing development at Marino Rocks. On behalf of a number of local residents I wish to clarify some issues. The first matter of concern to local residents in the Marino and Hallett Cove estate areas is the possibility of additional traffic flow on Cove Road. It is probably a relatively minor matter in the broad scheme of things, but people living on Cove Road, who already have great difficulty in getting access to that road because it carries several thousands of cars per day, would feel disadvantaged if there were an additional traffic load on Cove Road. What provision has been made in the proposed development to take care of traffic generated by this development to ensure that that traffic does not add to the already significant load on that road?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As a previous member for the area to which the honourable member refers—and that is the area Cove Road traverses, a fairly significant residential area—I can tell the Committee that in the proposal released

this morning the developers will build a specific road to the housing and marina development. That road will directly link back into the Lonsdale Highway. What this means is that all residents in the Marino Rocks and Hallett Cove area west of the railway line will then for the first time, because part of the proposal is an underpass—the road will in fact go under the railway line—have direct access for the first time to Lonsdale Highway and, if they so choose, across Majors Road to Main South Road.

They will have direct access in both a northerly and southerly direction. The effect of this will be to remove the kind of traffic that has already existed on the Cove Road rather than exacerbate any further traffic problems. This is an incredibly positive aspect of the development which will remove some of the traffic that is traversing through that built up residential area. As the honourable member knows there is a nasty S bend before crossing over the railway line at Marino, and residents in that area will certainly more than welcome this proposal because it will certainly improve the amenity of the local residential area.

Mr ROBERTSON: I take it the road mentioned by the Minister up to Lonsdale Road might have the additional benefit of providing some sort of buffer between the existing quarry at Marino and the area of housing at the Karrara portion of Hallett Cove. I ask the question because people in recent weeks in Karrara have become increasingly alarmed at the prospect of quarrying near their front doors or back doors, so to speak, and I am sure that they will welcome any aspect of the development which would impose an additional buffer between them and the quarrying operations. I understand that Quarry Industries impose a buffer which is essentially voluntary and which has not been imposed by the Mining Act and, therefore, I presume if it is a voluntary buffer it can be just as voluntarily withdrawn. Would the additional road between the quarry and Perry Barr Road provide those residents with some guarantee of a buffer between the housing development and the quarry development?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is my understanding that under the Mining Act there is a provision that, where there is private mining under the private mining provisions, there is a requirement that where it encroaches into residential area there must be a 400 metre buffer zone. However, I will check that. Notwithstanding that, it is my understanding that the current mining operations are more than happy to provide that 400 metre buffer zone.

This whole project will do a number of things: it will mean that we will see a curtailment of the encroachment of that mining area into residential area; we will see the early planting of a screening and buffer zone which is vitally important. As the honourable member says, this new road will provide a further buffer in terms of a break in the visibility of this mining operation as well as the provision of trees, roadside vegetation and that sort of thing. There is, in a sense, yet another buffer to be provided for residents, between the mining operation and their current residential position.

Mr ROBERTSON: Residents of Perry Barr Road or residents abutting Perry Barr Road at Karrara have raised the concern that any road from the marina connecting directly on to Perry Barr Road rather than running through directly on to Aroona Road would, in fact, create additional traffic at the fairly troublesome junction of Perry Barr and Aroona Roads which is already a problem for local residents. The suggestion has been made that it would be better to run that access road to the marina directly off the northern portion of Aroona Road where it heads east-west down to the marina, rather than run the access road to the marina

on to Perry Barr Road, thereby doubling the load on the Perry Barr-Aroona intersection and creating another difficult Y intersection on the junction of the access road and Perry Barr Road.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, negotiations have already commenced with the developers in terms of that road feeding directly into the northern section of Aroona Road rather than feeding into Perry Barr Road and then Aroona Road. I can assure the honourable member that developers are certainly positively looking at that slight change in the proposal. I will be supporting the negotiations in terms of having that road fed directly into Aroona Road and I am sure the residents will welcome that because it will also mean that a lot of the traffic that may well have fed in from the western section of the housing developments and up through Perry Barr Road and into Aroona Road will now be fed directly into the new road so that, in a sense, they will see less traffic on Perry Barr Road. Once again, as I answered in the previous question, there will be less intrusion on the amenity of residents living on Perry Barr Road. I believe they will welcome this road and welcome the fact that it will be fed into Aroona Road and then into Lonsdale Highway.

Mr ROBERTSON: I turn to the aspect of the marina proposal which involves housing on the eastern side of the railway line. One of the concerns of local people there will be that some of the land that is currently open grazing land, zoned rural B, will be alienated to housing. That is how much of the rural land has finished up in past years. What do the proposals involve in the way of a trade-off for the loss of the area which is going to be converted from open grazing land to housing? Will any thought be given to providing additional land in the so-called hills face zone to compensate for that loss in land for housing?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Having regard to the position we have found ourselves in a little earlier, I ask whether the realignment and rezoning would not more correctly fit into the planning portfolio, which will come on later this afternoon?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I invite the member for Brighton to ask another question.

Mr ROBERTSON: This is a related question in any event because the other concern about land use in the hills face is the area which is presently between the proposed boundary of the development, as I understand it, and the existing housing at Bunderra Road in Marino. The area of land in question at the moment is owned by a multiplicity of owners including Department of Environment and Planning, the Marion council and the like. I understand the plans are currently before the national parks authority to amalgamate a number of portions of land there and replace all of that land under the control of the department as a designated conservation park. The conservation park has not been gazetted although meetings have been held to form a friends group to look after the park after it has been gazetted. Will the development pose any threat to the valuable and somewhat fragile area of coastal heath land which is preserved in that park, and has any thought been given to allowing at least a notional or visual buffer between the northern end of the marina development or housing development and the southern boundary of the proposed park?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There are two answers. First, consideration will most certainly be given to providing a suitable buffer, and once again negotiations will be taking place with the relevant Government officers, including officers from my department, with the proponents of the development. The point raised by the honourable member initially

needs to be pursued. In fact, negotiations are currently going on within the department to ensure that all the land is brought together. I can give my assurance that I will be moving as expeditiously as I can to have that conservation park gazetted so that we will ensure that the land remains as preserved open space for the residents of that community and those of South Australia for all time.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I turn briefly to the question of waste management. In the other information that will be forthcoming, will the Government also indicate the number of prosecutions taken by the department and information about how many prosecutions have been successful? I ask that question against the background that there have been a number of threats of prosecution but more recently I understand that there have been few prosecutions taken to court. While we are getting an overview of the waste management program—I have no hesitation in saying that the bulk of the community applauds control over what otherwise was a haphazard and unfortunate series of disposal programs in the past—it has proved difficult to pinpoint alleged transgressors for prosecution purposes.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I take it that the honourable member refers only to prosecutions under the Waste Management Commission. I ask Mr Harvey to reply.

Mr Harvey: Prosecutions under the Waste Management Act can be difficult. One gets a number of fly-by-nighters who take advantage of particular situations. The commission has been resolute, particularly with prescribed or hazardous waste breaches of the Act, in taking action. From memory, we have two organisations in court. We successfully prosecuted one earlier this year. I would say that we average about three or four prosecutions a year.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am happy to provide the accurate figures, because it is important. I believe the intent of the question is whether the Act has sufficient teeth in terms of some of the breaches that we are finding. I can assure the honourable member that, while I have only been the Minister responsible for waste management for a short period (the honourable member would acknowledge that responsibility for waste management came across from local government), if necessary I will be moving to strengthen the Act next year to ensure that we are able to fully pursue the prosecutions which need to be pursued.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I extend the question to encompass the distribution of waste materials, particularly waste fluids from industry into natural watercourses and sewers. We run into the problem now of dealing with water resources, but is the Minister satisfied that everything is being done that the community would expect to be done? Without naming names, I refer to fluid going from an operation in the Thebarton area into a local creek. The fluid had previously been going into a sewer. The discharge is now conveniently located under a little bridge so that most people do not know that it is happening.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like to answer that. The member raises a serious issue. I hope that, if there is evidence that anyone is discharging material illegally into the E&WS or any other watercourse or land mass, that information will be given immediately to the relevant authority. I can assure the honourable member that we would pursue that unashamedly and relentlessly, because that is a gross breach of the regulations in respect of a number of Acts—not just waste management legislation but some of the water resources Acts.

In reply to the question about whether we are doing absolutely everything that the community would demand, it is something that no Minister at any time in the history of this Government or any Government could comment on

absolutely. We can do things better, as I have indicated on a number of occasions. For example, legislation will be introduced into Parliament by me soon—and I have given notice of that publicly—seeking to arrest marine pollution. Soon we will have legislation looking at point of source marine pollution, and the penalties will be very severe. We will have the ability to police these areas.

The question always gets down to one of resources: do we have officers standing at every E&WS drain or every E&WS outlet and creek in the State waiting to catch people dumping illegally, particularly liquid waste? I am aware that the Act needs to be strengthened, and that is one of the things I will be doing in the future in terms of revamping the water resources legislation. Obviously, we are not going to have that kind of resourcing, and I do not believe that the member suggests that we have it. I believe that the answer to the question is that at this stage we are doing as much as is humanly possible to ensure that we prevent that kind of person—one could hardly imagine the sort of person who would deliberately want to dump toxic liquid waste in our environment—from dumping in the environment. We are doing everything to ensure prosecution of these people but, at the same time, I am going to strengthen the legislation to make it much tougher for them to get away with it. Indeed, when they are caught, the penalties will be incredibly severe.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I advise the Minister that the information to which I have alluded is in the possession of four Ministers of the Crown, from the Premier downwards.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I think you are referring to something that goes back a long way.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: No. A great deal of the interest has only been in 1989 and it still has not been corrected satisfactorily. I do not intend to name the site publicly, other than to alert the Minister that this information is in the possession of the Government. I will come back to the Minister in due course on that matter.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I hope the honourable member would give me that address privately so that I can ensure that this matter is followed up as quickly as possible. It is one thing to allude to these things—I am not for a moment suggesting that the honourable member is doing this for anything but the purest of intentions and that he believes as strongly as I do in the protection of the environment—but I ask him to provide me privately with that information, because the matter must surely come under one of my two departments. It might relate to the E&WS Department or the Waste Management Commission and we can have that investigated immediately. Certainly, I would be willing to make a public apology if that information has been given to one of my departments and has not been acted on as quickly as it should have been. I will remedy the situation immediately.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Referring to the area of pollution management, I refer to program 7 (page 145 of the Estimates of Payments) and the increase from \$1 753 446 to \$1 826 700, an increase of only 4.18 per cent, in other words, below inflation. What the Minister has said about pollution, of the seas and generally, again is a matter which has quite unequivocal bipartisan support, but how will the necessary level of public benefit be provided while the financial position is deteriorating?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Certainly, the Government has increased the proposed amount, but I call upon the Director-General, Dr McPhail, to respond to the honourable member.

Dr McPhail: In the area of coastal management, particularly sand replenishment of metropolitan beaches, there

have been increases in the past few years, but the accounting arrangements have been changed. Consequently, there has been a reduction to recurrent expenditure, in relation to transfers to the Coastal Production Fund.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The officer is saying that there has been a negative 1.4 per cent growth in coastal management? The Program Estimates relate to pollution management. The Minister has indicated that a similar amount will be put into pollution management efforts, yet there is an increase of only 4.18 per cent for 1989-90?

Dr McPhail: The increases do not take into account any potential changes to salaries and wages in this current financial year, so one assumes that the outcome would be adjusted by whatever wage adjustments occurred. Therefore, to that extent, the proposed expenditure on salaries and wages relates to existing awards and payments, but will change during the year, with alterations. There has been quite a substantial increase for plant and equipment, but this budget does not identify that. In certain areas, such as the provision for maintenance of CFC legislation, direct charges will be made on the polluters—producers and users of that material—and that will provide additional resources to pay for the extra work. This is where the line budgets do not pick up what the yellow pages attempt. We are looking at a combination of marine pollution activity and CFC activity and to an increase of five staff, all funded by the contributions of the users.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The department is allocating extra resources and I am sure the honourable member will support the way it is being done.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I refer to noise pollution, because I doubt whether any member on either side of either House has not heard representations that noise pollution prosecution is somewhat difficult and that a fair amount of bluff is required to get people to undertake variations and that, in many circumstances, the people who lodge the greatest complaints went into the situation after the establishment of the existing business and should have been fully appreciative of the impediments involved. I can provide details of specific cases if the Minister wants, but I ask whether, now that the Noise Pollution Abatement Unit has existed for so long, any thorough review is taking place to assess the value of the legislation as it exists at present and whether it needs upgrading to better attend actions into the 1990s.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, indeed, I think every member of Parliament certainly shares the experiences outlined by the honourable member. The department is improving the whole matter of noise through tying it much closer to initial planning rather than waiting until after the problem has arisen and, for example, an engineering works creates large amounts of noise in an industrial area. The department is certainly addressing that through its planning regulations. However, the department is also moving to enforce the noise provisions more strongly than has perhaps been done in the past.

I have had discussions with people regarding noise in such places as Hindley Street, and concerns have been expressed about noise in a number of other areas. One of our colleagues has been looking at the Campbelltown timber mills.

There is much more awareness in the community and among the owners of businesses and developments that noise is an intolerable intrusion into many peoples' personal lives. To this extent, I think that we are moving forwards. A number of problems have been raised with me about the levels of noise created by a number of plants. The department has handled this whole area very sensitively and has

resolved many of these issues. People have written to me and my office to congratulate the Noise Abatement Unit on its work. As the honourable member knows.

Government departments do not get many thanks but, since I have been the Minister for Environment and Planning, I have had a number of acknowledgements of the work done by the unit. A review is under way and amendments are almost ready to be presented to me, and I will look at bringing those before Parliament. The department is undertaking a review and looking at amending the legislation. However, it is a very subjective area; for some people, noise is not a problem and for others it is almost a nightmare. We must be very careful that we get this question right, and I think we are well on the way to doing that. We will ensure that we do it as best we can.

Mr ROBERTSON: I have a number of questions about the marina proposal. I turn to the environmental impact of the offshore component of the proposal. One of the things that the conservation movement said about other similar proposals in the past was that the construction of a sea wall and groyne will in some way affect longshore sand drift and thereby by implication jeopardise the stability of the dune systems on southern metropolitan beaches. Have design measures been taken with this proposal that will obviate any problems associated with longshore drift and, if any sand accumulates as a result of that wall, will the public have access to the beach and will local people be able to use it?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will try to paint a picture of the area to which we are referring: I visited it this morning and thus I have an advantage over the members of the Committee. We are talking about a steep drop from cliffs to a rocky area, which certainly could not be described as a beach. Anyone who imagines sandy beach should be told that it is completely different from that. The beach is virtually inaccessible to the community and I understand that private land goes right down to the beach.

It is proposed that the marina development will not be that which was proposed some time ago, that is, a 2 kilometre groyne running out into the sea. That would have created a number of environmental problems along the lines referred to by the honourable member. I would describe the current proposal as an oval shaped rock wall, providing protection for the marina development. As Minister for Environment and Planning I have been involved in the announcement and supported the proposal for this area, because a thorough site suitability study was undertaken by the department, which considered a range of environmental questions, among others, one being the impact of any marina on such things as sand management and sand drift.

The Marino Rocks area was chosen as a suitable site as there would be almost no impact upon sand drift in that area because, first, there is no beach and, secondly, the water is deep. If the proposal proceeds to fruition—and I sincerely believe it will—a small artificial beach will be created where there has been no beach in the past. This beach will most certainly be available to the community in general but most specifically to the residents in that location. Thus, as well as getting all the benefits of this development in terms of facilities and amenities, the residents will be fortunate in having access to a new beach area. I believe they will welcome that, as I believe the honourable member will welcome it. The proposal has been considered from that environmental perspective.

Mr ROBERTSON: Supplementary to that, the principal objection by local people and Adelaide environmentalists to the Kingston Park marina proposal a little further north was that the breeding areas for squid and various other

creatures would be affected. I understand that, because the water is deeper, the rock platform is less extensive and there is no sand in the vicinity, the ecological dynamics at Marino are different from those at Kingston Park and thus the impact on the squid fishery and breeding areas would not be as great at Marino.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The way in which the honourable member has coherently articulated the question is absolutely correct. There will be no major impact on the breeding of squid in that location.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Or on the Aboriginal—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I understand that that is correct. A number of these areas have been considered in terms of site suitability, sand drift and sand management. In fact, I believe that was one reason why the site suitability study was welcomed by all sections of the community—by the Opposition (and that must be a landmark), the development sector and certainly the Conservation Council and the conservation movement. Those groups believed that was the way in which we should move forward to plan these types of developments so that developers would understand the ground rules and the environmental lobby would be aware of what areas are suitable for development. They could then support proposals so that we would not have to go through another Sellicks Beach process—and I think we would all say we do not want that.

A statement of environmental factors will be presented and there will be adequate opportunity for full and total community participation, certainly in a formal sense from the Marion council. The council will have two opportunities for involvement, as well as in an informal sense. I assure the honourable member that, while we still have to consider a number of environmental impacts of this development, the major impacts have been addressed and I as Minister for Environment and Planning feel confident that a sensitive, balanced and sustainable development will go ahead at that location.

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the development provide a safe anchorage for day sailors who sail around the gulf? Will the Sea Rescue Squadron, which is presently based at West Beach, be able to use the facilities as a base for launching sea rescue operations in Gulf St Vincent? Further, will ferries and tourist boats, such as the *Falie* and the Kangaroo Island ferries, be able to use the anchorage? Might additional tourist potential be generated by day tours operating from Port Adelaide to an anchorage within the marina facility?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member has raised a number of quite visionary issues regarding the marina proposal. These matters have not been absolutely and definitely firmed up, because the proposal was released publicly only this morning. Negotiations and discussions have taken place with a number of interested bodies, including the Marion council and the Conservation Council. I believe that the proponents of the development would welcome the opportunity to be part of a day sailing-type tourism development. That is the way in which they have been looking at this marina development. One of the positive benefits will be that the Sea Rescue Squadron craft will be able to use this facility if and when required. I sincerely hope that it will blossom into a successful tourist development and form part of a growing boating industry in South Australia as well as emerging as a whole new area for tourism development.

I am sure that my colleague the Minister of Tourism would welcome that, because it is a new and innovative proposal in terms of the day sailing destination set up of marinas right around the South Australian coast, not just on the immediate southern coast. I remind the honourable

member that recently I released a report that identified suitable sites on the two gulfs, and that was welcomed certainly by rural councils, as I am sure members of the Opposition would know as they represent councils in that area. That would form part of the day sailing destination-tourism-boating development, providing a unique experience in South Australia.

Mr ROBERTSON: The Minister said that public anchorage facilities will be available to day sailors, and I presume that the same access will be available to people who arrive at that area from the land either by car or on foot. If that is the case, where will car parking be provided, and will a car park form an unsightly blight on the coastline for those viewing the area from Marino or Hallett Cove, or from offshore?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: One of the most exciting aspects of the proposal is that all car parking will be undercrofted, that is, under the main wharf area so that the car parking area will not be visible. I believe that has to be one of the most exciting parts of this development. With most developments, be they shopping centres (and I know the member for Newland is nodding her head in agreement), one of the greatest blights on our environment is the fact that we are assailed with this huge expanse of bituminised wasteland. When I was first made aware of this proposal I thought to myself, 'No, don't tell me we are going to have another one of these'. Most certainly, we are not. The parking will be in a sense all underground. It will not necessarily be subterranean, but it will be under the wharf area and will be accessible to the public.

There will be two levels of pier: a lower level pier will be accessible only to people who own boats and have them in the marina—and I think everyone will acknowledge that is because of safety and security of the craft or whatever; and a higher public pier, which the community can access right out to the very end. So, if a proposal, such as I believe the honourable member might have alluded to in his last question—that the *Failie*, the *One and All* and any other large craft wanted to use that facility (and that was of course agreed to)—the public would have access to those vessels, once again picking up the potential for quite exciting tourism. The public will have access to this as a public facility by land and by sea. However, marinas are privately owned in the sense that people buy the berths, but it will have maximum public access to that extent.

Mr ROBERTSON: Following the aspect of car parking—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This is your fifth question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bright.

Mr ROBERTSON: If I may follow the aspect of the car park further. Clearly, for the development of car parking piers and housing on the rock platform area, some of the existing rock platform will need to be alienated and concreted over. How much of that rock platform area will be so alienated by development? How much of the cliff face will be destroyed or otherwise altered by the provision of road access to the commercial housing development and the marina at the base of the cliffs?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can answer the second part of the question quite simply. Any intrusion upon the natural environment will be minimised by the road. The road will come down, and that has been clearly identified in the preliminary work and studies that the engineers have undertaken for this proposal. I cannot give the honourable member a specific answer with regard to the question on the rock platform, but I will be pleased to obtain that. I would rather not answer that without having the accurate information.

With respect to the road, any impingement on the natural environment will be kept to a minimum. That site was chosen because it is an environmentally sound area. That is the reason the developers chose that site and that is the reason it was identified in the suitability study. I have seen a sketch of how it will look from the sea. Once that sketch is firmed up in a proper plan which will be done in consultation with the Marion council, the community and my department, then, I believe, we will obtain a better picture. However, the initial detailed impression indicates that it will be visually pleasant, and certainly not be an encroachment on that environment, in the sense that the member has raised.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: One of the jewels in the crown relating to the responsibilities of the National Parks and Wildlife Services, and for tourism in this State I would suggest, is the Coorong. Much has been said over a long period of time about the disastrous state that the Coorong is in, and the fact that it is deteriorating rapidly. It has been suggested that if some initiative is not taken to bring fresh water into the southern lagoon as a matter of urgency, it will be too late and we will lose that very real asset to the State. Precisely what positive action is being taken currently to overcome the extremely serious problems that are being experienced in the Coorong at present?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will answer that question in a general sense and I will ask the Director-General to pick up the specifics. I am aware of the sensitivities that the honourable member has raised, and I share those. I also have the same view of the Coorong. I believe it is one of our most precious and significant areas. We can say that about a number of areas in South Australia, but certainly that is one of them. I am also responsible for groundwater and for other problems and issues that relate to the Upper South-East, so I am aware of some of the proposals that have been raised by a number of people in that local community: they have come and spoken to me about that. A number of things are actually planned and are on the drawing board, but I believe it more appropriate for me to ask the Director-General if any other areas need to be covered. We could consider picking that up when we deal with water resources, but I am sure the Director-General can give us some answers to the questions that have been asked.

Dr McPhail: The Management of the Coorong is seen as a serious problem. However, it is also a very complex issue. It is argued that prior to European settlement the replenishment of waters in the southern end of the Coorong came from floods in the Murray, and not from water coming from the South-East. A considerable amount of work is happening at the moment on this basic hydrology. The refreshment at the southern end actually came from salt water being moved south down the Coorong, rather than water coming in from the South-East as had been popularly believed. Consequently, a series of propositions have been put over many years that fresh water should be released into the Coorong at the southern end: in fact, the Salt Creek drain was put in at an early stage—not to freshen up the Coorong, but actually to drain water from swampland behind and to get rid of it.

It has been determined that it is basically the effect of the barrages which has caused more of the difficulty than any possible lack of fresh water flow. In order to cope with this complex problem, the Murray Darling Basin Commission—although the Ministers have not formally approved it at this stage—has agreed to a substantial study of the hydrology of the Coorong and its impact upon the fisheries and on the problems associated with native fish stocks and

breeding of native fish. This would be expected to begin in this current financial year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: A certain amount of criticism has been expressed regarding the introduction of regional reserves. In fact, the Conservation Council, in one of its most recent newsletters in referring to the regional reserve in the Coongie Lakes area, states:

The draft management plan for the first new regional reserve smacks of the National Parks and Wildlife Services tourism and development ambitions rather than conservation.

It goes on to state:

It allows the major conservation area; the Coongie Lakes zone, to be grazed by pastoralists and explored for mining/petroleum purposes.

I would suggest that the current Government was critical of the previous Government in adhering to those policies, of allowing any form of grazing in national parks and in relation to exploration for mining purposes. Would the Minister like to comment on that?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would be delighted to comment, because I think it must be very clearly understood by everyone concerned that there will be no conservation of any of these areas without the implementation of what we call 'regional reserves'. It is very easy to cast an aspersions on the section of the department—Parks and Wildlife—that it has some sort of tourism agenda. I can assure this Committee, and the rest of South Australia that, in fact, the National Parks and Wildlife Service is second to none in this country and that it does not have some kind of hidden agenda to be a *de facto* tourist operator or manager. The staff, from the most senior level down, believe very strongly that to preserve and conserve what in many areas is an incredibly fragile and threatened area, we must look at how we manage the influx of people and the prior uses of those areas. The Government could have just done nothing and allowed these things to continue.

I will ask the Director of Parks and Wildlife to pick up the point made by the honourable member in relation to regional reserves. Regional reserves ensure that we have some control and that we have the conservation of those areas in the longer term. Is the honourable member suggesting that the rights of prior users, such as miners and graziers, should be torn up and taken away from them? They have had those rights for some time. Or, will he support what the Government has done, which is to work constructively and positively with the people who have prior use and rights to ensure that we have sound and effective management and that we have these areas to pass on to future generations of South Australians? We have chosen this way because we believe it is the right way and the only way to go. For example, we have an indenture bill on mining which is worth some \$15 billion. What are we going to do about that? Is the honourable member suggesting that the people of South Australia buy out the mining rights?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would have thought that in this Committee we would be expressing our own concerns as members of Parliament and not necessarily the concerns of groups outside the Parliament.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am certainly not, but I am suggesting that surely if the honourable member asks a question he is expressing his view. Normally people ask questions in this Committee which deal with their own views.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: He is running with the hares and hunting with the hounds.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Well, I am not running with the hare and with the hound. I know very clearly where I am running and where I am going to end up, that is, with probably the best desert park system, not only in Australia but in the world. I will remain tireless in my pursuit of that goal. I believe I have one of the best departments in the country to do that, and certainly one of the best areas in terms of parks and wildlife.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Well, some members may laugh, but let me remind them that we will be here for a long time and we will achieve these goals. I am disappointed that the Conservation Council has taken the stance that it has on regional reserves. However, that is certainly its prerogative and its right. I work very constructively and positively with the Conservation Council and, while we agree on almost everything, there are some areas in which we agree to disagree. I will argue strongly in the community for the position that this department and this Government have taken on this matter. I will now ask the manager of the Parks and Wildlife Service to make further comment if he wishes.

Mr Leaver: The major problem with the Cooper Creek/Coongie Lakes area is that the area has outstanding conservation significance—it is listed on the International Convention for the Protection of Wetlands (RAMSAR). The problem was that with the ever increasing numbers of visitors to the area—who were causing vandalism, littering, damage and who were shooting and destroying wildlife and archaeological sites—there was no regulation framework that could be brought to bear to conserve the value of the area.

The major problem was that the reserve included a \$16 billion oil and gas site in the Cooper Basin. Of course, the area involved the major oil and gas fields. In addition, it is probably one of the jewels of the crown in the outback pastoral industry. Therefore, whilst there were these priceless wetland values, there were other complicated economic values. The regional reserve notion was evolved to try to focus attention on the wetlands and, more importantly, to control the ever worsening impact of visitors in the area and, at the same time, to take a realistic attitude to the existing rights and economic realities of the use of other natural resources in the area. The outcome was a trade-off and compromise. Whilst there was a lot of criticism, there were certainly no solutions offered when we were looking for them.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would have liked to hear the rest of the answer from the Director-General in relation to coastal management and the serious reduction in that area of funding. It would be remiss of me not to ask a question—and the Minister probably would be disappointed if I did not ask a question—relating to the Mount Lofty development. There is considerable confusion about the state of play in relation to that development and the impact that any development might have. Will the Minister now explain precisely when it is anticipated that the feasibility study that we have been told about is likely to be completed? How will the feasibility study be structured; that is, what is the involvement of the Government in that study? Has the Government now advised the developers precisely what will be acceptable regarding such a development? Has stage one of the development been approved?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: In answer to the honourable member's first question in relation to how long the feasibility study will take, the Government would hope that it would be a maximum of about four months. It is envisaged that the feasibility study will not need to be a long and drawn-out study, because of the enormous amount of work

that has been done up to this point. I am not sure what the media has reported in terms of that but I would expect that study to be completed in about four months. The honourable member asked a number of specific questions which I will refer to the Director-General. If we do not have specific answers to those questions, I give an assurance that we will provide those answers to the honourable member for incorporation in the *Hansard* report.

Dr McPhail: The feasibility study is being carried out by the Mount Lofty Development Company, which is a consortium of three major consultant firms in Adelaide for the original proposal. That group is carrying out the feasibility essentially as consultants. However, they are carrying it out with a view to participating in, as the Premier announced, a joint venture for the development.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The main question was whether the developers have been informed precisely by the Government what is acceptable to the Government in regard to a development on that site?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I take it that the honourable member is delighted with the Government's decision?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am asking a question.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would have expected the honourable member to be gracious enough to preface his question with congratulatory remarks.

Dr McPhail: I believe the Premier publicly stated what could be the proponents of the development on that site which would include a tavern bistro centred around a tower which would contain a viewing platform and a revolving restaurant. The tower would go up to 100 metres initially, which would be for radio communications. If it is then possible, it is everybody's objective to bring the television towers in and then it would go higher to pick up the broadcasting requirements of television. There would be some sort of expo centre for the State. This is only in the conceptual stage at the moment and, of course, the old seminary and the coach house would be fully restored and would contain a small retail component. This is a substantial scaling down of the original development on the summit itself to something that would fit the scale of that area.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the development fit into the hills face zone regulations? Are the developers or the proponents now fully aware of what would be acceptable to the Government, regarding such a development?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The people of South Australia will get an absolutely top quality tourism and visitor facility that is environmentally sensitive and meets the demands of all sections of the community. It has been welcomed by all sections of the community. It was an excellent decision and I am a little sad that the local member has not been gracious enough to acknowledge that. I will ask the Director-General to answer that specific question about the character of the hills face but let me say that the developers certainly have a very clear understanding of exactly what will be supported and approved. I have made very clear publicly there will not be a requirement for another EIS and for the processes to be in any way drawn out. We are looking for a sensible resolution to this matter and I would have thought that the honourable member and his constituents would welcome that.

Dr McPhail: The assessment report details the way in which a development of this nature, of the original proposal, in fact, relates to the hills face zone and also relates to the various provisions that exist within the hills face zone designation in relation to the Mount Lofty summit area which looked to some sort of tourist and similar development in that area.

Ms GAYLER: My question relates to environmental policy development. What sorts of environmental concerns and problems would result from any proposal for a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia given that the Liberal Opposition has foreshadowed such a possibility?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think that the people of South Australia will have a very significant number of environmental concerns. I will not go into great detail as to what those concerns might be. Suffice to say that I have been contacted by a significant number of people involved in the environment and conservation movements expressing absolute horror and outrage at the proposal which has been described to me as turning South Australia into the enrichment capital of South-East Asia, and I think the Liberal Opposition might well remain in that position.

There is currently an oversupply of enriched uranium in the world and, consequently, no extra market for enriched uranium. In fact, the oversupply extends to both the supply of natural uranium and the enriched product. This situation is likely to remain until the end of this century when laser will then be competing with the centrifuge process for a market. Over-capacity plus price projections will make associated contractual arrangements an uncertain investment area. As well as having very serious considerations about the environmental impacts one would have to question in the total picture the economic benefits to South Australia. Established commercial operators in this area seem unlikely to invest in an Australian enterprise but rather indicators point to the United States laser plant operations.

The operation of an enrichment plant certainly has to be looked at in the light of some of the experiences around the world and some of the uses which the enriched uranium has been put to. There is a chemical risk that must be addressed in the safety standards of any such plant and the transport system. There is then, of course, the question of location, and I am quite sure that members of the Opposition, if they are serious about this proposal, have already identified a location and as Minister for Environment and Planning I will be calling on the Opposition to actually share with the public of South Australia exactly where they propose to locate this enrichment plant.

It has been suggested that it will need to be located near a port so I am sure that residents living in any port in this State will be looking with great interest at the announcement of which particular port and which particular community will have the privilege of having this plant located right in its midst. I will ask the Director to speak on where the waste will go but, generally speaking, there are very serious environmental concerns about the location of an enrichment plant and, in fact, locking us into this whole uranium cycle. I believe it would have been much more responsible for the Opposition to talk about other forms of energy such as reusable energy and the way in which we might harness solar, wind and wave energy and to look positively and constructively at forms of energy which do not have the negative environmental impacts nuclear energy has. It is interesting that, if this is the Opposition's answer to the energy question for the future of South Australia, not only is it lacking in vision but we have an enormous number of problems.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: All will be revealed. The Opposition is providing a 1970s solution but then, of course, we are dealing with yesterday's men.

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

Dr McPhail: As to the possible difficulties associated with waste from a uranium enrichment plant, there would be

waste from such a plant and considerable care would have to be taken over the disposal of such waste.

Ms GAYLER: My next question relates to pollution management and the plans for waste minimisation and waste recycling. Adelaide is likely to reach the dubious distinction of producing 1 million tonnes of solid waste this financial year. In view of the increasing community concern about recycling, both across metropolitan Adelaide and individual local areas, what have the Minister and the department in mind?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As other members of the Committee know, the member for Newland has not only supported this whole move to recycling but is also knowledgeable about what is happening within Australia and overseas as well. As to what we are doing here, we have recently established a recycling advisory committee which has already held a number of meetings. I will be asking Dr Harvey to talk about that and outline what the committee is addressing.

Cabinet supports of the establishment of a recycling plant or plants in South Australia and is working hard to ensure that we attract a private sector investor to establish a recycling plant in this State. I am sure that that will receive bipartisan support across the board. I will ask Dr Harvey to talk about the recycling committee and to comment on what it is doing and what we aim to achieve from it. Certainly, it is established and has held a number of meetings, and I have been getting reports on what is happening.

On the broader scale, the Government has a role not only in improving and increasing community awareness and consciousness of the issue but also in giving a lead to local government. It is in this area that we have to work positively and constructively because, without the cooperation of local government, we can establish as many recycling plants as we like as a State Government but we will not achieve positive outcomes for the South Australian community—both from an environmental perspective and also from a commercial perspective—without that support. Future development of the industry will be tied to many of these environmentally sound developments such as recycling.

I am aware of the work that the honourable member has done personally in this area in her own electorate with her own local council. I can assure her that I will be putting this on the broad agenda with local government and moving as hard as we can to establish not only the recycling ethos in South Australia but also to provide the wherewithal to be able to follow it through from the initial product to the recycled product in respect of established markets and make sure that the whole thing is economically viable. It will be a future sunrise industry in South Australia. As to the specifics of the committee's activities, I ask Mr Harvey to comment.

Mr Harvey: The committee has noted in respect of glass and metal that there are ongoing good markets which show no signs of causing any trouble. The big problem seems to be with paper where for many years there has been a rise and fall in demand. With the increased activity arising from greater community consciousness it is fair to say that the markets have been swamped with newsprint. A major role of the committee is to look at ways of improving markets for recycled paper products with a view to establishing more facilities in Adelaide.

As a first step, and as a means to stabilise the market, a proposition has been put to the committee by the private sector to consider a proposal for shredding and bailing of waste paper for export. That could stabilise the market and allow possible future proposals of de-inking, pulping and ultimately full paper recycling. Certainly, there are big

changes nationally with recycled paper. I understand that Australian Newsprint Manufacturers and Visy Board are both undertaking feasibility studies with a view to recycling newsprint. That would be an extremely positive move.

Another area which will require further consideration by the committee is the recycling of plastics. There has been an ongoing demand for plastics for granulation and this has been met by industry. However, with increased community awareness, a number of supermarkets are taking both soft and hard plastics for recycling, and we are getting to the same problem of a lack of market for these materials. In the short term an option is to granulate these materials for export.

Ms GAYLER: As a supplementary question, what action is the recycling committee considering to try to encourage local councils to move to kerbside recycling as part of their regular rubbish collection? In my own council area of Tea Tree Gully certain members have treated this matter as a temporary fad by trendy residents rather than seriously looking, as some other metropolitan councils have, at providing households with the opportunity of recycling products for which there is not a glut on the market. What steps are being taken to work with local government to try to get a positive response from individual local councils, and from councils collectively?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can talk about the general part of the question. The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy) supports the whole move forward to a recycling program becoming part of the normal procedures in terms of collection of waste through the council system. To that extent she and I are having discussions on this matter. There have been a number of policy level discussion encouraging local government to move in this direction but, if there are any specific activities undertaken by the Waste Management Commission, Mr Harvey can advise the Committee about them.

Mr Harvey: There have been a number of promotional activities by the commission, rather than the recycling advisory committee. The recycling directory which most people have been aware of has been a remarkable best seller. Thousands have been distributed over the past several months. Also, the commission has contracted Kesab to assist in the development of an information kit for local government to assist in developing recycling programs. I understand that that should be available by the end of the year. Also in this promotion vein, the commission has joined with Kesab in establishing a waste management award under the successful Tidy Towns program, which allows for applicants to put in for recycling initiatives by local communities.

Ms GAYLER: My next question relates to national parks and the Anstey Hill Recreation Park which my local community was so pleased to see dedicated under the National Parks Act by the Minister last Sunday. We are absolutely delighted that we now have in Tea Tree Gully our own park under the national parks system.

However, we were a little surprised at the joint proclamation under the Mining Act to allow for quarrying of some of the freestone that apparently was used to construct some of Adelaide's major historic buildings. We were surprised because neither I nor the Friends of Anstey Hill had been consulted and because at this stage we do not know whether there are any plans to mine or quarry that stone or whether it is simply a means of keeping future options open, should small quantities of that stone be needed for the restoration of some of our fine historic buildings. Could the National Parks and Wildlife Service provide some information on the scale of potential quarrying?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will answer that question generally and then ask the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife to pick up its more detailed aspects. It was my understanding in proclaiming the conservation park that this is really only an insurance policy for the future. Some of our historic and heritage buildings may need some form of restoration, and this will allow some suitable and complementary stone to the original stone to be used for that purpose. That is my interpretation of the situation: that there would be no mining as a normal occurrence but that, if any stone was required for future restoration of significant heritage buildings, there would be the proviso that it would be taken under those conditions. That was my initial understanding, but the Director may perhaps give us an accurate assessment of whether I was correct.

Mr Leaver: That is indeed the case; that option was left open because of the need to have access to that stone for the restoration of some of the city's outstanding heritage buildings, for example, the post office and the town hall. So, if in future limited quantities of stone were required for heritage purposes, that site is considered to be the appropriate place from which to take it. There are no plans for any quarrying operations but the continued use of that site for that purpose was the reason for including those provisions in the proclamation.

Ms GAYLER: Could the Minister give me an assurance that, if any such operations occur in the future, Friends of Anstey Hill will be consulted, and that the proposed park management plan would also set down the kinds of condition under which this could potentially happen?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I certainly give the honourable member that assurance, and I apologise if Friends of Anstey Hill were not aware of that condition of the proclamation. I should be pleased if the honourable member would pass on to the Friends of Anstey Hill my assurance that they would be consulted if any program were put forward for the removal of stone for the purposes that we have just outlined. The management plan will go out for public display and comment, so not only the Friends of Anstey Hill but also other members of the public will have the opportunity to make a response to this public document. I am therefore sure that the honourable member can give her residents and the Friends of Anstey Hill an assurance about this matter.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I note that the proposed expenditure for various wages and related payments for native vegetation management is \$589 400 and that actual payments were \$661 844; that goods and services—operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries were voted \$5 188 100 while actual expenditure was \$5 721 088; and that the Native Vegetation Compensation Fund, which was voted nothing last year, has a proposed expenditure for 1989-90 of \$9 million (Estimates of Payments, page 146). Is that \$9 million made up of the combined amounts of salaries and operating expenses of approximately \$6 million? I note on page 404 of the Program Estimates that there is an additional \$3.393 million in recurrent funds for the compensation program. That new line indicates that there is an additional \$3.39 million involved above the \$9 million proposed.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: A total of \$9 million is allocated for this purpose and nobody has ever suggested that a further \$9 million is proposed. I refer members to my introductory statement where I talked about a total of \$9 million. I said that an additional \$3.5 million has been allocated for a total expenditure of \$9 million for the purposes of this program. That was clearly spelt out in my introductory statement.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: What is the reason for changing the way in which it has been set out over recent years? What is the object of the exercise?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I call upon Mr Nicholas Newland to respond to the question.

Mr Newland: I am not sure why there has been a change in the way that the Estimates have been set out, but the member is correct when he suggests that there has been an increase from a little over \$6 million last year to \$9.5 million this year.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Where a landholder enters into or negotiates with the department to enter into a heritage agreement on land with native vegetation, how is compensation determined? Does it relate to current market land values?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask Mr Newland to respond to the question.

Mr Newland: The compensation figure is set by the Valuer-General's office of the Department of Lands and is based on the diminution of land value which would apply with the land use being changed from a productive to a non-productive purpose. A particular formula is contained in the Native Vegetation Act which sets out the detail on how that procedure is applied.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As a supplementary question, what is an example of how that works? For example, if the current value of land was \$90 per hectare, what figure would be offered to a person under that formula virtually to put that land under heritage listing? If the land is put under heritage listing and it cannot be cleared, those involved will have to be able to purchase other land that is already cleared if they are to remain commercially viable.

Mr Newland: A number of factors apply to the working out of this formula, and the details vary, depending on whether the application has been made and where it is located in the State. The best way to address this would be to send to the honourable member some examples where this formula has been applied in this State.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Would the Director-General comment?

Dr McPhail: It is not simply the diminution in the land value itself that is important; the Native Vegetation Authority has the capacity to recommend that payments be made that take into account a number of other factors such as overcapitalisation of plant and equipment, which can then be factored into the final amount. It can be fairly significant and, in particular parts of the State relatively close to the metropolitan area, valuations are being affected by the potential value of timber for firewood.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: If we take into account the value of the cleared land for farming purposes, deduct the cost of clearing but add the value of firewood, that is mallee stumps, and so on, we arrive at the current market value. Many farmers have told me that they have been offered considerably less than the current market value of the land in that area, and they are not happy with that, given that they know the value of the timber on the land if they had had permission to clear it. They cannot buy an equivalent piece of land with the compensation provided.

Dr McPhail: It is the Valuer-General who establishes the figure.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In recent years we have approached various Government departments in relation to the availability of mallee drift sand. The importance of this issue cannot be overestimated in relation to irrigators in the Riverland. Mallee drift sand has an important part to play not only in making heavy river flat soils friable but also in improved irrigation practices in terms of filling low

areas and farmers achieving correct gradients for dead level irrigation, which is an important aspect of improved irrigation practices. At this stage we are encountering enormous problems in having areas of sand dunes made available. We are talking about probably half a hectare of sand dune land; that would provide much of the required fill in the Riverland for years to come. However, we are not making any headway. I have spoken with the Director on numerous occasions and he appreciates the problem; I know that he is working on this matter, but it involves a number of Government departments.

Mallee drift sand is also required where vines that have been in a certain area for 40 or 50 years are to be replanted. The land is opened up and the trenches filled with virgin drift sand, particularly in heavy soil areas and that plays an important part in the new vines progressing and producing a viable crop in about three years. At present sand is not available because of the vegetation clearance requirements. No more than half a hectare is required to service the Riverland. This is an important aspect of good management practices in the horticultural industry.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will insist that we look at working through to a successful resolution of this matter. The Director-General may like to elaborate.

Dr McPhail: For the variety of reasons referred to by the honourable member, I am aware of the problems facing irrigators regarding the need for sand. We have been attempting to resolve this problem and, as the honourable member said, there are a number of actors in the field, not just the Native Vegetation Authority but the Department of Mines and Energy. We believe this is an important issue that must be resolved, and at the Minister's clear direction we will press to see whether we can come to an early resolution.

Mr ROBERTSON: I understand that the major uranium enrichment agency in Europe, EdeF, handles most of the enriched uranium for Western Europe. I understand that the centrifuge plant is running at about 60 per cent capacity and that, when the German consortium, Urenco, gets its act together in Germany and begins a similar centrifuge plant in that country, the utilisation rate of the EdF plant will drop to 30 per cent. I understand that, in order to counter that, EdeF is going ahead with research into laser isotope separation which, in turn, will increase efficiencies of energy usage and, therefore, cost efficiencies, by which that company hopes to win back its market share from 30 per cent/40 per cent to 60 per cent.

To complicate matters, a Japanese consortium (I am advised by the member for Mitchell), Idemitsu among others, is working on a chemical separation process, by which the various isotopes are put into solution and separated, presumably through various semipermeable membranes. That technology in turn is reputed to be capable of bringing the cost of separation of the isotopes down to not 60 per cent of the current cost, as the laser isotope technology will, but 30 to 40 per cent of the current centrifuge cost. Given that background and that array of new technologies lined up virtually waiting to come on stream when the market is ready, how can anyone in this country possibly suggest that a plant using an outdated technology, namely, the centrifuge technology, could be viable in the world market?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The simple answer is that no-one in their right mind would suggest that, but obviously the Opposition has not done its homework in terms of this whole issue, as has the member for Bright. I congratulate him on his analysis of the world situation; his question reinforces my previous impression.

Mr ROBERTSON: It has occurred to me since I heard about the new marina proposal that a mechanism is required to enable local people to express concerns about the development and to feed suggestions to the developers so that, as the developers in consultation with the council and the department go ahead and plan this development, the doubts and concerns raised by residents can be taken into account. This morning I suggested to the Minister that some sort of consultative committee be set up to consider local objections. This would be not only a planning element but a general issue.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This morning I responded publicly to the request of the member for Bright; I would be delighted to establish a consultative committee made up of local residents. It would be appropriate to have someone from the Marion council on that committee and, if the residents feel it is helpful, I would be happy to make available an officer from the department.

Certainly, I believe that that would work in a positive way towards giving the local residents a direct input, not just into concerns about planning aspects, but a direct information channel where they can find accurate information quickly about any aspect of the proposal. I would see that consultative committee being chaired by the honourable member, and liaising directly with the proponents of the development so that there is a flow of information and an opportunity for this consultative group to have an input into any of the processes that they feel they would like to have an input into.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As the Minister responsible for fauna and flora, she no doubt gave approval for the despatch of koalas, wombats and snakes to the Adelaide Show where they could be handled by the public. Does the Minister look upon the handling of koalas by the public in the unnatural surroundings of the Adelaide Show as coming under the normal protection of fauna?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As I understand it, the particular animals to which the honourable member refers were quite a delight—I had a look myself—and were from the Cleland Conservation Park. I will ask the Director of Parks and Wildlife to answer the honourable member's questions more fully about whose permission was sought, whose permission was given and what effects there were to the animals—if there were any detrimental effects. I know a little about this matter, but I believe it is better to get the Director of Parks and Wildlife to answer.

Mr Leaver: The staff who were exhibiting those animals were from the Cleland Wildlife Park. They used animals that were well used to being handled by the public. It is a popular attraction up at Cleland to handle those animals. Also, the staff have had many years practice in the handling and husbandry of koalas. The scheme used for the show involved a number of animals, and a limited showing of those animals well before they were stressed or tired. Again, that was based on the experience of the handlers themselves. That section of the show was undertaken by the staff from the Cleland Conservation Park, and it was part of a broader display to explain parks and wildlife to the general visiting public. As the Minister said, it proved very popular.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In relation to the National Parks and Wildlife Service, has the department given any consideration to the degree of cooperation which will exist between that department and the Country Fire Services in the forthcoming fire season? I refer now to some of the decisions of the coronor's report in respect of the Mount Remarkable fire and the absolute necessity to maximise the effort to control fire before it gets out of control. Whilst I have mentioned Mount Remarkable, one could also talk

about the Namkatta Reserve in the South-East, which seems to be on a permanent angle fire basis.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Director of National Parks and Wildlife to respond to that question.

Mr Leaver: I worked very closely with Don McArthur, the Director of the Country Fire Services. I met with him frequently to ensure that the closest possible liaison was maintained between this critical element of rural fire protection, in particular the fire prone landscapes that are obvious in many of our park areas. I believe the lesson from the Mount Remarkable fire—and I am sure Don MacArthur would agree 100 per cent with me—is that it is absolutely crucial for the community (that includes the park service, the CFS and the local community) to work closely together in planning for fire.

Fire is an inevitable consequence of where we live in terms of climate and in terms of the recurrence of fires. When those fires occur, it is a bit late then to decide that is the moment to consider things like planning communications, training, joint equipment, and so on. I believe that lesson has been well learned by a lot of people, and that one of the main priorities for the new Fire Act and regulations is that element of regional planning. We are committed strongly to regional planning in conjunction with the CFS and local communities. We will certainly give it as high a priority as it deserves.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I welcome the fact that this understanding does exist, and I hope that it goes from strength to strength and is understood well down the line, not just at the top, because in the past that has been some of the difficulty. It also does become something of a difficulty when a fire is still raging, it comes to 3.45, and it is time to knock off and the fire truck suddenly disappears because they are not allowed overtime.

Mr Leaver: That is not our policy. In this State—unlike another State I have worked in—we have never had any trouble. I understand that that trouble applies to Governments of different persuasions—Treasury allocations on supplementing funds that were expended due to control of wild fire.

Mr ROBERTSON: That is an outrageous slur on the CFS.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is not the CFS at all. From time to time the National Parks and Wildlife Services—as have the Woods and Forests Department officers in fire situations—have knocked off when it is knock-off time, leaving the volunteers to continue the fight.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am aware of quite the opposite. There have been times when volunteers have come from other parts of the department to help with the fire fighting in particular areas. If the honourable member does have a particular example, and he can give me either on or off the record a date and the circumstances, I will give an undertaking to the Committee to have it fully investigated. If it is years ago, then it will be a little difficult for me to trek ground, but if it is happening it is certainly not happening with the concurrence or knowledge of the Director of Parks and Wildlife, neither is it happening with my concurrence.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I trust we are talking of the past and not the future.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The fact is that it will not be in the future.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I understand the National Parks and Wildlife Service frequently makes use of various plants and animal control boards, or as they are now known, pest control boards. Has there been a requirement that those persons who contract to undertake work on behalf of the

National Parks and Wildlife must employ only union labour? I draw attention to a memo that has been forwarded to me in relation to a contract which has been available in respect of both the Coorong and the Mount Monster areas in recent times where, on Wednesday morning of 12 September 1989, one of the board's officers rang the National Parks and Wildlife Service at Salt Creek to inquire when the order for the work would be issued as it was already almost too late for a maximum control benefit and because doing the work at the right time is important. The officer was advised that the National Parks and Wildlife Service wanted to know who was to do the work, what union they were members of, and their union membership number.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Who did that come from?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It came from the officer at the National Parks and Wildlife Service at Salt Creek passing on information to an officer of the Lacepede and Tatiara Plant and Animal Control Board.

Dr McPhail: There are a number of components to that question. There is a requirement that anyone employed, either directly or indirectly, on government contracts or in government employment, must be paid, and the conditions of work must be, in accordance with an award. That is certainly one of the elements. I do not have a copy here, but I believe there is a general directive in regard to preference for union labour. Of course, I have read debates in *Hansard* on that matter from time to time.

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Ms D.L. Gayler
The Hon. R.G. Payne
Mr D.J. Robertson
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan, Minister for Environment and Planning.

Departmental Advisers:

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

Mr J. Hill, Director, Departmental Services.

Mr S. Haines, Director, Planning.

Mr N. Johnson, Chief Finance Officer.

Mr R. Hook, Manager, Assessments.

Mr J. Womersley, Manager, State Heritage Branch.

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

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I propose to ask the Minister about intended, or proposed new draft legislation relating to environmental impact assessment procedures, which I certainly argue is part of planning legislation. Unlike the member for Heysen, I indicate quite clearly that my view on this matter is not the same as that contained in this publication—*Environment and Conservation News*—produced by the Conservation Council. I think it is a quite serious statement and I believe the Minister should have the opportunity to be aware of the statement—if she is not aware of it already—and she should also have the opportunity to refute the implication contained in the article.

On page 1 of this issue of *Environment and Conservation News*, 1989, No. 10, the following statement appears under the heading 'EIS Legislation':

A draft Bill to amend environmental impact assessment procedures has been strongly criticized in conservation organisation submissions to Government. Perhaps resulting from the pressure from a minority of building development interests who have had projects rejected, the Government proposals could amount to a fast track in the wrong hands. A new process 'Public Environment Reports' (PER) is proposed which would provide a half-baked [that is their words, not mine] environmental assessment, allow normal planning provisions to be ignored, and remove rights of appeal for building projects that should really undergo the full environmental impact statement process or be put through the normal low key planning processes which at least has a few checks and balances.

Unless the Government amends its PER proposal it will face stiff opposition even from members of the review committee which was set up to recommend the changes—their advice has been twisted around to something clearly never intended.

I do not believe that that is the situation at all. What is the Minister's view on this matter?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I refer honourable members to comments that I made in my opening statement, when I talked about the White Paper and the fact that there are a number of groups and organisations who, quite clearly, wish to make their views heard, one way or the other, and to facilitate full and open discussion on any proposed changes to the proposed planning legislation in this State. I have indicated, and I will indicate again, that I am happy to extend the time available for those comments to be presented.

The honourable member has read out a number of comments that people have and their views of what is a white paper. I think it is important that we recognise the role and function of the green and white papers. They are not definitive, final documents. In fact, they are discussion papers for various groups and individuals within the community to voice their views on the proposed legislative changes that come before both Houses of this Parliament. Therefore, there will probably always be a bit of jostling for positions in the run-up to the presentation of a piece of legislation in the Parliament. I will ask the Director of Planning to make some comments.

However, as far as I am concerned, I welcome a vigorous and thorough debate on these issues, because it is important that we get the whole process right. I have ongoing discussions with the Conservation Council and with various groups who make up the conservation and environmental movement in South Australia. I am delighted to do so and I think it is important that we continue with open negotiations. Certainly, those groups have not expressed their views quite as strongly and stringently, but in the years that I have been in this Parliament, this document—*Environment and Conservation News*—has always been a fairly provocative document. That goes back a number of years and almost every issue is one that we take to battle. Therefore, I am not going to get too excited about some of the claims in the document. I do not believe that it is appropriate for me to comment until I have all of the submissions on the draft legislation through the white paper process. At that stage, I think that there will certainly be room for quite a bit of consultation between all parties.

As honourable members would know, we have had quite a bit of criticism from the other side of the fence—from BOMA. This situation reminds me of what happened with the Pastoral Bill. When one is criticised from both sides the feeling is that one must be getting it right. I well recall the criticisms about the composition of the Pastoral Board. The conservation movement believed that it did not have enough representation, and the UF&S felt that it did not have

enough representation either. I suspect that, at the end of the day, we got it right.

However, I am very pleased that the honourable member has raised this issue because I think we have the kind of open processes in this State that allow a full and vigorous debate and discussion of these issues. At the end of the day, once again, we will get it right in terms of the very sensitive balance between the need for development, and the need for that development to be environmentally sustainable so that it enhances the environment in which it is placed and that it does not detract from it or destroy it. I can assure members of this Committee that there is no way that I will be moving to any fast track system that has overtones of the previous—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can assure the honourable member that I will not be moving on any side of the election. If the member for Light wants to cast his mind—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can assure him that the conservative side of politics—and I refer to the Gray government in Tasmania, which is no longer in existence, and which thought it could flirt with the fast track proposals and the Queensland situation in terms of the way in which it dealt with development proposals—there is absolutely no way that I, as Minister, or the Bannon Government, will ever move to a fast track system that does not have adequate community consultation and community input.

Mr ROBERTSON: In passing I add a word of commendation to the officer, Mr Womersley, who gave up part of his last holiday to come to the AGM of the Kingston House Committee which I thought showed devotion above and beyond the call of either reason or duty.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to comments that have been made to members of the Opposition regarding the Government's White Paper on the EIS. Does the Minister agree with an attitude expressed by some councils that certain powers contained in the Government's White Paper (and I have taken on board what the Minister has said in regard to the White Paper on proposed changes to the EIS procedures) are designed to further reduce the local government's role in the SDP process and, if so, why? Does the Minister also agree with some councils that the proposed EIS PER procedures are designed to allow developers to rewrite the development plan without reference to the community and with the active support of the South Australian Planning Commission?

Is the Burnside council's experience with its recent SDP to be but the first in a series of unattributed, without discussion, possibly illegal changes to approved development plans and, if so, where is the authority and direction for such changes coming from? Can the Minister supply a list of the organisations provided with a copy of the White Paper? It is being rumoured abroad that this particular legislation may not proceed before the election. Can the Minister confirm or deny that rumour?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It would take the rest of the Committee's time to answer all those questions. I refer the member for Heysen to the last part of my introductory statement. It is my objective to have the amended legislation in Parliament by the end of this year. If an election is called before I can have my amendments into this Parliament, quite obviously I will not be held responsible for that. It is my intention, if we sit through until the end of this session, which is exactly what is proposed, to have my legislation into the Parliament by the end of the year. If there are unforeseen events beyond my control just as they are beyond the control of the member for Heysen, that will not be my

responsibility. I have extended the time for people to get their comments and submissions into the department so that they can be thoroughly assessed and analysed and people can have a say.

There are a number of questions relating to the SDP. I do not intend to take any powers away from the councils that they already have. I will refer the question to the manager of the planning unit of the department for his comment. Some of the other questions (and there were about six, rather than one) we may have to take on notice.

Mr Haines: I will just respond to the first question that relates to the local government attitude to the major projects Bill. We had some discussions with the Local Government Association and have received a very full and detailed submission on the Bill from the association which raises a number of concerns about aspects of the legislation. We are intending to have further discussions with the Local Government Association and hope that we will have an opportunity to accommodate them wherever possible in the draft legislation. In relation to the further discussions with other groups that are likely to be held as a result of this consultation process, there are a number of issues that have been raised that similarly we hope to find solutions to. Most of the issues raised are not major but relate to detailed aspects of the Bill and I believe can be accommodated.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In relation to the transferable development rights, when the Mount Lofty Ranges Review was announced we were told by the then Minister that one matter to be considered as part of the overall review was the use of transferable property rights particularly in relation to the watershed catchment area. Since then we have heard very little officially regarding this practice. However, I am aware that the transfer of titles continues to be achieved to a limited extent through a licensed agent operating in the Adelaide Hills with the approval of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Planning Commission.

Can the Minister explain how this process currently works, how approval is gained through the E&WS Department and Planning Commission under such circumstances, how many agents are engaged in this practice, what rules and regulations are applied regarding the charging of fees associated with such transfers currently, and how many consolidations of title have occurred in the watershed catchment area under this process and does the Minister and her department support this practice currently? Will the transfer of development rights or the transfer of titles be promoted more widely with the finalisation of the review? I am happy for the Minister to take some of these questions on notice.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member asked for some expert advice on this in the beginning of his question. I will ask the Director-General to respond to a number of those questions and the rest we will take on notice.

Dr McPhail: I am sure the honourable member appreciates that some of the questions require research in order to provide an answer. I can simply point out generally to the Committee that the concept of transferable development rights was an idea that grew up through the Mount Lofty Review and is one which is seen to be a potential force in trying to assist the difficulties of land management within the watershed zone. We have a consultancy operating at the moment attempting to work through the details of transferable development rights and how they can be built into the planning system. The exercise going on at present by one individual is done voluntarily within the existing system. We are looking towards a system which would be built into the planning policies through a change to the supplementary

development plan and even, if necessary, changes to regulations.

We are still some way from that and it is important to stress that the interests shown by this particular individual in operating on a voluntary, non-statutory basis are quite separate from the Mount Lofty Review's intention to see what the outcome will be by way of a permanent statutorily based system. It is, of course, modelled upon the transferable floor areas (TFA) of the City of Adelaide. It becomes a question of how we can transfer that concept into the Mount Lofty Ranges and watershed. A consultancy is being undertaken now and, until that has been completed, we will not know the degree of change that we will have to make to regulations and supplementary development plans.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As a supplementary question, I hope that in supplying the answers to my questions, specific notice will be taken of questions asked about the current situation.

Dr McPhail: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: A number of members of the Opposition have been made aware recently of the extreme concern recognised by people in the Aldinga area about the activities of the South Australian Urban Land Trust. When the Minister was questioned about this matter in the House last month she referred to an article in the local paper on the subject as a beat up. The Minister was also quoted later as saying that no person in the area had received notices of intention to acquire land.

I have now had the opportunity to see a number of these notices and a number of people have expressed concern about the compulsory acquisition side of the matter. I refer to one letter which has been brought to my attention in which the writer states:

The present owners are being denied their rights of ownership simply to make huge profits for the Government under the guise of providing land for houses. I cannot understand the logic of the urban trust acquiring this land in a rural living type of area and interfering with the lifestyle of so many people when there is so much open land which can be purchased by them without interfering with the lifestyle of people . . . [and without] the Urban Land Trust purchasing rural land on the open market . . .

Now I wish to refer to a letter forwarded to residents of the Deputy Premier, wherein he states:

Further growth in the area is inevitable and probably desirable.

He goes on to say:

I believe that to a degree we can have our cake and eat it. The Government has maintained very strong controls on growth in the broader Willunga Valley over many years and this should continue. They will protect the valuable horticultural products of the south and ensure that it will not simply become a further extension of suburbia.

How does the Minister explain the action of the South Australian Urban Land Trust with the express objective set out in the Deputy Premier's letter to residents in his electorate? What is the reason for the purchase of vast areas of land in the Aldinga area? Is it likely or intended that this land will be rezoned? If it is, when will it be rezoned? Is the Minister aware of the alleged intimidation tactics being used by the trust in the Aldinga area in respect of this project?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: A number of points are raised in the question and I will attempt to answer them as fully as possible. First, let me say that in my reply in the House I stand by what I said. I believe that the way in which that article was outlined was not accurate, and I stand by that. Secondly, I wish to clarify for the record the fact that I did not make the statement that people had not received their notices. A member of my staff received information to that extent, and it was quoted as a 'spokesperson' and not the Minister.

If we are going to get down to every 'i' being dotted and every 't' being crossed, I am happy to do that. I remind the honourable member of the role and functions of the South Australian Urban Land Trust in ensuring that we keep the supply of land just ahead of demand in this State.

In answering a question in this House some time ago the honourable member will remember that I was clearly able to demonstrate that at its urban fringes South Australia has the lowest cost land of any major capital in Australia. The only area where the cost of urban land is lower in mainland Australia is Darwin, but the overall cost of housing in Darwin is much higher than in Adelaide. South Australia has a record which is the envy (and obviously the honourable member does not travel or he would know this) of Governments in other States because of the operations of the trust.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As Minister responsible, in my discussions at planning levels, as recently as the Planning Ministers' conference in Perth, this matter was raised with me. The statistics will speak for themselves about the cost of land at Adelaide's urban fringes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to listen to the Minister in silence and notify me of his supplementary question if he wants to ask one, and not to interject.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As I pointed out clearly in my reply to the question in the House, I acknowledge the responsible role of the private sector working closely with the trust and I certainly acknowledge that role again. However, what has been said is absolutely a misrepresentation of the historic facts as well as the current facts. The South Australian Urban Land Trust has played a major role in ensuring that land is affordable, particularly for young home buyers and first home buyers on the urban fringes.

I do not resile from that—it is an undisputed fact. A number of questions relate to the acquisition by the trust. It is grossly unfair of the honourable member to attack the trust and call officers bullies and standover merchants, or whatever he called them. If one knew the officers involved, anyone less like bullies, standover merchants or whatever they were referred to, one could never meet.

It is unfair to attack staff of a statutory authority under parliamentary privilege. However, let it be clearly on the record that that is how the honourable member wants to operate. That is his decision and I do not believe it does him any credit at all. I will ask the Director-General to pick up the specific points about why we need this land. I would have thought that the Deputy Premier's letter was self-explanatory. If it is not, we are happy to provide a full and thorough explanation. One question was about future rezoning and future needs for the land, and I ask the Director-General to respond.

Dr McPhail: The notices issued in relation to this land fall within the standard program and practices of the Urban Land Trust. The land is and has been identified under the metropolitan development program as future urban land and it is part of the objective of the trust to maintain land prices. This is done critically through the prevention of fragmentation of ownership. By issuing the notices early it is possible to prevent the land moving into a number of other ownerships and, therefore, in due course creating difficulties of leapfrogging and added infrastructure costs.

A feature of the development of metropolitan Adelaide has been the ability to at least maintain some rationality on the fringe. The trust plays a critical role in that. As the Committee knows, Seaford is now in the process of being

rezoned. That land was purchased by the trust and the Housing Trust many years ago, but it has been leased back to the previous owners who have had continued use until the land is called upon. It is also important to know that the issue of those notices provides a protection to the landowner. All transfer and legal costs from here on-out become a cost on the trust and not on the landowner.

The important point is that this fits into the metropolitan development program. What occurred to those landowners is exactly the same as that which occurs in every other part of the metropolitan area where these requirements are required and introduced. It is part of a rational phased program which has helped to contain the cost of private residential land in South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As a supplementary question, the Minister and her predecessor have, on a number of occasions both in and outside Parliament, referred to the role of the Urban Land Trust in 'ensuring the availability of affordable land for residential purposes'. The Minister has mentioned the private sector in regard to this area, but what does the Minister see as the future role of private land developers in this State?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I certainly see a very rosy future for developers of private land in this State and I would be very happy to provide the honourable member with my learned views on the matter at some other time; I certainly do not intend to take up the time of the Committee now canvassing all the options available to future developers. The Urban Land Trust is not and has never been a developer of land; it is only a land bank and it does not actually develop land. It is the private sector that does the actual development of the land, not the South Australian Urban Land Trust.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: If the honourable member wants to make threats and use tactics like that he is quite free to do so, but the South Australian community fully understands the fact that the quality of life in Adelaide is probably second to none in this country in terms of access to services, the kind of environment in which we all live and the fact that people can afford to buy a house. If one were to journey to New South Wales or Victoria one would find the costs in the major urban areas prohibitive because they do not have the same kind of proper, planned system that we have in South Australia, where a statutory authority such as the Urban Land Trust works very closely with private developers. This is undisputed; they do work very closely with private developers. If the honourable member suggests that we should have a system where developers can buy up land, speculate, and make a lot of money, I make no apology for not having a bar of it.

I have lived in other States and I understand the systems there. I certainly understand this system and I not only support it but I also believe that it should be protected so that we do not see the kind of speculation on land prices such as can be seen in the outskirts of places like Sydney and Melbourne, where one must travel up to 2½ hours from the outer suburbs to get into the city. The honourable member should look at the quality of land, the quality of housing, the quality of development and, most importantly, the quality of our lifestyle and environment in South Australia before talking about having some other system that will tear that down. If that is the Opposition's policy, I am delighted to hear it, but it is not and will not be the Government's policy.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As a supplementary question, I invite the Minister to look at some of the prices that are

being charged by the Urban Land Trust for land for development.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask the honourable member to look at the prices charged for comparable land anywhere else in this country and we will see whose figures stand up.

Ms GAYLER: My question relates to the role of the Urban Land Trust and, consequently, to infrastructure costs for new development areas of Adelaide. I am surprised that the member for Heysen seems to be so critical of the Urban Land Trust, particularly since the legislation under which it is currently operating is supported by the Opposition in this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Committee to let the honourable member's question be heard.

Ms GAYLER: My question relates to the report released by the Minister today on the future urban development program for metropolitan Adelaide, where I note that infrastructure costs for new development will be about \$11 000 for each new house on the metropolitan fringe, or about \$4 600 per person, for all the physical and social infrastructure that new communities need. If the Government, via the Urban Land Trust, were not coordinating future urban development such as it is doing in the north-eastern, northern and southern suburbs, could we expect those developments and infrastructure costs to be even higher?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Certainly, we could expect those infrastructure costs to be even higher because, instead of a planned release of land where suburbs were created and therefore infrastructure costs per allotment were reduced, the kind of strip development that has occurred in other parts of Australia would occur, to the detriment of the individual purchaser. In other parts of Australia, people have purchased land without the necessary infrastructure such as electricity, water, kerbing and guttering, and so on, being provided, or they have had to pay exorbitant prices because of the costs that are therefore engendered by not having a properly planned and staged release of land.

That is the role of the Urban Land Trust: to ensure that we have the lowest land prices (with the exception of Darwin) in Australia. They are thousands of dollars lower, not just \$500 or so, than in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane or Perth, and the reason is that Adelaide has a properly planned and staged release of land, in which the Urban Land Trust plays a vital role. As I have acknowledged, the private developers work very comfortably with the Urban Land Trust and are certainly not backward in proposing land for development on the urban fringes. They are involved in that development but, to the purchasers of the land, who are normally young families or young married couples, it means that they can afford to buy the land and afford to establish themselves in suburbs, such as Woodcroft in my own electorate, which have amenities and facilities, and from which it is not necessary to take public transport or drive for 2½ hours, as one must do in other places including cities like Brisbane and Perth. When one looks at developments in other cities, one can be proud not only of what is happening now but also of the policies of previous Governments of both persuasions. I acknowledge what has been done by previous Governments of both political persuasions.

Mr ROBERTSON: I have two further questions about planning issues, the first of which relates to the proposed marina. One of the aspects that I wanted to pick up earlier but did not because it was not deemed appropriate relates to public access but in this case, to public access to the proposed walking trails, green belts, fingers of vegetation, and the like, through the eastern portion of the proposed development on the eastern side of the railway line. I simply

seek an assurance from the Minister that those walking trails, tracks and open space areas will be open to the public in the way that they would had it been anywhere else in the Marion council area.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I wish the honourable member had given me some notice of his question. I have no details about where this land will be, but I will try to provide an answer. The land that is considered for development is Crown and private land that is inaccessible to the general community and the public at large.

People have no access now; legal access does not exist. Under this housing development concept on part of the marina proposal what I call a linear park linkage will be established throughout the whole area. That will involve such things as walking parks for passive recreation where people can walk, ride a bike, fly a kite, jog and so on. That will provide more recreational and environmental facilities for the people in that area. I can assure the honourable member, without providing the details of where these things will be located—because community consultation will be involved in that determination—that the community will have a say in the establishment of what I call a passive recreation parkland through that whole area. It will be exciting and something that the residents will welcome.

Mr ROBERTSON: I have counted about 32 coastal drainage outlets along the metropolitan foreshore between Port Willunga and St Kilda, and I do not include the Torrens River outlet and the like. The land through which they discharge into the sea is held under a number of pieces of legislation. The south-western drainage legislation, for example, covers a number of drainage outlets in the Marion, Glenelg and Brighton council areas, and other pieces of legislation relate to the Torrens River outlet, the West Lakes area, and the West Beach Trust land. Given that plethora of statutes covering the various drainage outlets, will legislation covering diffuse pollution of that kind be prepared relating to all those drainage outlets, including the Torrens River outlet and the Field River Outlet? The logical place to control any kind of pollution is at the drainage outlet. Given the mish mash of legislation and the titles under which the land is held, can this whole problem be covered under the Local Government Act or will separate legislation to cover drainage outlets of that kind be required, incorporating those pieces of legislation into that covering diffuse pollution?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The question was quite detailed. I acknowledge the problems that the honourable member has identified; I have also identified them. The issues he has raised are valid in that they cover the whole question of pollution and pollution management. As the honourable member would know, in the near future I will introduce a Bill relating to the whole question of point of source discharges into the marine and riverina environment. To this stage the department has concentrated, in conjunction with other agencies, on ensuring that we take into account the comments of local government right around the community, including conservation groups and people who have an interest in the issue of marine pollution. We have concentrated on ensuring that legislation is prepared and will be introduced in this session.

However, I am certainly looking closely at the second aspect that I believe must be addressed as soon as the first part of the legislation is in place, and that is the question of how we are to deal with diffuse discharges and the pollution problems that that involves. I acknowledge the problems which have been raised and to which the honourable member has proposed solutions. Whether that is done under the Local Government Act or new legislation

that might cut across the whole area has not been determined. Certainly, I assure the honourable member that I will be looking closely and carefully in the near future at the suggestions he has put forward.

I also acknowledge that on a number of occasions the member for Bright has come up with creative suggestions as to how we might do something about those drains. I thank him for that, because the department welcomes the kind of suggestion and initiative that the honourable member brings up from time to time. We must encourage that sort of thing from the community, not just from members of Parliament. We must tackle this whole question of litter and pollution in the marine environment not only from the Government department level or the local government level but from the total community perspective. There would not be a problem if people did not throw away milk cartons and other rubbish and waste. I remind the honourable member that littering penalties and laws apply, and perhaps we should consider that area in a bipartisan way in the near future. We will no longer be able to live with the kind of littering problem that is now evident. Discussions with Kesab would highlight the issues raised by the honourable member today.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Minister said that the Urban Land Trust aims to stay just ahead of demand.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is to ensure that the supply of land remains just ahead of demand in terms of the release of land.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: What criteria have been established, what external or internal advice is taken, and by whom is the final decision made as to when one is just ahead?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask one of the departmental officers to answer that question in detail, but I suspect it is really a mischievous question. I said that the Urban Land Trust ensures that the release of land is just ahead of demand. I do not want to sit here and lecture the honourable member on supply and demand and what that does to pricing. I am not an expert in economics; I used economic terminology, which I thought the honourable member might have understood.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member is trying to nitpick. If that is the way he wishes to proceed, we have a long time here tonight and we can spend all night doing that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: All right. I will ask the Chief Executive Officer to outline the specific—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Proper procedures are laid down.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee want to adhere to the originally agreed timetable or extend for a few minutes?

Honourable members: Extend.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I know that Government members wish to ask questions, so I will ask the Director-General to respond to the supply and demand question—who ascertains at what point the trust is just ahead or behind?

Dr McPhail: I cannot give a detailed answer in terms of the mechanisms adopted by the Urban Land Trust (the details could be obtained), but basically the metropolitan development program provides the framework. There is a staging program within that development program that brings it down to a narrower focus. The Urban Development Coordinating Committee, which is a combination of all relevant departments associated with planning and infras-

structure, provides advice and focuses the areas that will be required within the next five to 10 years. I understand, although I cannot give a detailed answer, that the practices of the Urban Land Trust have been worked out on the basis that it is most cost effective for the trust to obtain the rights over the land about five years ahead of need, thus it is obtaining rights, as in this case, five to seven years ahead of need and purchasing closer to the time when the land is required for conversion. I cannot provide exact detail on that.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Program Estimates (page 402) state:

Commence planning reviews for Barossa Valley and southern region. Complete planning reviews for Gillman, Gawler region, Thebarton and Normanville.

It seems to me that the Thebarton area is a much neglected area, in terms of our State heritage, particularly the early days of the colony as westerners. At this stage, is there any detail of what this planning will involve?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There is detail available and I had it at my fingertips, but I will ask the Director of Planning to answer that question.

Dr McPhail: Considerable work is being undertaken in the Thebarton area as part of the inner western metropolitan development program. Investigations are taking place in the area of Henley Beach Road and another more contentious program relating to the proper boundary between residential and industrial use in the area to the west of Port Road. The department is also assisting the Thebarton council in the conduct of a local area traffic management study to assist in some serious local traffic problems in the area. A further investigation will take place in Thebarton over the next couple of years as that program reaches full head.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In relation to the Mount Lofty Ranges Review: as I understand it the opportunity for interested persons to make comment regarding the review concludes at the end of this month—that period was extended to the end of September. I am also told the Minister has suggested that she would like to see the project 'wrapped up'—I think that was the expression used—by December of this year. I am further informed that sections of the review consultative management plan have been rewritten as a result of the complete turnaround on a number of issues being dealt with in the review process. Can the Minister provide a precise timetable regarding the review and the release of the management plan, and also some form of Government commitment regarding the final outcome of the review?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I believe that I have been eminently reasonable in terms of allowing groups who have approached me—and local government particularly—to ask for an extension of time to have their submissions in. I understand there are people who still want to have a further extension of time. I am not prepared to extend the time officially, but I will take late submissions if people have good reason to have a late submission. I do not want to prevent any full and thorough discussion or analysis of the issues. I remind the honourable member that it has gone on for three years now at a cost of something like \$2 million. Every time that we extend the review process, that is a cost to the public purse because each of the departments that provide people to service that Mount Lofty Ranges Review must be funded somehow. It comes from each of the budgetary lines so this question is incredibly relevant to all of my departments. Therefore, I am not prepared to continue extending the period in which we will take further comment. There has been pressure from some areas to do that.

It is my intention to look at the end of the year—not by December—to look at the end of this calendar year for this

whole proposal to be finalised. I have not concreted that date. I will certainly take some advice on that, but that is my intention at this point.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I mentioned that some of the draft management plan is being rewritten extensively. Is it intended that more opportunity be provided for public comment in regard to that rewrite?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I do not think it is appropriate for me to comment on whether or not pieces are being rewritten, or whether or not it is extensive. Certainly, I understand that the departmental officers and the people who are considering this whole matter have responded to some of the suggestions that have already been made. I believe to talk about an extensive rewrite is probably an exaggeration. It is not my intention to have yet another round of public consultation. I am sure the member for Heysen would appreciate that we could go on doing this long after our time in this Parliament. We could keep saying every time we get towards a final proposal whoever does not like it or anything about it might want to call for more public consultation, and further consider the final draft. We could end up with 14 final drafts. It is not the intention of the review committee to do that and it is not my intention as Minister to preside over that. I believe we must give everyone the fullest opportunity to have input into the review. That has happened to a whole range of mechanisms over a three-year period. I have now extended the time for comment on the draft of the review and I believe that sensible consultation could go on in the preparation of the final report. However, it is not my intention to extend indefinitely a finalisation of this particular review. Many councils and groups want to see the final review.

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

Engineering and Water Supply, \$27 168 000
Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous, \$721 000
Works and Services—Engineering and Water Supply,
\$167 250 000
Works and Services—South Eastern Drainage Board,
\$235 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
Ms D.L. Gayler
Mr G.A. Ingerson
The Hon. R.G. Payne
Mr D.J. Robertson
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan, Minister of Water Resources.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr D. Alexander, Chief Executive Officer, Engineering and Water Supply Department.
Mr N. Killmier, Chief Operating Officer.
Mr P. Norman, Director, Technical Services.
Mr J. Shepherd, Director, Business and Information Services.
Mr R. Mander, Acting Capital Planning Officer.
Mr G. Habersfeld, Group Manager, Business Services.
Mr J. Bennett, Business Analyst.
Mr G. Drilling, Acting Recurrent Planning Officer.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open for examination, and invite the Minister to make an opening statement.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like to take the opportunity of advising the Committee of the general changes in the Engineering and Water Supply Department's management and financial direction. The department is presently undergoing a transition, changing its direction from a traditional expenditure oriented Government department to that of a Government trading enterprise. This approach has brought about fundamental changes not only within the department but in its relations and arrangements with central agencies, particularly the Treasury.

As from 1 July 1988, the department has accounted for all of its operations through a deposit account. Previously, receipts and payments for recurrent and capital purposes were accounted for through the Consolidated Account. These new arrangements were implemented to facilitate a much broader commercial approach to the department's financial management. To complement this change the cost of interest on borrowings was included in the department's deposit account along with all revenue collections and the more traditional lines of Government expenditure. The appropriation process has been modified to reflect this initiative so that funds appropriated to the department now relate to the department's capital borrowing requirement, together with the recurrent grants necessary to support non-business activities. Further financial management arrangements have been implemented that improve cash management and foster a sense of responsibility and accountability on the part of all managers to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness in managing the community assets entrusted to their care.

For the year ended 30 June 1989 the department's financial statements have been prepared in accordance with schedule 7 of the Companies Code reflecting trading enterprise and private sector practice. Depreciation has been raised on the historic cost of assets. In 1989-90, depreciation will be raised on the current valuation of water filtration and sewage treatment plants. In future years other asset groups will be revalued to further take account of the real cost of asset usage by the present generation of customers. During 1988-89, to enhance the move towards a more commercial approach, the department's operations were further identified into business and non-business activities with specific funding provided by the Government towards the shortfall on non-business undertakings. This has been followed by a rearrangement of the department's program structure as from 1 July 1989 through which this department reports to Treasury and Parliament. The revised program structure emphasises the five business activities of metropolitan and country water supply and sewerage and irrigation services. These programs account for over 96 per cent of the department's expenditure. Eight minor programs have either been amalgamated into the one program—'Other Community Services'—or absorbed within the major programs.

The department is preparing a business plan which brings together all of these initiatives and summarises all areas of its activities into a single planning document. The development of the business plan marks a major step forward in upgrading the financial management processes of the department. The department has programmed a range of capital works and I would like to mention briefly some key projects and activities.

Expenditure of \$10.1 million has been planned for the construction of the Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant in 1989-90. A further \$6 million is planned for distribution and other ancillary works associated with the filtration plant.

The first stage of the plant will be commissioned in November 1989. On that date filtered water will be provided to a further 420 000 people in the metropolitan area, including suburbs not previously served by Happy Valley on a continuous basis, such as Christies Beach, Hackham, Moana, Seaford and Port Noarlunga South. The Finger Point Sewage Treatment Works in the South-East of the State has \$400 000 in expenditure planned for 1989-90 to complete construction. The treatment works will be officially opened tomorrow.

I am also pleased to draw attention to the increasing tempo of activity on asset renewal. The major impetus for these works commenced four years ago with the department's study on the impending need for asset replacement. This issue has been subsequently addressed on a much wider basis by the Public Accounts Committee. The department is currently focusing its attention on key operational assets which include the Mannum-Adelaide Pipeline, major sewers and the Metropolitan Sewage Treatment Works.

An amount of \$16.2 million is programmed to be spent on asset renewal this year. Over \$19 million is planned for 1990-91 with further increases proposed in later years. The department has also responded to community concerns with regard to control of odours at sewage treatment works. At Bolivar there have been reported problems as the odours emanating from the treatment works have increased as recent housing development moves closer to the works. I am pleased to advise that an oxygen injection facility on the Bolivar sewer is currently under construction and should be operational by the end of September. This should reduce the incidence of sulphate based odours in the surrounding suburbs. Last year the Woolpunda groundwater interception scheme construction commenced.

This year some \$10 million has been provided by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission for this purpose, of which South Australia provides one-quarter. This project has major benefits for the future quality of river water which is utilised by both irrigation users and domestic and industrial consumers across the State as it will intercept 170 tons of salt per day when complete. The Woolpunda salinity interception scheme and the investigations in the Chowilla and Waikerie area are just three of a number of land management and salinity interception initiatives of the salinity and drainage strategy of the Murray-Darling Basin ministerial council. This will be complemented by the natural resources management strategy which has been approved in principle by the council and for which funding has been set aside by South Australia.

The Government of this State, through continuing active participation in the ministerial council, its work in support of and on behalf of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and its own water resources management activities within this State, will give top priority to ensuring that progress continues to be made in water quality and quantity management and in arresting land degradation throughout the basin for the benefit of the community of users of both land and water.

I have pleasure in presenting the Program Estimates of the E&WS Department. I believe they represent continued real progress in improving efficiency, customer service and a responsible approach to the husbanding of the States' resources.

Mr INGERSON: I have a general four-part question that I would like to ask the Minister and some of the answers or details will probably need to be supplied at a later time. My questions are:

1. What sick leave has been taken over the past financial year and how much of this leave was taken on Mondays

and Fridays and days immediately before and after holiday weekends?

2. What is the current salary of the Chief Executive Officer and the salary applying as at 30 June 1988 and 30 June 1989 and what allowances does the Chief Executive Officer receive in addition to salary?

3. How many officers are employed at EO and AO level?

4. In relation to interagency support items not allocated to programs, will the Minister provide an itemised rundown of spending during the previous financial year and the budget spending for this financial year under administration expenses, minor equipment and sundry items?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like to answer one of those questions and then I will ask the Chief Operating Officer to answer the remaining questions. With regard to the question of the Chief Executive Officer's salary, I suspect the answer to that is not enough but I would remind the honourable member that, as all honourable members know, those figures are easily obtainable from the *Government Gazette*. They are gazetted and they are public information and I think the honourable member is more than capable of finding that for himself. It seems amazing to me that he is asking for information which is freely available to every member of the community and the Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for Heyson to come to order. Does the honourable member for Bragg have a point of order?

Mr INGERSON: Mr Chairman, as you will be aware, the question that I have asked has been a question that was asked of all Committees and the response we have had from all other Ministers has been one of reasonableness. I do not believe that my question was asked in any other way and I think it is unreasonable for the Minister to reply in the manner in which she did.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot direct the nature of the ministerial reply but your comments are on record.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think it is an incredible question to ask public servants who are brought before the Committee when that information is readily available. I am so pleased to be of assistance to the Committee that we have anticipated a number of questions in terms of sick leave which I would be delighted to present. Is it the intention for members to ask five or six questions in the one question? We have not been provided with an advance copy of the questions so when an honourable member reads out very quickly six questions in a row—I think the member for Mitchell actually counted six or seven in one question—it is very difficult to answer them. Mr Chairman, I would seek your guidance as to how you wish me to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN: This is the fifth session of this Committee at which such a question has been asked. It is my understanding that the member for Bragg does not want an immediate answer but is putting the question on notice. In that sense it was broken up into parts and I allowed it as one question on notice. Similarly, there was another question this afternoon from the member for Heyson which had parts to it which I understood he was happy to take on notice.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As I interpret your ruling on this, if people ask multiple questions then they can be taken on notice?

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Any of these questions can be taken on notice at any time.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The Chief Operating Officer, Mr Killmier, will answer the questions.

Mr Killmier: The first question dealt with sick leave. In a survey of the E&WS Department by the Government

Management Board on sick leave taken in 1988 the following results were highlighted: the overall average sick leave among clerical and administrative staff was 7.24 days per year; the overall average sick leave among the weekly paid workforce was 10.17 days per year. A survey by the Department of weekly paid sick leave for the period 24 March 1989 to 16 June 1989 indicated that the average was 9.3 days per year. This indicates a slight improvement over 1988. The department is continuing to monitor quarterly the amount of sick leave being taken and takes action when necessary to ensure that sick leave is not abused. I will take the rest of the question on notice and provide the information.

As at 31 August the number of AOs and EOs was 353.6. The .6 would be somebody who was on part-time employment. Residual interagency support services is \$199 000 and appears on page 412 of the Program Estimates.

The note in the estimates indicates that in 1988-89 it included notional payments to Sacon for debt servicing and building services. The \$199 000 is made up of several amounts: \$4 233 for property maintenance services, property development services, transportable building location, and the debt servicing charges were \$101 015. The third one was capital works expenditure carried out by housing and construction on behalf of the department, totalling \$93 911.

Mr INGERSON: At the bottom of page 407 of the Program Estimates under 'Receipts' the recurrent figure for 1988-89 is \$272 million and the actual amount received was \$292.539 million. Can the Minister explain the reason for the \$20 million increase of actuals over proposed? Will she comment on the proposed figure for this year which is only \$10 million over the actuals of financial year 1988-89?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Chief Operating Officer to answer the question.

Mr Killmier: The E&WS Department is to some extent placed in the situation of having to rely on the weather from year to year. Therefore, the budgeting for receipts which has to be done before the first of July in each financial year has to anticipate the weather for the ensuing 12 months. The method used to budget for receipts is to take a moving five year average, plus any other knowledge that we may have at the time we do the budget in June.

Inevitably, if we have a hot dry summer or a summer with a little rain, water consumption varies. Consequently, last year the consumption of water amounted to about 231 million kilolitres, against the average consumption in the past decade of 215 million kilolitres. The result was that revenue from additional water rates was ahead of budget. I am being very precise: under the Act we have base rates and additional water rates for legal purposes. Some of us talk about excess water, but additional rates and excess water rates are the same thing. The term 'excess' water does not legally exist. That was the main reason.

The consumption during the period of billings in the past financial year was up significantly, resulting in additional income. The 1989-90 budget is based on normal averages. It is interesting that consumption now compared with consumption last year is slightly down on last year. I remarked to colleagues the other day that if the weather continued the way it is up to Christmas or thereafter our income might be slightly down on past years.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, in the reply there was a comment that additional income had been achieved. Can the Minister say what that additional income was?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would have thought that that was the difference between what was proposed, that is, \$272.108 million and the \$292.539 million. I thought the

Chief Operating Officer gave a long and detailed answer about why one could not be precise about matters relating directly to climatic conditions and individual usage by consumers around the State.

Mr Killmier: There may be other small amounts of income. As the Committee is aware, economic activity in South Australia has been somewhat higher in the past 12 months than we might have thought when we set the budget. Certainly, in the case of having to do new connections we have been under a fair load to keep up and, therefore, there would have been some other income from new construction and the like. I gave the principal reason for the additional receipts.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to the next line because there is also significant variation in capital receipts. Can the Minister explain the \$27 million lower figure between the proposed and actuals in 1988-89?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask Mr Shepherd to answer that question.

Mr Shepherd: The answer is fairly simple. A large part of the additional income received during the year was applied to capital purposes and, accordingly, the amount required to be obtained from other sources for capital expenditure was reduced.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to page 413 in respect of source of funds. That page lists specific deposit accounts and payments from trust accounts of a recurrent and capital nature. Can the Minister provide details of these accounts so that the Committee can understand from where all this money is coming?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The purpose of my statement—

Mr INGERSON: It did not explain the amounts.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It explained the process.

Mr INGERSON: I listened, but the statement did not explain the deposit accounts and, with such large sums being involved, it is fair and reasonable that there be an explanation about the source of that money.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am happy to do that.

Mr INGERSON: As the Minister has explained, there has been a significant change from all those moneys going through the budgetary process to going through deposit accounts. Significant sums of money are involved here and I think the Committee ought to know where they come from.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am sure Mr Killmier can provide that information.

Mr Killmier: The line appropriation from Consolidated Account is the amount appropriated to the department by Treasury for the non-business undertaking component. The payments from special deposit account are departmental appropriations for the business undertaking. We do have other special trust and deposit accounts, which is the next line, and the other line—the intra-agency support services—was the Sacon payment that has been referred to. The proposed total for 1989-90 of \$328.823 million can be reconciled as follows: the appropriation to the department from Treasury totals \$27.168 million; payments from departmental income are proposed to total \$298.355 million; and payments from trusts and deposit accounts, \$3.360 million. That gives a total of \$328.883 million.

The same procedure applies for capital expenditure. Again, the first line, appropriation from Consolidated Account, is the extent to which capital is provided by Treasury to make up any shortfall in the department's ability to provide its own capital. That is proposed to total \$16.725 million; proposed payments from the special deposit account are \$69 million; and payments from trust and deposit accounts

are to be \$1.19 million. The total is \$86.915 million for the year. That is the short answer.

Mr INGERSON: We no longer have any information on the income of the department other than the annual report that is put before Parliament. It is important to know where the money for some of these deposit accounts is coming from. In this instance I know that a lot of detail is required, and I requested the Minister to supply detail about recurrent and capital expenditure and their source of funds to the Committee at a later date.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That is fine. As I explained in my introduction, the whole process has been changed and is not as simple as perhaps it was before, but we are happy to provide that information.

Mr INGERSON: At page 414, the Program Estimates state:

A limited sewerage scheme for Aldinga Beach will be commenced and a design for a sewage treatment works to serve the surrounding areas will be completed.

Can the Minister give some details of that scheme?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is proposed to construct a 10 000 person capacity works to accommodate the anticipated development in the Aldinga area to the year 2000. We are looking at an indicative capital cost ranging from \$3 million to \$3.5 million, and at this point I am not able to release details of the actual design and operation of the scheme. The honourable member was asking whether, if such a scheme was on the drawing board, what would be its capacity. I will certainly provide more details as soon as I have them. The scheme is certainly proposed and the design is proceeding at the moment.

Ms GAYLER: My question relates to asset replacement and I note in the capital works program that certain proposals are referred to, such as the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works, the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works, and so on. The matter of asset replacement has come to the attention of the Public Accounts Committee from time to time. Would the Minister provide details of expenditure which falls into this category of asset replacement for 1989-90 and what planning is being undertaken for future asset replacement needs as the system generally ages?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Again, I referred to this in my introduction. The E&WS Department plans to spend about \$15 million on a number of projects, with further increases in subsequent years. The asset management plans are being prepared for the very complex strategic asset, such as treatment works, major pipelines and pumping system. As I said in my introduction, plans have been completed to date for the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works, the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, and as the honourable member mentioned, the whole question of the Bolivar Treatment Works. Renewal projects are now identified separately in the department's capital works plan so that the component of renewal to total capital works undertaking is very clearly identified.

In relation to the specific details that the honourable member wants to know, the major projects which have been planned for this financial year include the following: Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works rehabilitation, \$1.1 million; Port Adelaide STW rehabilitation, \$1.646 million; Bolivar STW rehabilitation, \$1.371 million; South Road water supply main replacement—a major main, leading to the south—\$800 000; Glenelg North Warren Road sewer replacement, \$2.052 million; Calton Road, Gawler, water main replacement, \$590 000; and Hughes Street, Birkenhead sewer replacement, \$610 000.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members will hear the Minister out.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member asked for detail about where that money was going in terms of dividing it up and I have given some indication. I have certainly not given a detailed list because I did not want to waste the time of the Committee, but the honourable member will see that we are very serious about asset replacement. The E&WS is the leading light of Government departments in moving towards a proper and adequate allocation of funds each year for asset replacement.

We have a difficult job in convincing the community that it is important to put away this money, because people cannot see the asset until there is a burst pipe. Everyone then recognises the problem and wants to make comment. In comparison, the need for replacement of school buildings, red hens and STA buses is evident. We have a job ahead of us in convincing the community that asset replacement is a vitally important part of any budgetary process. This department has a good record that other Government departments and the private sector would envy.

Ms GAYLER: I refer to page 420 of the Program Estimates. I understand that the Ministerial Council of the Murray Darling Basin is now taking a wider view of its role in relation to both salinity management and protection of the land and environmental resources of the basin. That will involve new financial arrangements. How much is the council, which is made up of the respective Governments, committing this year for management and works in South Australia?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The total allocation this year by the commission is about \$17.398 million. South Australia's contribution to that is \$8.975 million. The council has certainly moved forward, and I am pleased to say that there is a great spirit of cooperation. The relevant Ministers from all States work positively and constructively together, and I include Ministers from various political persuasions right across the political spectrum. Those Ministers work together to ensure that we move towards redressing the serious problems that are the result of 200 years of practices, the effect of which were not clearly understood. There has been enormous degradation in the Murray Darling Basin.

Programs have been identified, one such project being the Woolpunda groundwater interception scheme, on which \$10 million will be spent this year. As I said in my introductory speech, 170 tonnes of salt will be removed from the Murray River each day under that scheme alone. A number of other elements could be considered. This scheme is in the second year of a three-year, \$25 million project, so we are moving more than half-way through the scheme. I am looking forward to the completion of the scheme, as I am sure is everyone in South Australia and people in the Murray Darling Basin, but the effects for South Australia will be most particular, because the scheme removes salt from the northern part of the river as it flows through this State. I could refer to the salinity mitigation investigations, which we are directing as a high priority in the Waikerie, Chowilla and Loxton areas, but the honourable member may wish to ask questions in that regard.

Ms GAYLER: The Program Estimates (page 419) refers to water resources management and states that a preliminary evaluation of the long-term threat to surface water in the Mount Lofty Ranges is posed by the greenhouse effect. What are the results of that preliminary investigation and when will the report be completed?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask Mr Peter Norman to provide that detail.

Mr Norman: Some preliminary investigations have been undertaken into the effects of the so-called greenhouse effect and in respect of the Adelaide Hills watersheds, on which we rely for a large part of the Adelaide metropolitan water supply. The findings to date are that there could well be a significant reduction in rainfall and, therefore, runoff in that part of the State. Fortunately, the shortfall that would occur as a result of that process can be made up from additional pumping from the Murray River. It is predicted that, as a result of the greenhouse effect, the flow in the Murray River system would increase; thus, the reduced resources in the Adelaide Hills could be supplanted by the extra flow in the Murray River. From the point of view of water supply, metropolitan Adelaide can look forward to a bright future in terms of having sufficient water from the combination of those two resources, but it will cost us a bit more to pump that extra water.

Ms GAYLER: Supplementary to that, how reliable are the predictions on the greenhouse effect? It sounds to me as though we are talking about marked variations between areas such as the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Murray River catchment area.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think we probably all agree that no one can predict that with any certainty. In the wider context of the greenhouse effect, we have tried to obtain objective scientific measurements by which to ascertain whether the greenhouse effect is producing the predicted results. I have established a Mean Sea Level Change Committee, which will play an important role in monitoring the effects of sea level rises not only on the South Australian coast but also around the Australian coastline. We will be looking at an objective and scientific measurement of whether the sea is rising, and by how much. This expert committee will report to me, making suggestions and proposals as to the ways in which we might mitigate the outcome of the greenhouse effect.

The honourable member is quite right; at this stage it is prudent to factor in the predictions, whether or not they are absolutely accurate, in terms of such things as planning legislation. We are already doing that. This is not happening in other parts of the country. At a recent Planning Ministers conference, a number of other Ministers were amazed to learn that South Australia has already adopted a fairly cautious approach to coastal management and development based on some of the predictions. We cannot be accurate, and I believe that that is acknowledged, but we can set in place processes to enable us to carefully, properly and scientifically monitor what is happening as a result of the greenhouse effect. That goes right across the issues relating to land and water in South Australia. Mr Norman may be able to provide further details.

Mr Norman: The predictions are preliminary at this stage. Ongoing monitoring and research into this subject is required, particularly on a national level. It is fair to say, as the Minister has pointed out, that this possibility is being taken into account in planning for water supply in South Australia; it was considered in the preparation of a report that the Minister released recently entitled 'South Australia: Water Futures. 21 Options for the 21st Century'.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Discussions are already being undertaken between the Australian Water Resources Council and the CSIRO in terms of accurate and scientific monitoring. I have also established a Climate Change Committee, which will work with the information provided by such scientific committees as the Mean Sea Level Change Committee. That sort of thing is vitally important: I do not find it amusing. If we are to be serious about our environment and our water resources, if we are to ensure that we have

not only an adequate supply of water but good quality water, which the community demands and expects, and if we are to factor in the cost of providing enough water of suitable quality, we must look at all the environmental effects that will impinge on delivery of that safe, high quality product at an affordable cost.

Therefore, I believe that these committees which are selecting this scientific information in a sensible and planned way will be relevant to the future. Future generations of South Australians may well thank us for having had the foresight to establish this type of monitoring and research program.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In relation to the Murray-Darling Basin, the question was asked about how much South Australia was contributing and what the total expenditure was. I believe the Minister said about \$17 million was being spent, of which South Australia was contributing \$8 million. There are four contracting Governments, and it seems that South Australia is putting in a lot if that is the case.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I interpreted the member's question as being, 'How much is being spent in South Australia?' She did ask that, and that is what I answered. The answer to the question was \$17.398 million in South Australia. I can give the actual figures.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: What is the total expenditure this financial year on the capital works program for the Murray-Darling Basin and what is South Australia's contribution?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The total expenditure authorised by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission for 1989-90 is \$29 308 800. South Australia's share of that expenditure through the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be \$15.998 million, and this expenditure is made up as follows: investigation and construction, \$1.471 million; operations and maintenance, \$3.482 million; salinity mitigation—the investigation program which I referred to in my introduction—\$945 000; salinity mitigation construction, \$10 million—I have given that in answer to the honourable member for Newland; and salinity mitigation operations and maintenance, \$100 000.

Owing to the various formulae for cost sharing by the contracting Governments—the Commonwealth and the three States—after allowing for the small surplus held by the commission in its account from the previous year, South Australia's contribution for 1989-90 will be \$7 488 422.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Out of \$29 million.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, I presume it is. A natural resources management strategy has been approved in principle and is subject to funding. Funding will be considered by the council at a meeting in the Riverland in October of this year. If the commission's recommendations are approved, the total commission's expenditure on the strategy will be \$7.206 million. Expenditure in South Australia for that part of the strategy will be \$1.04 million. That is a breakdown of the figures.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am not concerned about whether the money contributed is spent in South Australia. Obviously it has to be spent where it will do most good to the system, and whether any is spent in South Australia would be immaterial.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would have to take issue with that.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It is all a matter of priorities, and the Commission can work out best where the high priority is. All these capital works have to be taken in order of priority. If order of priority means that virtually no work is been done in South Australia this year, or next year, then

so be it; that does not upset me at all. It is a matter of where it will do the most good.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I agree with that, but I believe it is important to recognise that the problems have been identified.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: On page 417 reference is made to Smoky Bay and Port Vincent water supply. The Smoky Bay water supply has been in dire straits for the past 10 or 15 years and something has at long last been done about that. How many of the uneconomic schemes that are currently listed are scheduled to commence this financial year, and how many currently stand on the uneconomic list? What progress are we making in coming to grips with that problem?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That is something we take very seriously, as a Government, to provide water to remote areas. I am sure that the honourable member is aware that we do that. I have been part of the opening of a number through the COWSIP scheme. The fact that we are restricted in what we can do by the Federal Government's contribution to COWSIP means that we have actually had to prioritise this, and it also means that those schemes where a local community, through its local council or through, in some cases, a combination of a local council and a private development—which has happened in a number of schemes—is prepared to contribute its third along with the State's third and the Federal Government's third means that in some cases some of these schemes have proceeded because of the willingness of the community to participate and contribute its third.

I believe it is important that the Committee and the community generally recognise that the COWSIP scheme is based on a third contribution from the three levels of government, and that third level can be interpreted through a private commitment, a developer, or through the community themselves making contributions. I believe it is important to set the scene in terms of this question with that background.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: How many are scheduled to be started?

Mr Killmier: The list of uneconomic schemes was prepared some years ago and has declined in size, in some respects, for a number of reasons. First, some of them have been done under the COWSIP arrangement, and I refer to Mount Compass, Blanchetown, and the upgrade of the Port Victoria supply and the Penneshaw supply, and I believe I could also refer to one or two others. This year, there are proposals for Smoky Bay, Port Vincent, Port Parham and Webb Beach, all within the COWSIP arrangements.

The other reason why the list has shrunk somewhat is because under the COWSIP proposals offers have been made to a number of communities for water supply schemes, only to find that those communities were not quite as interested as they first appeared to be when they were invited to contribute towards the cost or to pay rates. I refer to the likes of Meadows, Macclesfield, Echunga, Kangarilla, Upper Sturt, Mundulla, Kingston South-East and the upgrading of Hawker supply to give it a desalinated scheme—all of those, having been made offers within the COWSIP arrangements, were declined.

However, notwithstanding that there is still potentially a list of towns that may be interested, and the only way to resolve how genuine their interest is, is to make them an offer within the COWSIP arrangements. As funds present themselves, and as people demonstrate a genuine interest in getting a mains supply, it is hoped that those people can be made offers and dealt with. The answer to the honourable member's question is in the papers: Smoky Bay, Port Vin-

cent (which covers both Port Vincent and Stansbury), Port Parham and Webb Beach will be dealt with this financial year.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I refer to the winding down of the work on the metropolitan water filtration plant and I note a 30 per cent reduction. With much of the work on the Happy Valley water filtration plant being completed, and given that work on the overall program for water filtration in the metropolitan area is winding down, what is the Government's attitude to filtration of country water supplies? I point out to the Minister that any town whose water supply comes directly from the Murray River has water with far greater turbidity levels. The quality of water is much less in those towns than that of water ever received in metropolitan Adelaide. Of course, the towns that pump water directly from the river straight into their water supply face the problem that the water has no chance to settle. Consequently, the level of turbidity is much greater than that experienced elsewhere in the State. Does the Government have a policy or a program of water filtration for country towns? I recently spent some time in Victoria and New South Wales, where I was shown very small, efficient water filtration plants. I inspected a very small plant at a town called Leachville, which has a population of only 300 people. Its very efficient, small water filtration plant was designed by Kinhill in Adelaide.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is certainly a significant issue. The proposals for water filtration, given the enormity of the capital cost for large plants, will have to be addressed in terms of greatest need. It has been identified that, once the Happy Valley stage 1 project is completed, we will proceed to complete Happy Valley stage 2. On a number of occasions I have made public announcements that the Government will then move that technological expertise and staff resources to the construction of the Myponga plant.

I recently announced that I have managed to secure some Federal funding to investigate how we can then move towards providing a filtration scheme at Stockwell for the whole of the Barossa Valley. Whilst this project is not in the honourable member's electorate—it is in the electorate of one of his colleagues—he would acknowledge that that is an area of great significance in terms of South Australia's economic development. It is probably the most recognised tourism area for wine growing in the country never mind in South Australia. It seems to me that it is fairly important that we provide water filtration facilities for that large and diverse community after we have finished the metropolitan scheme. After we have finished the Myponga plant we will have completed the metropolitan filtration scheme and, as I have indicated, subject to my being able to convince my colleagues in Treasury, we would like to move into country areas and to complete the scheme in the Barossa Valley.

The member is questioning where the very small schemes fit in this program. I take the point that a 300 person scheme is fine. However, if one has limited resources, and if one is dealing with very large communities, where one can provide a significant size filtration plant and provide for the needs of those communities, all reasonable people would agree that one should deal with those plants first and then move to the smaller communities of 300 people, 500 people or whatever.

This is part of the whole philosophy that the Government will be moving towards. We recognise the need, and we have identified that need through the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Some preliminary planning for the smaller schemes, particularly the riverside towns—which I

am sure are the towns to which the honourable member refers—has been undertaken. However, as the capital funds have been directed to more pressing projects, we will continue to plan and investigate the schemes. The preliminary study, which has identified some 20 communities, has estimated the total cost to be in excess of \$35 million. I am sure the honourable member would agree that that is a considerable capital contribution.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am answering the question. The point is that the 'needs basis' must be looked at in terms of the financial viability of providing for the greatest number of people who will use the scheme. There is a cost factor involved in terms of looking at the effectiveness of these schemes. I am sympathetic to the honourable member's point. I do not think that there is any need for any comments about who lives where. I believe very strongly—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Well, if that was the point, I would not be moving towards getting a commitment from my Federal counterpart for preliminary work and studies on the Barossa Valley. If we were looking at whose electorate would get water filtration, I do not think that this whole argument would hold one drop of water. I will not look at the provision of water and sewerage services in this State along those lines. I have not done that and I do not believe that the department is involved in that type of activity. We are looking at servicing the great bulk of the population, because the unit of cost of doing it that way makes sense—it is an effective and efficient way to go.

I have indicated that we have already done preliminary studies. The department is monitoring continuously the level of new technology and the cost effectiveness of that technology so that we can move, as quickly as our budgets will allow us to move, to provide for water filtration schemes for small communities, particularly along the river. It is fine for the honourable member to demand scheme after scheme and rehabilitation of irrigation in the Riverland. The Opposition is demanding pipelines west of Ceduna, with not one shred of thought being given to how we will fund those projects. What does the Opposition suggest we cut back? I am not prepared to be part of that kind of thing—where one asks for everything and no-one must worry about where the funds will come from. I would have thought that in an Estimates Committee there might have been some degree of financial responsibility shown on the part of the Opposition. We are moving as quickly as possible to provide these water schemes and to provide water filtration, and I assure the Committee that we will continue to do so.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I was trying to make the point that I inspected very efficient, effective and small water filtration plants in Victoria, which serviced towns with populations as small as 300 people. The towns and communities that I am talking about have populations of 3 000 and 4 000 people. My point is that the technology is there. We have been led to believe that the technology is not available to produce small, efficient water filtration plants. When one is talking about a needs basis, whether one is or is not aware of it, the water that is pumped directly from the River Murray, particularly at times like this, has a far greater level of turbidity than any water that one has seen in the metropolitan area.

Of course, people in country areas have as much right to the same standards as people living in the metropolitan area. I am not asking for anything more. But, let us not lose sight of the fact that 25 per cent or 30 per cent of the population live in the country areas and produce 50 per

cent of the State's income. That is what the rest of the population live on. A water filtration plant for the country areas that I started—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Chaffey, if he has further comments to make, to make them by way of a supplementary question.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like to have it on record that I acknowledge the work of the member for Chaffey in terms of the filtration plant for Whyalla and the towns in that area, and that is a significant country area that already has water filtration. The honourable member, when he was Minister, did exactly the sort of things that we are doing now in terms of identifying—

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister and the member to come to order. I will give members supplementary questions rather than have these continual unnecessary interruptions and interjections.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I want to make very clear that I have never at any point suggested that the member for Chaffey is just wanting to put water filtration schemes in his own electorate. I have not said that nor implied it. What I have said is that we must look at a scheme whereby the largest communities get water filtration first because of the economics of it. I will ask the Chief Executive Officer to pick up on that point. That does not mean that I do not acknowledge the problems that exist in the Riverland towns. As the honourable member would be aware, I have visited the towns on a number of occasions in a private capacity as well as officially. I am aware that at times of very high river flow the turbidity creates extra problems for those people. If we had an unlimited budget in E&WS, (and I can speak on behalf of the whole department), we would move as quickly as possible to provide the quality of water that we would like to see supplied throughout South Australia to every community in this State.

The economic realities of living in the real world are that we do not have an unlimited budget. We are therefore moving very quickly to provide water filtration. We will take the honourable member's questions on notice. I understand his concerns and I think it is quite reasonable if he wants to see water filtration in his own area. I am not suggesting that he has ever done that at the expense of any other area, because he did preside over the Morgan to Whyalla pipeline and that whole program.

I am saying to the honourable member that I am really doing a similar sort of thing to what he did when he was the Minister, that is, to work as quickly and as systematically through the provision of clean filtered water to as many people of South Australia as we can. I believe I have had a small success in getting some money from the Federal Government; that is extra money that we did not have, and I will certainly be pressing in future years to ensure that we get a continuous supply of that money. I take on board the comments about small, efficient filtration plants. I will certainly ensure that I am right up with that latest technology, and in future we will move to those sorts of schemes. I cannot give a commitment in terms of a time frame at this point, but I am sure that we will be able to do so in future.

Mr ROBERTSON: Has any work been done to quantify the impact of extending the present pensioner concession scheme and indexing it yearly? What would be the cost to revenue had that concession been indexed to about the cost of living? I understand that the amount of money is quite enormous. Has any work been done on that?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will take that question on notice.

Mr ROBERTSON: I now turn to some of the workings of the department as they relate to treatment of odours and related matters. One of the problems that I encounter in surprisingly newly developed areas, and certainly some problems encountered by my colleagues, is that of sewer odours, particularly on hot summer days when the configuration and slope of sewers, and the like, and the rate of movement through them sometimes allows the colder air from below ground to come out through breather pipes and, in the hot atmosphere of a quiet summer afternoon, it drops from the breather pipe and onto the ground, causing considerable discomfort to surrounding areas.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:

Mr ROBERTSON: It would not happen in the Hills but it happens on the flats. There are a number of technological solutions to that, one of which is to inject oxygen into sewers. Is that the zenith of technology, or are options available for oxygenating sewers and for treating the problems of what are called sewer gases but which comprise in the main the various oxides of sulphur and, I suspect, a few elements of methane and the like? Is oxygen injection the best we can do, or are there other alternatives?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There are a number of things that can be done. I have actually had this in my own area, and one of the things that can be done is to identify, through wind, etc., that the venting pipe is perhaps too low. In some cases the venting pipe can be extended and the problem then tends to be solved. There are some simple solutions that do not require high cost and fairly sophisticated technology. In fact, the department tries those solutions first, as you would expect it to do, because we are not in the business of using a Rolls Royce model if we do not need to.

A number of substances can be injected into the sewers, and we are doing that at Bolivar at that his very moment; of course, that is a major undertaking. We have, in fact, injected oxygen into a number of problem areas in a smaller way, but the problem with using other substances is cost. It is not cost-effective to use other substances. The only other substance that we could inject is chlorine, and that is not as cost-effective. It is much more expensive than using oxygen injection. The state of technology at this stage would seem to lead us to think that that is the best form of solution in terms of cost effectiveness. The department continually searches the literature from around the world and, whenever any of the department's officers travel overseas for any reason, they have a shopping list of things, like control of odours and a whole range of questions relating to sewerage and the disposal of effluent, to examine.

So, I believe that the department is right up to the minute in terms of what technology is being used around the world and, wherever possible, we see whether our officers can visit those places and return with accurate engineering and chemical assessments of just what that technology is. It is my understanding that that is the latest technology. Where there is a severe problem we look at oxygen injection; where there are other problems that can be dealt with in a more mechanical way, they are dealt with in that manner.

Mr ROBERTSON: One of the perennials in this Committee has been the issue for methane generation from sewage, and I am aware that in at least two of the treatment works the methane that is generated can be burnt off and used to generate electricity which in turn is used to drive pumps. For example, at Glenelg I understand that the energy balance is about right and that one can generate about as much methane as one needs to drive pumps. I also understand that at times excess electricity can be fed back into the grid. I would seek some elucidation on the arrangement

between E&WS and ETSA in relation to the refund that the E&WS Department receives for that energy that is to be fed back into the grid. I ask the question against a background of other people who generate methane privately and want to sell it back to ETSA being paid considerably less than the opportunity cost of that energy; in other words, they are paid about 2c a kilowatt hour for the energy, whereas ETSA will charge 6.5c per kilowatt if they want to buy energy from it. Is the E&WS subject to the same constraint, or does ETSA have a more liberal arrangement with the E&WS about buying surplus electricity from the methane run pumps?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I know that the member for Newland is also interested in this matter on a broad industrial basis, and it is probably relevant that we get as detailed a reply as we can. I have no intention of taking over ETSA's role and function in terms of the production of electricity. We have more than enough in my three portfolio areas—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It would not be beyond the capabilities of this department, but I can assure the honourable member that we have enough to do without generating electricity. The honourable member has raised an important issue, because it gets back to the question of generation of energy and transforming one form of energy into another. I will ask Mr Norman, who shares my interest and that of the two honourable members to whom I have referred, to comment on our relationship with ETSA, the generation of methane and any visionary aspects he may have for making our plants even more efficient.

Mr Norman: The E&WS Department runs four facilities in which it generates methane and in descending order of scale, they are Bolivar, Glenelg, Port Adelaide and Christies Beach Sewage Treatment Works. At the first three of those methane along with supplementary diesel oil is used to generate electricity. At Glenelg we also use the energy produced to direct drive air compressors which provide the necessary air for the treatment process. The scale of the Christies Beach plant has not yet reached the point where it is economic to use the methane to generate electricity, but we do use the energy to heat the digesters which are part of the treatment process. The energy is still used and put to good use.

The energy demands at the Bolivar works are such that they are easily met by the available energy produced from the methane at the plant and we flare off gas in excess of our needs. At the Port Adelaide and Glenelg plants where we also generate electricity, the energy needs of the treatment plant and the pumping facilities which are nearby to bring the sewage to those plants are such that the energy produced is about equal to the energy needs. As to the provision of energy to ETSA, we have not yet reached a stage of exporting energy from our plants into the ETSA grid.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Are we going to?

Mr Norman: The possibilities exist to provide and sell energy from our plants to the ETSA grid. However, that would require upgrading the electrical connections between ETSA's grid and our facilities. We are not yet into that business, but it is certainly an option and, as the price of energy increases, perhaps it will become more attractive.

Mr ROBERTSON: Essentially, my question was about what arrangements have been made, and you have answered that. In the event that the department opts to discontinue flaring at Bolivar, which handles about 40 per cent of the total volume, if at the end of the day the department sells the energy back to ETSA, surely negotiations will have to take place. Whether the department does it by having a

reverse flow meter or by commercial arrangement whereby ETSA pays the department, would the department look at obtaining the opportunity cost, or would it look at simply working a net budget so that at the end of the day ETSA pays the department or the department pays ETSA at the prevailing rate.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We will look at those options. It is recycling taken to its ultimate level. The answer is, 'Yes'.

Ms GAYLER: The gas company buys methane converted to natural gas from an operator now establishing a plant at the Wingfield tip. That is an alternative market. My question relates to water quality and, contrary to the implications from some members, the problem of unfiltered and excessively turbid water are not confined to rural areas. Residents of Range Road South, in particular, have their water supply taken direct from the pipeline from the Murray River just before the Anstey Hill water filtration plant, so these residents have turbid and unfiltered water. I have written to the Minister on one or more occasions about this. Is there any prospect that people in the area could draw water from the Anstey Hill plant back downhill to supply their domestic needs?

Mr Norman: The honourable member's question relates to a matter that is technically feasible. It is all a matter of cost. I cannot quote the figures because, to my knowledge, that investigation has not been done. Although it may have been undertaken in responding to the letter in which the matter was raised with the Minister, but I am not familiar with that information. Although it is technically feasible, it is a question of economic justification.

Ms GAYLER: If the costing is available, could it be included in *Hansard*?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We will provide information on the costing.

Mr INGERSON: It has been reported to me that in the past couple of weeks, due to cutbacks in Government funding, maintenance by E&WS crews has been minimised and that, as a consequence, a blockage in sewerage drains was not detected and raw sewage flowed and was fed by a concrete aqueduct into the Hope Valley Reservoir. I understand that raw sewage could have seeped into the water supply for about two months. Further, I understand that the Health Commission, through its officers, has treated the water supply to chemically neutralise the sewage. What action has been taken on this matter and has the treatment by the Health Commission officers been deemed to be satisfactory?

Mr Killmier: I know something about the matter to which the honourable member referred, but I did not hear the last part of the question about the Health Commission.

Mr INGERSON: I have been informed that the Health Commission, through its officers, has treated this problem chemically and I question whether this is satisfactory, whether the E&WS is happy with the arrangement and whether there are any other long-term problems.

Mr Killmier: In introducing this question the honourable member made the statement that this problem occurred due to a lack of maintenance. An incident occurred not as a result of a lack of maintenance; rather, it occurred as a result of a lack of telemetry. The department is spending about \$6 million on a very sophisticated telemetry system which will enable it to be aware of every instance of malfunctioning ejector pumps, and so on. In this case, a pump malfunctioned, as happens from time to time, and it overflowed, which also happens at ejector stations from time to time. As soon as the problem became known through routine inspection, immediate steps were taken to solve it. It

happened at a time when the Hope Valley water filtration plant was not in use and water was being supplied from another direction but, by conducting tests, the department ensured that the quantities were so small that they were not likely to present any problems.

The department went through all the precautions but I am unaware of any involvement of the Health Commission, and normally the E&WS would use its own laboratories to check for any problems. I do not believe that the incident occurred as a result of a lack of maintenance; rather, it occurred because it is impossible to stand alongside every pump 24 hours a day. Malfunctions occur from time to time but, as soon as they are found, steps are taken to rectify them. In this instance it is unfortunate that the overflow reached the intake channel, which feeds into Hope Valley, but the quantity was minor in proportion to the inflow, and the reservoir was out of use. Notwithstanding those facts, every precaution was taken to conduct tests, and I can provide the results of those tests.

It has to be fully understood that the officers of the department are as conscious as everyone else of the absolute need to take every precaution on every occasion but, as happens from time to time in the Hills, and at Milan Terrace, for example—and the Hon. Mr Wotton can vouch for this—it is not possible to run a sewerage system without problems. When they do occur, we do everything we can to ensure that no hazards result. In this case, the water would have run through the Hope Valley water filtration plant, which means that, by the time it was treated, no health problems would have been created.

The Minister may wonder why she is not aware of this. It is a fact of life that I cannot report every incident of which I become aware every day, given that there are literally hundreds of pumping stations. Recently air got into the pipes at Rostrevor and the incident was blown out of all proportion, when in fact it was a non-event; officers attempted to get the air out of the pipes at the weekend, but it was reported as being a waste of water. Members of Parliament and other people made inquiries but we were doing only what we normally do to ensure that the public gets the best quality water that we can provide with the funds available.

Mr INGERSON: The question was reasonable because it was reported to me that that incident occurred and that the Health Commission was involved. Was the Health Commission involved and what action, if any, did it take in this matter?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, I will certainly make that information available.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister advise whether the E&WS intends to increase its inspection staff to carry out spot checks on domestic plumbing installations in the metropolitan area? I understand that there has been a reduction in inspection staff.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: What line does this relate to? Is there something in the line that indicates that there has been a reduction in the amount of money allocated for staff?

Mr INGERSON: I would have thought that the Minister could answer any question that related to the number of staff employed by the E&WS.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! During the past hour or so a lot of unnecessary trouble has been caused by members rudely interrupting each other. It would be preferable if members do not interrupt the Minister, that the Minister does not interrupt members, that members speak to me,

and that the Minister speaks to me and we could then return to some order.

Mr INGERSON: My question on the staffing of the E&WS Department and any particular section of it comes under the total budget line of the department. If the Minister refers to the Program Estimates she will note that in all sections the number of staff is mentioned. The question I have asked is about inspection staff as it relates to domestic plumbing installations. I would have thought that was specific and that, if the Minister and her officers do not know the answer, the information could be supplied to the Committee in the normal way.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The reason I asked what line this question related to was that the honourable member talked about a reduction in allocation of funding. I remember that, when I was a member of the Committee and we had to relate every question to a line, every question I asked over five or six years of Estimates Committees related to a particular line. Had the honourable member not said that there was a reduction in allocation for this group—

Mr INGERSON: I did not say that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have promised that members will have the opportunity to ask a supplementary question if they feel their original question has not been answered. Can members please stick to our normal procedure.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I apologise if I misheard the honourable member; I thought I heard him say that the number of inspection staff had been reduced, so I assumed that there must be a line to which I could refer in giving my answer. As I have not been given a page number or line, I will ask whether any of my officers have that information in their head and, if not, we will be happy to provide it to the honourable member. I believe that the Chief Operating Officer has that information.

Mr Killmier: The drains inspectors to whom the member referred are employed under the Public Service Act. The budget for Public Service Act staff this year has been reduced slightly, as has the budget for the award area. The department is endeavouring to increase efficiency, and we require all areas of the department to contribute to an average reduction of about 2.7 per cent. There is no reason why that should result in a reduction in the quality of the services provided. We are asking the various areas of the department to increase efficiency. There are practical examples of the increases in efficiency. For example, I am aware that the meter readers' rounds were recently reworked so that we have achieved about a 25 per cent increase in the number of meter readings.

The number of plumbing and drainage inspectors does not increase and decrease as demand goes up and down. Members may be aware that building activity varies significantly due to the peaks and troughs, but the same number of people are employed in that area year in and year out. To my knowledge the number of plumbing and drainage inspections is equal to or better than that applying in other States. In fact, I believe that other States have reduced the number of plumbing inspections to a greater degree. It would not be unreasonable to ask why it is necessary to inspect plumbing work as compared with the work carried out by other tradesmen that is not inspected by departmental officers. However, the facts of life are that we are continuing to perform our requirements as laid down in the Act.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: During the Mount Lofty Ranges Review process, the 17 or so councils within the watershed catchment area commissioned Australian Groundwater Consultants to prepare an independent report to determine the major causes of pollution in the watershed.

The findings of that report were, in many instances, contrary to the policies of the E&WS Department. Since that time, Tourism South Australia has commissioned Roger Stokes to prepare a further independent report into the causes of pollution within the catchment area. I understand that that report has been completed and that Tourism South Australia has copies of the report. I further understand that the findings of the Stokes report are sympathetic to those of the Manning report. However, I have been told that the Stokes report is not to be released publicly. Given the importance of this subject to the review and in particular to water quality, why will the report not be released? If the Minister does not know why, will she find out and advise the Committee accordingly? Will she make representations to the Minister of Tourism to ensure that the Stokes report is released publicly?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I certainly have not seen the Stokes report. If it was commissioned by the Minister of Tourism, it would be her prerogative to release it or not release it. I am not in the practice of telling my ministerial colleagues how to run their departments or what to release. I am sure that the honourable member, who was formerly a Minister, will understand that. I will liaise with my colleague. I have not seen the report, so I cannot say anything about it and I cannot say whether or not it will be released. I assume that that will be a decision for either the Minister of Tourism or Cabinet, if the Minister chooses to take the matter to Cabinet. That is the normal procedure.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Supplementary to that, I repeat what I said: because of the importance of this subject to the whole review and because of the uncertainty relating to this issue, particularly the contradictions between the Manning report and the policies of the E&WS department, I believe it is essential that that report be released. If the Minister does not know why it will not be released—and she indicated that she does not know—will she make representations to the Minister of Tourism to ensure that the report is released because of its importance to the whole Mount Lofty Ranges Review?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is probably appropriate, as the honourable member has called into question the research being undertaken and the information being provided by the E&WS Department on the Mount Lofty Ranges Review, that he be asked to comment on that. It seems to me that, if we are to talk about the Mount Lofty Ranges and the review, surely one of the most significant issues is water quality. We have already heard a number of questions about water quality and the possible effects of the greenhouse effect; we also heard questions that elicited answers about the provision of water to Adelaide in the future. The largest catchment area for water supplied to Adelaide comes under the Mount Lofty Ranges Review. Because of practices that were permitted in the ranges in the past, we are facing enormous problems with the quality of water, and it is time that people sat down and asked collectively, 'What are the major priorities in terms of the Mount Lofty Ranges?' I was under the impression that that is exactly what is happening in the Mount Lofty Ranges Review. People may have other agendas, they may want to push particular barrows, but at the end of the day the community of South Australia will decide the primary and major issue with respect to that area. I look forward to hearing how the debate develops from here. The Chief Executive Officer may be able to comment on the Manning report and E&WS procedures. I am sure he has seen the Manning report.

Mr Alexander: Let us be clear that E&WS Department policies are policies that Governments of whatever persuasion have adopted. I am aware of the Manning report, which

was commissioned by local government; I am also aware of the report commissioned by the tourism people. I do not accept the term 'E&WS policies'; I implement Government policies. The study indicated that a number of the policies that I, or the Government, have adopted in the Hills were complementary. What we have advocated for years has suited agriculture and other areas. I have been looking fairly carefully at the situation because of my responsibilities to the Government regarding quality and safety of water supply, and I have seen nothing to date that indicates that I should change my advice to the Government. The issues under the Mount Lofty Ranges study are being put together, but I make the point that until now I have seen nothing that would lead me to change my advice to the Government regarding the quality of the water in the Hills and the need to preserve what we have done.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Supplementary to that, as Government funding has been used in the commissioning of the Stokes report, will that report be recognised as evidence in the overall Mount Lofty Ranges Review and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Once again, that question should be directed to the Minister of Tourism, who commissioned the report, and not to me as Minister of Water Resources. It is up to my colleague to decide whether she will release the report. We must look at these issues seriously. Does anyone seriously suggest that we should go back to establishing piggeries in the Hills or initiating the kinds of practices that were adopted in the past?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I don't know what the Stokes report says, but somebody should know.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I thought you indicated that the Stokes report—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: If you know all that, why did you ask the question?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members must come back to discussion through the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There is a review committee to consider all this. I will not personally review every submission into the Mount Lofty Ranges Review.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Program Estimates (page 416) refer to the South Road main duplication program being constructed in conjunction with Highways Department roadworks, and a statement is made that it will be completed. I am aware that that would be one of the aims of the department. Is that project on target? It is in my electorate. A few days ago they were at Corunna Avenue, which is still some distance from Daws Road. The section being treated at present is between the overpass and Daws Road. I want to congratulate the Minister and ask her to let her officers know that the work so far has been done with the minimum of disruption, taking into account that mains are being installed in the middle of South Road, a road carrying more traffic than any other undivided road in this State. I have had only one complaint in the past four months. Commendation is also due to the Highways Department, ETSA and the Gas Company. It is a co-operative effort. Some problems were experienced with the first stage of the project between Anzac Highway and the overpass, but I believe everybody learnt a great deal, and it has been an excellent effort so far.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is nice when a member acknowledges that the department is doing its work, not only efficiently and effectively, but also with the minimum disruption of such a busy and highly populated area. I am aware that the program is due to be finished in June 1990,

but I will ask the Chief Operating Officer to give some further details on this matter.

Mr Killmier: The works that the honourable member has referred to involve the laying of a service main while road-work reconstruction between Anzac Highway and Daws Road is under way. This is designed to facilitate future rehabilitation of the existing trunk main to minimise disturbance to the new road surface and to consumers, and the expenditure proposed by the department is about \$800 000. To answer the question, the department is doing what we need to do at the appropriate time in coordination with the Highways Department. I cannot really say when the Highways Department will finish.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Are you able to keep up with the schedule?

Mr Killmier: I can assure the honourable member that the E&WS Department will fulfil whatever we are required to fulfil as part of the highways program, because we do not want to end up with a situation where we undo anything the Highways Department has done. I do not think I could bear the pain of the questions if I was asked why we are digging up a finished road surface. So, we are coordinating to the best of our ability.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Estimates of Payments (page 149) refer to the depreciation of fixed assets. Last year, \$5.48 million was actually spent and proposed is \$12.568 million. This is obviously a large increase in the depreciation of fixed assets. Is this a result of any study of the need to increase the amount put by in relation to asset replacement in sewerage plant in the metropolitan area? Is there some reason for this large change?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I gave a lot of that information in my introductory statement.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I do not think it actually dealt with those exact figures.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Chief Operating Officer to answer this question.

Mr Killmier: In her introductory statement, the Minister drew attention to the fact that in 1989-90 the department was changing its methods of depreciation calculation. In 1988-89, our depreciation was based on the historic cost of assets. We are moving towards current cost depreciation. In 1989-90 we have valued our water filtration plants and our sewage treatment plants to current values. The result of that is that when one divides the new value of those plants by their lives—and sewage treatment plants in some respects do not have a long life because a large part of the plant is mechanical and electrical equipment which has a relatively short life of 20 to 30 years—the net result is that the provision for depreciation for the metropolitan sewerage has had to be increased, hence the figures that the honourable member has pointed out whereby the provision in 1988-89 of \$5.48 million has been increased for 1989-90 to \$12.568 million.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note that the amount proposed last year in relation to metropolitan drainage and south-western suburban drainage funds was \$110 000; \$159 000 was actually spent. I know that south-western drainage is concerned with my electorate, the area of Marion, and so on, particularly drain 6, which has been an absolute godsend since it was installed a number of years ago to provide better surface drainage of stormwater as high up as Pasadena down through St Marys, Clovelly Park, and so on, to the Sturt Creek inlet, which then takes charge of that water and delivers it down to the Patawalonga. I note that an increase in expenditure is estimated. Was work necessary or is it simply an interest charge increase?

Mr Alexander: The honourable member deserves 10 out of 10 for perception. The increase is due to interest payable on the outstanding loan for metropolitan drainage, and it has been included for the first time under this line. Previously, it had been handled in another way.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Killmier is well aware of my eagerness to have Old Noarlunga connected to the sewer. I heard a rumour the other day that there may be a possibility that the township of Old Noarlunga may be connected to the Seaford project. Will the Minister indicate whether that is feasible? Also, I attended a meeting last night which was attended by representatives of a task force that the Minister has established to look at cleaning up the Onkaparinga and the estuary. I would appreciate it if the Minister would give some kind of timetable, as I imagine that the Minister would have indicated that she would like a report from that task force.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask the Chief Executive Officer to answer the first question.

Mr Alexander: The honourable member is referring to public meetings that he and I have attended from time to time in relation to Old Noarlunga. As was brought out at the public meeting, clearly, as development gets closer to Old Noarlunga, the opportunity, or the cost, of connecting it to the main sewerage system might be somewhat easier. However, all the calculations that have been done to date have indicated that the return that we would get from Old Noarlunga is quite low. The cost of the project is about \$1.8 million, and it returns only 2 per cent or 3 per cent. I think an offer, or a suggestion, was made to the people concerned, namely, that they might like to contribute towards the cost. However, I do not think that that has progressed very far. At the moment, the main activity relates to an investigation that is under way to look at the Noarlunga estuary. I think that the Minister may want to comment on that.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I established the Onkaparinga task force in response to well perceived public concern about the state of the Onkaparinga estuary and the river. There have been a number of meetings, and I have had excellent reports back from the community in relation to the people on the committee and the work that they are doing. The first phase of the activity of that Onkaparinga task force is the technical phase, where the people who have been appointed have some degree of technical expertise, or knowledge, about the issues and problems. My time frame is more in the sense of achievement. Once the task force has clearly identified the issues in respect of the Onkaparinga River, we will broaden the committee to include representatives from Healthy Cities and other interested parties.

Mr INGERSON: I note, from reading the line on public safety, that the document states that one should look at some other source, and there are four different sections. Will the Minister say whether the E&WS Department has addressed the problem of the inadequate drainage of the built-in pipework forming part of spa baths being imported to South Australia from other States?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will take that question on notice and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

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

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

Lands, \$42 470 000
 Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, Miscellaneous, \$10 000
 Works and Services—Department of Lands, \$6 000 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
 Ms D.L. Gayler
 Mr M.J. Meier
 The Hon. R.G. Payne
 Mr D.J. Robertson
 The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan, Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. Darley, Chief Executive Officer, Department of Lands, and Valuer-General.
 Mr B. Kidd, Director, Operations Services.
 Ms A. Stimson, Manager, Executive Services.
 Mr C. Kaufmann, Acting Director, Regional Operations.
 Mr R. Emery, Manager, Management, Accounting and Budgeting.
 Mr J. Porter, Surveyor-General.
 Mr C. Backen, Assistant Valuer-General.
 Mr J. Maher, Registrar-General.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Would the Minister like to make an opening statement?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Since taking on the portfolio of Minister of Lands, I have continued to support the departmental strategic objectives of excellence in service provision to its many client groups, flexibility in the management and training of its people and a commitment to change and innovation. The diversity of its service activities is reflected in the budget estimates being discussed tonight. The Department of Lands is now recognised both nationally and internationally as a leader in technological innovation.

The State land information system recently received the exemplary systems in Government award of the influential North American body, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA). The Department of Lands has played a major role in the development of the land information system. In fact, the department received the same award in 1984 for the land ownership and tenure system which is one of the major nodes of the State land information system.

The department's work in the development of a digital cadastral data base (DCDB) also illustrates its leading edge. The further development of a digital topographic data base (DTDB) in the 1989-90 financial year is another example of its commitment to the development of excellent systems. The computerisation of titles is yet another important development in this area. In undertaking these developments the department has developed expertise which is recognised world-wide.

In concert with Sagric International the Department of Lands has successfully tendered for contracts in registration, surveying and land information systems throughout the world, including participation in a land surveying project in the Philippines in 1988-89 which will continue this year. The Philippines project is a major exercise in cooperation between public and private enterprise with an overall value

of some \$25 million. These initiatives benefit South Australia by raising overseas awareness of our State's abilities and developing contacts and opportunities for the sale of other South Australian goods and services. They also increase the department's skill base and provide personal development opportunities to individual members of the staff. In that same vein, the department is also discussing with tertiary education institutions methods of providing land information systems training to current and future employees locally.

Apart from these externally orientated emphases on products and services, the department is pursuing an active program of management improvement. This ranges from formal reviews of departmental procedures to the provision of efficiency and responsiveness, through the development of better management information and legislative review. The approach is essentially one of reviewing and simplifying administrative activities to ensure that there is no unnecessary waste of resources—public or private—and developing internal information systems to encourage and promote that aim.

Mr MEIER: Page 444 of the Program Estimates, under 'Issues and Trends', states:

Major valuation system modification and enhancement will be necessary particularly in the areas of residential computer aided valuations and computerised field records. Rating and taxing program is potentially being effected by special project pressures. High levels of professional staff turnover is placing considerable pressure on senior valuers to maintain the quality and quantity of valuation output whilst also training replacement staff.

This statement seems to conflict with that made by the Valuer-General, as reported in the *Advertiser* yesterday as follows:

He knew of no plans to review the valuation system and did not propose recommending a change.

I note, too, that the Valuer-General had received more than 6 200 complaints, yet the Minister has said that she does not intend changing South Australia's property evaluation system even though her own fellow Minister, the Minister for Employment (Mr Mayes) has publicly attacked the Government's valuation system. I wish to bring to this Committee's attention and indeed, the Minister's attention the following examples concerning land valuations and to say why I believe there is a need urgently to review the land valuation system. The first example is from a property at Medindie, the valuation of which went from \$125 000 to \$220 000 in the last land assessment. That is a \$95 000, or 76 per cent, increase. The owner complained for some five weeks before a person came out and inspected the property. He was told that the yard was large and that, therefore, the property was worth the value. However, the house is in poor condition. The owner says that there are no carpets throughout the house, that it has no bath and that it needs maintenance. The owner was told on a subsequent appeal that if the valuation should come down it would be by very little.

A second example was from Kings Park. The assessed capital value in 1986 was \$87 000; in 1987, \$89 000; in 1988, \$94 000; and this year it is \$143 000, which is a \$49 000, or 52 per cent, increase. This person, a pensioner, rang the Valuation Department, which said it would let the owner know whether or not it would revalue the property. Eventually, the owner was informed that a person had driven past the house and said that it was a deep block and that was what influenced the valuation, as a result of which it would not be reduced.

Another example was from North Adelaide, where the valuation increased from \$190 000 to \$295 000, a \$105 000 or 55 per cent increase. The owner rang the Valuation

Department and a young man inspected the property. He said that a similar house had sold nearby for \$300 000 and that the value would stand. The owner contacted a senior valuer and asked for a revaluation. Subsequently, the valuation was dropped by \$45 000 to \$250 000.

How many others have been told by a junior person that there will be no re-evaluation? Perhaps they should have pursued their inquiries with a senior person. A Glenelg unit had an assessed value of \$74 000 as of 1 July but the property was purchased in May of this year for \$66 000. It had been advertised at \$67 000, so, obviously the owner negotiated a \$1 000 drop. Thus, there would appear to have been an \$8 000 increase in the property valuation in one month.

Another example relates to a property at Gilberton, which in 1984 had an assessed value of \$93 000; it remained the same in the following year 1985; in 1986 it went to \$130 000; the following year it remained the same; in 1988 it went to \$145 000; and this year it has gone to \$240 000, which is an increase of \$95 000 or 65 per cent in the past 12 months. Since 1983 the council rates have increased from \$179 to \$698.

The next example relates to a property at Hyde Park where the assessed value has been increased from \$161 000 to \$247 000, which is an increase of \$86 000 or 53.4 per cent. The owner is renovating the house and, according to him, there is a huge hole in the middle of the house. After four telephone calls over a five to six week period, a valuer agreed to reduce it by \$27 000 to \$220 000, which meant an \$86 reduction in council rates, but the owner said that, it should be reduced further. He was told to put the appeal in writing, because unless the objection was in writing, a valuer would only drive past. He has not heard anything since the letter was written. The place next door has been put up for sale on several occasions and the asking price was \$140 000, but it still has not sold.

My final example relates to a property at Gilberton where the assessed value increased from \$100 000 to \$188 000, which is an increase of \$88 000 or 88 per cent. The owner rang the Lands Department and a young gentleman said that not much could be done because other houses had sold for high values in the area, therefore, there would be no reduction. The owner was not satisfied with that answer so he asked to speak to a senior valuer. In the first instance when the young gentleman looked at the property, a subsequent phone call led to the valuer decreasing it by \$22 000, which is still a 66 per cent increase, so the owner was not happy.

The owner obtained a computer print-out of sales for the past 12 months and discovered that there had been only a 12 per cent increase in the median price of properties in the area. He questioned how an 88 per cent increase (now reduced to 66 per cent) could be justified. In view of these examples and recent comments in the press, will the Minister now admit that the present property valuation system is in a shambles?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, I will not admit that at all. I will ask the Valuer-General, who is responsible to Parliament, to outline clearly the valuation system in South Australia and perhaps to pick up some of the examples cited by the honourable member. He can also clearly explain how the system in South Australia relates to systems in other parts of Australia. If the Valuer-General is happy to do this, perhaps he could mention other systems and why those other systems are not appropriate for South Australia.

Mr Darley: With regard to the first question about the enhancement to the valuation system, that refers to the fact that a number of computer programs are used in connection

with computer assisted valuation. We always enhance those computer assisted programs, but we will also look at additional programs to assist in the valuation of commercial industrial properties.

I am mindful of all the examples that the honourable member mentioned where reductions have been given in some cases but not others. That demonstrates how generous our valuation staff are in attending to any inquiry made by the public. Only in South Australia, and nowhere else in the world, can an owner object at any time to our valuations. That means also that they can object any number of times.

The basic process that is undertaken in making valuations is that every relevant recent sale that has occurred throughout the State is analysed by valuation staff. This information is kept in an information bank, as is the tremendous amount of detail concerning each and every property in South Australia. I remind the honourable member that there are 652 000 properties in South Australia and each and every one of those properties is valued every year—once again, the only place in the world where this occurs.

Having collected the information on all these relevant sales, the valuation staff assesses the valuation of each of the 652 000 properties having regard to these recent sales. The honourable member mentioned one example where a property had been on the market for less than we had valued it, but I remind the honourable member that valuations are relevant to particular points in time. Notwithstanding the fact that a property may have been on the market in May and was then sold, our valuations are made at some other date and, therefore, the valuation could be quite different from the actual selling or asking price.

With regard to the example at Medindie, the answer to that question relates to the second example at Kings Park. The valuer was really saying that in a lot of cases the highest and best use of these two properties in particular was as a developmental site, or that the improvements made no additional contribution to the value of the land. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that there may have been certain problems about the improvements, the highest and best value was attributed to the land value alone.

I think that the other examples related to the fact that people had approached my officers and asked for consideration to be given to the valuation. In some cases reductions had been made, but in other cases they had not. The fact that more than one approach had been made to the office demonstrates the fact that my officers are only too keen to listen to all the concerns of individual owners and to take those concerns into account. Therefore, those reductions were made in keeping with our guidelines.

South Australia undertakes 652 000 valuations annually. The only other place where this occurs within Australia is Queensland. A system of annual valuations is progressively being introduced into that State. South Australia's valuation system returns two values: first, the land value; and, secondly, and more importantly, the capital value to which we found the community can relate. Most South Australians can understand that, if we determine a capital valuation on their property, then it is quite easily related to the market, because they are aware of what is happening in their streets. As mentioned in one of the examples, the Glenelg unit was valued at \$74 000 and it sold for less than that—\$66 000—having been on the market for \$67 000. That sort of information and knowledge in the community in South Australia is not uncommon. I think that is attributed to the fact that we are returning values to which they can quite readily relate.

Mr MEIER: I certainly acknowledge the work of the Valuer-General. I acknowledge also that his staff must be in an uncomfortable position in having to respond to all the complaints. However, we seem to be heading towards a situation where 652 000 property owners might all appeal and make a total mockery out of the present system that the Government is reinforcing and claiming is the system that should be followed. Despite the comments of the Valuer-General, it appears obvious that changes have to be made.

To say that staff have been generous in re-evaluating fails to recognise that people have been hit hard, as in the examples I have given, by increases of up to \$105 000. If that person had not appealed, I would not have called it a generous increase, but the \$45 000 reduction could be regarded as generous. In more than one case property owners to whom I spoke decided not to appeal and I certainly questioned why they did not want to appeal. They said they did not want to stir or make an issue out of it. I am concerned about the thousands of people in South Australia who have been hit with valuations that are not true. The valuations also affect the council or water rates, because they are based on the valuations. Only the people who are willing to telephone, write or see their local member seem able to get obtain reductions.

How does the Minister intend to overcome the problem of people, who in good faith approach the Lands Department and speak to an officer responsible for valuations, being told that their valuation is correct, but then on the same, or a few days subsequently, after speaking to a different officer—as in the example I quoted—obtain a \$45 000 reduction? Whom should people approach? Should they all go to the Valuer-General or the Minister if they believe that justice is not being done?

An appropriate answer was not given about the 88 per cent increase in the property value from \$100 000 to \$188 000. The officer involved claimed that houses have sold for high values in the area, yet on the computer print out indicated that there had been a median price increase of only 12 per cent. How can 88 per cent be justified when the mean value was 12 per cent?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This question could involve a long and detailed discussion. I remind the honourable member that, as the Valuer-General has said, valuations are tied to market values. They are not stagnant values set across the State and annually increased by the rate of inflation. That is not how the market place operates. Some areas in Adelaide—more so than in other parts of South Australia—are highly sought after as places where people want to live and buy property. As happens in every other part of the world, such properties are more valuable because people are willing to pay more for them.

The valuation of that property increases not in the same proportion as houses, flats or units situated a greater distance away from services and facilities, or in areas being newly established. Anyone who has travelled around the world understands that fundamental principle. Valuations for the same house are different in different locations. This raises the whole concept of real estate. Real estate agents talk about the three Ls—location, location and location. We are not talking about that concept.

I take it that the honourable member is suggesting that because house valuations in one area increase by as much as 88 per cent (the figure he used), when the mean increase throughout the State is 18 per cent, there must be something wrong with the system. Is he suggesting that we move to a system that takes no account of market forces and that allows for a house in a highly sought-after suburb close to

the city, close to facilities, entertainment and recreation to have the same value as a house that is not sought after and is not located near facilities or services? Of course he is not suggesting that.

The valuation system operates on the value of the property in terms of the market place. To say that we should set all values at a certain level on day one and, just to be fair to everyone, allow valuations to increase only by a certain percentage would mean that we were completely out of step with every other State and the way they undertake their valuations. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table which looks at the average sale price of houses and the average capital value of residential properties by local government areas.

Leave granted.

AVERAGE SALE PRICE (HOUSES ONLY)

Local Government Area	Average Sale Price	Average Sale Price	% Change
	June 1988	June 1989	
	\$	\$	
Whole State	84 769	98 897	16.67
Adelaide	174 468	328 573	88.33
East Torrens	124 133	137 294	10.60
Port Adelaide	71 616	87 822	22.63
Prospect	99 829	129 590	29.81
Enfield	66 828	79 337	18.72
Mitcham	117 396	141 841	20.82
Unley	147 001	170 607	16.06
Marion	82 173	96 631	17.59
Glenelg	128 042	142 131	11.00
Brighton	120 613	143 821	19.24
Willunga	64 513	74 930	16.15
Happy Valley	93 581	110 689	18.28
Kensington/Norwood	145 048	149 671	3.19
St Peters	151 744	171 506	13.02
Campbelltown	93 225	109 904	17.89
Burnside	165 500	214 482	29.60
Payneham	100 688	119 489	18.67
Walkerville	228 519	259 408	13.52
West Torrens	92 766	108 442	16.90
Thebarton	79 889	101 397	26.92
Hindmarsh	70 852	93 321	31.71
Henley and Grange	112 624	133 607	18.63
Woodville	107 621	122 214	13.56
Tea Tree Gully	85 016	97 214	14.35
Munno Para	57 782	61 309	6.10
Elizabeth	52 700	54 961	4.29
Stirling	113 443	124 289	9.56
Salisbury	64 282	72 905	13.41
Gawler	70 770	77 675	9.76
Noarlunga	65 257	75 950	16.39
Port Pirie	31 806	37 767	18.74
Mount Gambier	66 162	76 539	15.68
Murray Bridge	59 355	57 243	-3.56
Victor Harbor	88 945	88 988	0.05
Port Augusta	52 028	59 452	14.27
Renmark	60 269	57 538	-4.53
Whyalla	50 408	57 850	14.76
Port Lincoln	76 838	75 013	-2.38

AVERAGE CAPITAL PRICE (RESIDENTIAL)

Local Government Area	Average Capital Value	Average Capital Value	% Change
	June 1988	June 1989	
	\$	\$	
Whole State	78 473	89 650	14.24
Adelaide	189 295	242 638	28.18
East Torrens	126 564	139 413	10.15*
Port Adelaide	69 100	80 721	16.82
Prospect	88 567	115 310	30.20
Enfield	61 560	71 269	15.77
Mitcham	100 101	115 921	15.80
Unley	116 270	152 201	30.90
Marion	80 921	89 407	10.49
Glenelg	99 992	116 306	16.32

Local Government Area	Average Sale Price June 1988 \$	Average Sale Price June 1989 \$	% Change
Brighton	99 384	117 661	18.39
Willunga	77 726	87 699	12.83*
Happy Valley	91 035	99 454	9.25
Kensington/Norwood	116 489	139 371	19.64
St Peters	116 445	137 109	17.75
Campbelltown	91 406	98 764	8.05
Burnside	141 559	178 183	25.87
Payneham	93 153	108 246	16.20
Walkerville	156 352	218 681	39.86
West Torrens	84 432	97 089	14.99
Thebarton	74 272	80 332	8.16
Hindmarsh	70 195	74 638	6.33
Henley and Grange	86 587	97 184	12.24
Woodville	86 428	95 667	10.69
Tea Tree Gully	81 115	91 564	12.88
Munno Para	59 354	64 721	9.04*
Elizabeth	47 425	48 957	3.23
Stirling	104 615	114 925	9.86
Salisbury	62 290	67 607	8.54
Gawler	73 117	80 722	10.40*
Noarlunga	65 759	77 179	17.37*
Port Pirie	36 724	41 339	12.57*
Mount Gambier	63 784	65 443	2.60
Murray Bridge	55 419	63 866	15.24*
Victor Harbor	83 690	106 809	27.62*
Port Augusta	44 100	44 973	1.98
Renmark	54 812	58 998	7.64*
Whyalla	37 721	37 929	0.55
Port Lincoln	68 900	70 235	1.94

* These figures include Rural Living properties and do not entirely isolate single dwelling houses as per sales statistics.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member can see the changes in the average valuations. The whole concept of valuations in a society with a mixed economy is that valuations are tied to what the market will pay.

Mr Darley: The question referred to the example at Gilberton and an increased valuation from \$100 000 to \$188 000. The valuer talked about a \$22 000 decrease and a 12 per cent variation from the median. One problem with valuations is that the real concern is not whether the average value increased by a percentage or whether the median price increased by an average but, rather, whether that valuation was correct.

As to the Gilberton property, that has nothing to do with median, average or other levels. The question to be asked is whether or not \$188 000 is correct. Otherwise, one is comparing a whole range of properties. About 60 000 residential properties change hands every year. If one works out the average increase and compares that with the median increase, one arrives at different answers. If we try to relate them to individual properties, there will be no correlation whatsoever. The real question to be addressed is whether or not the actual valuation returned for an individual property is correct. It has nothing to do with averages or medians—median prices, median valuations, average prices and average valuations can be taken only as a rough guide.

Mr MEIER: It would be easy to express my anger about the lack of understanding of the Minister in defending the indefensible. The point has been made, which I thought I had made through examples, that there are cases where properties have increased by \$105 000 in value in one year, yet at the stroke of a pen on the second, not the first appeal, the value has been dropped by \$45 000.

That is the first thing. There is something grossly wrong with the valuation system when it can be decided that a property has been overvalued by nearly 50 per cent. I could cite other examples but I will not, because time is too limited. Surely, when one can cite a case where houses which are poor and run down are compared to houses nearby that

are sold in excellent condition, having been renovated, and they are given a similar value, it is time the system was changed. It is so unfair. The tragic thing is that many of these people are pensioners and they are feeling the pinch. More than one has said to me that it looks as though the Government is trying to run them out of their house. From the Minister's comments, that is perhaps the case; perhaps the Minister will argue that if the value is too high, these people should sell out and find another place to live. That would be very unfair.

If a house is run down, in poor condition and has not been maintained, why should it have a similar value to a nearby property that was sold at a very high figure merely because they seem similar on the outside? I know that we could go on all night arguing this point but I just want to reinforce the view that the whole valuation system has to be looked at. It hinges on the ridiculous at present. I acknowledge that it is generous of the Valuer-General to say that he will look at any complaints, but the staff could do better things than re-evaluate all the time. It could get to the point where staff simply re-evaluate all year, and that is not what the Department of Lands should be doing.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is quite outrageous for the honourable member to suggest that, because a pensioner has lived in a suburb for a number of years, perhaps always, and that the value of their property has increased, the mere fact that that property is now valuable is somehow connected with being driven out of their home. The valuation of land will not in itself drive anybody out of their home. It is reasonable to talk about how the valuation would affect things like council rates but to suggest that, because a property assumes a higher value, determined by the marketplace, free enterprise and market forces, people will be driven out of their properties, is quite ludicrous.

Mr MEIER interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Goyder was heard in absolutely strict silence and I insist that the Minister make her reply under the same conditions.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I understand exactly what the member is saying. How these valuations affect other systems should be discussed, but to say that the fact that we have a valuation system which recognises market forces will drive people out of their homes is nothing short of ludicrous. The honourable member is suggesting that, if a property is in an area where the council strikes the rate and they experience a dramatic increase, it is the rate that is struck in the dollar in terms of the valuation that causes the problem for the pensioner. Surely there are ways in which that matter can be addressed rather than saying that we should tear up a valuation system that has operated in this State and around the world. If we tear it up and throw it out the window, what do we replace it with? Perhaps the honourable member would tell the Committee exactly what he would replace the current valuation system with. To say that the whole valuation system is wrong because of a number of complaints is ridiculous. I remind the honourable member that the percentage of complaints is very low. Out of 625 000 properties there were 7 600 complaints in 1986-87, which is only 1.22 per cent. Only 6 272 complaints out of 652 000 properties were received this financial year, which is considerably fewer than valuation queries and objections in some other years.

Obviously, no valuation system that is determined by market forces, demand and the value which the community places on property, will be perfect. I do not suggest that it is but is the honourable member suggesting in the first part of his question that, as Minister for Lands, I directly interfere with the responsibility of the Valuer-General and the

way in which he carries out his responsibilities? If so, I remind him that the Valuer-General reports directly to Parliament under an Act of Parliament and does not report to me regarding the way in which he carries out his duties as Valuer-General. That goes for the way in which his valuers carry out their duties under his direction. The honourable member must be very careful about this because I am sure the Opposition would be the first to scream 'Ministerial interference' if I were to direct the Valuer-General in the day-to-day carrying out of his responsibilities as a direct link into Parliament.

I am certainly aware that increases in value reflect the buoyancy of the economy and the demand for properties in South Australia. I suppose the down side to this would be that we totally stagnated and nothing increased in value from one year to the next. Is that the solution? I do not believe it is. There are some problems. It is important that the Valuer-General address those problems and I would be very pleased to hear what kind of solution the member for Goyder could suggest for this problem.

Mr MEIER: I would be pleased to discuss variations to the current system but, since we have an hour and three-quarters left and I have some other very important questions, I do not think this is the right time to do so. I have made the points very clearly and I do not thank the Minister for the lecture I have just received. In reply to her statement that it is ludicrous that people could be driven from their homes because the valuation system, I would simply say that she is not heeding what people in the electorates are saying. They have made those comments and I have made them here on their behalf. I am sorry that the Minister has been so reluctant to bow to any change, but we will have to see a change in South Australia and perhaps the Minister will go away and think about the matter further.

What does the Minister feel may happen in relation to the pastoralists who will be subject to similar wide variations in property values under clause 20 of the new Pastoral Act which provides:

The rent payable under a pastoral lease will be an amount determined annually by the Valuer-General.

There have been these massive valuations and re-evaluations in the metropolitan area. It will be much harder to adjust values in the outback where it will not be possible to send people regularly to value properties. We have received an assurance from the Minister during the debate that we can have full confidence in the Valuer-General. I am certainly not reflecting on any person in that position but I have pointed out very clearly that things have gone wrong in the valuation system currently in use and, if it is related at all, how does the Minister see it working for the pastoral lands?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It will work very effectively. We spent quite some time in Parliament debating the Pastoral Bill. We went through a whole range of issues and questions relating to the setting of rentals. Fair market rentals will be set by the Valuer-General and there will be a right of appeal to the Land and Valuation Court. I will ask the Valuer-General to outline how he intends to proceed along those lines. I cannot see the analogy between the valuation of properties and the setting of fair market rents in the terms of the pastoral legislation. Fair market rentals are set on the previous year's economic viability of a lease. We discussed this at length in Committee on the Pastoral Bill. Fair market rental is not related to the valuation of the property; it is based on the productive return on that pastoral lease. In terms of ascertaining the fair market rent, that is how it will be looked at. There are other factors to be taken into account, which the Valuer-General can delin-

eate, such as distance from the market place, and the buoyancy or otherwise of the wool industry in terms of international and national markets. Such factors will be taken into account in determining a fair market rent for a lease.

We should remember that we still have the pastoral lands in public ownership. They are on 42-year rollover leases. The valuation of the land does not relate to the setting of fair market rents for someone to use publicly owned land to make an economic return on it. I have said until I am almost blue in the face that fair market rents will be set retrospectively in line with the productivity of a lease in the preceding year.

This is nothing more than a fear and scare tactic to frighten the pastoralists. Everything else has failed, so the latest tactic is to frighten them in this way. The pastoralists are not fools. They will not be frightened by the fear tactics of the member for Goyder. The Valuer-General may see it in another light.

Mr MEIER: Perhaps I may ask a supplementary question in relation to the Minister's comments about my not appreciating that there is a difference in evaluating different things. Of course I do. Earlier the Minister outlined the criteria which are used for valuations in the metropolitan area and in the pastoral areas, of which I am aware. As we have witnessed massive problems in the metropolitan area in regard to property valuations, does the Minister not see that similar problems could occur in the pastoral lands?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Absolutely not, for all the reasons that I have given. I am starting to sound like a record stuck in a groove. I will ask the Valuer-General to restate the answer, put it in another way or explain it more simply to try to allay the fears of the member for Goyder who seems determined not to have them allayed, but we will try.

Mr Darley: There are no massive problems in the valuation system operating in the metropolitan area. Some 652 000 properties were valued and there have been 6 272 complaints and objections. A complaint amounts to a telephone call or someone coming in and discussing a valuation over the counter. An objection is where someone puts something in writing formally objecting and protecting their rights to go to the Supreme Court at a later stage if they so desire.

We are talking about the rental determination for 250 pastoral leases. The process will involve looking at comparable rentals for pastoral land throughout Australia. In broad principle we shall be looking at the net return from leases based on productivity. We will determine a fair market rental which has regard to what a pastoralist would be prepared to pay by way of rental knowing the net return that he expects from that lease.

Ms GAYLER: I should like to ask a number of questions about shacks on Crown land. First, is it correct that the Murray Valley management review has recommended that a large number of shacks along the river should be removed, as recently reported on television?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes. The Murray Valley review reinforced every assessment and report that has come out of the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council and Commission and other environmental and water resources reports of which I am aware. The review reinforced a policy which has been in existence since 1979. That policy has been supported by subsequent Governments, including the Liberal Government of 1979 to 1982. The Murray Valley review, which has been released after two years of work, consultation, community input, professional input and the gathering of expertise and scientific evidence and information, clearly stated that the shack policy should continue and that there

should be revegetation and the removal of some of the shacks in the flood zone area under the 1956 flood level.

Ms GAYLER: I understand that the Government's policy on shacks on Crown land allows for replacement sites to be offered where sites presently leased are on unacceptable areas environmentally. What will be the process for the offer of alternative shack sites to such people and what timetable is envisaged for those offers?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The Government has a definite policy in terms of offering replacement sites where shacks have been determined to be in areas which are environmentally unsound and will cause erosion or pollution, be washed away by floods, have their effluent washed into the river or be subject to a whole range of other environmentally unsound factors. There are two groups of shack owners. One group purchased shacks after 1979, and they knew that they were doing so for a maximum of 15 years. I think it will be 1994 when those people will have to vacate their shacks. They purchased their shacks knowing full well what the rules were. The rules were that, if people purchased a lease on Crown land shack sites in an environmentally unacceptable area, they would have a limited lease and would have to vacate that site by that time. People paid very small amounts for those leases because they were not buying perpetual leases or something for their lifetime.

So, the market place determined that they would pay a low rental. These people will be, and have been, offered an alternative site in an environmentally sound area not hundreds of miles away or inland but still in the river environment and on a site that is neither prone to flooding nor right on the water's edge, where there will be things like erosion and pollution and a whole range of other environmental factors. They can choose to take up that offer, which is made in absolute good faith by the Department of Lands, and the people will be asked to pay only the cost of providing that site. In other words, there are no on-costs or extra fees, and no middle operator to increase the value of that purchase. I imagine they would also be able to move the shack onto the new site.

One of the significant advantages for these people is that, instead of having a limited lease, if they purchase the new site at cost—whatever it costs the Department of Lands—they will have a freehold tenure. So, they will have tenure for themselves, their families, and their descendants for as long as they choose. It will be a freehold site, and that means that they will have security in terms of their tenure.

The second group are people who owned their shack leases prior to 1979. These people have what is called 'life tenure'. So, if the lessee's name was on the lease prior to 1979, that shack will remain viable and usable until that lessee's death. I believe we should be even more reasonable—I am not quite sure but I think we should be—and be prepared to offer those people the opportunity of an alternative site any time from now on. They will not be pressured into accepting that; they will have a free choice. If they want to buy a shack site at today's value—what it cost the department—and they want to move into a situation of an environmentally sound site, or relocate their shack, the big advantage is that they have the security of freehold tenure.

In terms of shacks that currently exist on Crown land, I believe the policy is eminently fair. It has been supported for 10 years by various Governments and Ministers. The latest report completely reinforces the environmental soundness of that policy. I am prepared to argue in any forum anywhere in this State on those matters.

Ms GAYLER: My constituents have repeatedly expressed concern about where these replacement sites will be. Often

people have friends, neighbours and connections in the area where their shack is, if they have used a shack in a particular location for a long time. Will they have access to an alternative environmentally acceptable site in the vicinity of their present shack? How soon will everyone who has an unacceptable site be offered this opportunity? What proportion have already been made that offer? I believe more information is needed about the timetable.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Director of Lands to answer that question. However, I have had a meeting with the Shack Site Owners Association, and we have discussed a number of issues. Initially, they were persuaded by the 'Clayton's' policy that was put forward by the Opposition that all unacceptable Crown land shacks, irrespective of where they were, be they in national parks or anywhere, would be freehold and bought at the unimproved value.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, I have it, and I have read it in detail. I will enunciate the policy in detail. One looks at the fine print and one hears the Opposition Leader changing feet on this, saying, 'Oh yes, we are going to freehold all these Crown land sites, but we will ensure that they conform to proper planning and health regulations.' One then says to the shack site owners, 'Well, what does that mean for you if you are in a flood plain?' Those people would have to put on deep drainage that was taken up over the cliffs, which would be an enormous expense. I had the E&WS Department consider this: it is a huge cost. I believe that the E&WS Department representatives who attended before the Committee would know what I am talking about in terms of questions from the member for Heysen about some of the matters in the Hills.

Also, there is the problem of what happens in terms of obtaining council approval to do any kind of extensions or whatever one wants to do. The legal position is that, if you then obtain building approval, the council then is liable if the shack is washed away. We have ample precedence for this.

Mr MEIER interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There are ample examples of this happening in the Hills. In fact, it happened to the Housing Trust in the Hills. I will not argue about that; I am not Crown Law. However, let me assure you that I know what I am talking about on this one. It also means that this is nothing more than a 'Clayton's' policy. It is a rush out culling a few votes. Those involved say, 'Let's whip up a few shack owners and tell them that we will freehold their shacks.' When you actually sit down and talk with them it is very interesting that the Shack Owners Association then said, 'Well, actually Minister, we really don't want freeholding of our shacks. What we really want is just a few more years after the expiry date.' I found that incredibly significant because they were saying that they had seen through this false and phoney policy of the Liberal Party. I have not even touched on the environment at this point. All I have talked about is the actual workings of this policy.

With respect to this whole question, there is a clear and definite policy from the Government that has in the past been supported by the very Opposition that was prepared to tear up the policy to obtain a few votes, as they see it, in marginal seats. I do not believe that the people in marginal seats, or anywhere else in South Australia, will be prepared to sacrifice the environment for some purely short-term perceived gains. We will offer a package that will be sensitive to the needs of the individuals. I will ask the Director of the department to outline that for the honourable member, but I believe it is important that I have the

opportunity to mention the alternatives for people in terms of the two policies.

Mr Darley: First, in relation to the proximity of these alternative sites, the department is seriously considering providing alternative site accommodation as near as possible to the location of the current sites. At present, we have alternative sites available at Bairds Bay, Hardwicke Bay and Younghusband, and there are a number of existing sites in about 20 acceptable locations throughout the State. However, we will certainly consider the wishes of the individual shack lessees at present by providing alternative sites as near as possible to the location where they currently exist.

In terms of the timetable, as the Minister has said, the leases terminate from 1994 to 1999, apart from the life tenant situation. We will be talking to shack lessees and obtaining their ideas on how soon they would like to relocate and, depending on the volume of inquiries and acceptance of the proposition, we would then go ahead and develop these sites at cost for those lessees.

Ms GAYLER: It has just occurred to me that I should perhaps have declared an interest before I embarked on these questions. My family has a shack on a life tenure lease, although I do not have a financial interest in it and I will not inherit it. However, I would like that fact on the record. How much money has been set aside in the budget for the development of alternative sites to be offered to shack owners?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I cannot give that figure off the top of my head. I will provide that information for the honourable member. The question was introduced in relation to the Murray Valley management review. Of course, one of the other issues highlighted by the review was that freehold land in the flood plain is also totally unacceptable for development. As a department we will offer to purchase unacceptable freehold land in the flood plain. In addition, we are prepared to offer the owners an alternative site at cost. I think that one would have to say that the department is bending over backwards to ensure that people who either have a shack or who own property freehold will have every opportunity to enjoy the holidays that they desire. However, they will do so in an environmentally sound way that, with each individual doing their bit, will help to rehabilitate some of that area along the Murray and, ultimately, improve the quality of water in the river.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand that the Government's policy, as has been explained, is to have shacks in national parks removed by 1994. I am aware that there is particular concern in some national parks, and I refer, in particular, to the Coorong, where some of the shacks are inhabited by Aborigines, who are very concerned about having to leave the shacks, because they believe they have special rights over some of that land. Will the Minister indicate what Government policy will be in relation to those people?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I take it that the honourable member is suggesting that we should have a policy relating to shack sites on Crown land. Is he now suggesting that we have a separate policy, as a broad policy, for shack sites in national parks and that a subset of that should be a policy for people who are of Aboriginal descent and who live in shacks?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not suggesting that at all. In fact, I believe that it is essential—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will treat this as another supplementary question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I believe that it is essential that everyone be treated in the same way, under the same policy. I am asking the Minister if she is aware of that

situation and what action, if any, she believes should be taken in those circumstances.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This Government, and previous Governments, have had a policy that people with shacks in national parks would be treated the same way under the policy. As far as I am aware, this is consistent with the new Liberal policy that it will allow freeholding of shacks in national parks, because they are on Crown land. The Leader of the Opposition has continuously stated that the Opposition will freehold all Crown land shacks. That strikes at the very heart of any kind of environment and conservation principles. I cannot, for a moment, believe that the member for Heysen as an environmentalist, would support that policy. However, I do not wish to embarrass him.

I will ask Mr Kaufmann, who is probably our departmental expert on shacks, to answer the honourable member's question. I am certainly not aware of any Aborigines in the Coorong who have shacks. I know that some people are concerned, because they have shacks and have been able to participate in some safety and lifesaving exercises. They have expressed some concern that, if they were not there, there could be some danger to people who participated in recreational activities in the Coorong. At this point, I have not given the matter any deep and meaningful consideration. Mr Kaufmann may be able to give more information.

Mr Kaufmann: As far as I am aware, there is a very small number of Aboriginal families in that locality who live in shacks in the Coorong National Park. I was aware some time ago (and I would imagine that it is still the case) that the National Parks and Wildlife staff were talking with those Aborigines in relation to a ranger status in order to both provide better interpretation facilities in the area and to look at continuing occupation of those shacks, but not on a formal lease basis. These shacks may then become rather more like national parks housing.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am quite happy to take up that matter with the relevant officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to see what is proposed. I remind honourable members that in this year's budget we have quite an expansion of our Aboriginal park ranger and park staff. I am not sure, but there may well be some connection, I do not know, but I will be happy to provide that information to the Committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister ascertain how many Aborigines are being considered?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I imagine the honourable member would want to know whether they have lived there all their life, whether they have a deep and meaningful affinity with the land, whether it is part of their heritage, or whether they moved in last week. I am more than happy to get that information.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister would be terribly disappointed if we did not ask some questions about the dolphins, as was foreshadowed this afternoon. I am not quite sure whether we started out on this road this afternoon or whether it was determined that it was not appropriate that we should ask questions on this issue. However, one of the questions asked related to when the Minister expects the dolphins to moved from Marineland. I am not quite sure whether she concluded her answer to that question. Will the Government be responsible for any costs associated with the Marineland dolphins once they have been relocated to Seaworld in Queensland? If so, will the Minister explain the arrangements with Seaworld?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am prepared to answer any questions that relate to my portfolio area of animal welfare. I point out that my colleague, the Minister of State Development, was asked these exact questions earlier in the day.

I do not intend to take up the Committee's time by restating his answers verbatim. The Minister of State Development is responsible for any payments if they are to be made. Again, I remind the Committee that the dolphins are owned by the receivers, Allert Heard & Co. Any payments made to anyone for anything will be made by Mr John Heard. It is not within my jurisdiction, and this is not under my budget line. I will not be responsible for paying anyone anything. The question is directed to the wrong Minister. I believe that the question was answered by the Hon. Lynn Arnold in the other Estimates Committee this morning.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will follow that matter through later. However, I might add that a few receivers have ended up with a few strange things in their time, but this must be the strangest.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman. On page 411 of the Program Estimates, under the heading 'Animal Welfare', it is stated that the broad objectives and goals of the Lands Department are, amongst others, to monitor animal welfare issues throughout the State and to resolve animal welfare issues in the community. I would have thought that the member for Heysen's question was appropriate in that context. However, perhaps the Minister is not interested in answering.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am sorry that the honourable member was not here this morning, as it was ascertained that I am the Minister responsible for animal welfare, which makes me responsible for every animal in this State. I can cope with that, but the question related to financial payments, dates of movement and transactions that have nothing to do with me as Minister responsible for animal welfare. I do not have any responsibility for the date on which those dolphins will or will not be moved. Further, I do not have any responsibility for the payment.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any proposed payments here for the dolphins in question?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, not from my line; no payments at all.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no proposed payment, then that is not a relevant question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would like to question the Minister further on the same subject on the basis that she has just said that she is the Minister responsible.

The CHAIRMAN: I invite the honourable member therefore to put a question and then I will rule whether or not it is relevant.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister explain what action the Government has taken to investigate possible serious maltreatment of the dolphins, in particular, and also the sea lions?

The CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that on the face of it, it seems to be a relevant question. Sometimes it can only be finally determined on the basis of information supplied by the Minister. I am not stopping the honourable member from proceeding. I now ask whether the Minister has any reason to doubt my ruling that it is a relevant question?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No. I am happy to comment on allegations of maltreatment of the animals.

The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the member for Heysen to explain the question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to the treatment of Marineland mammals for which the Minister has responsibility in her capacity as the Minister chiefly involved in the administration of the Government's animal welfare policies. Public comment has been made about maltreatment of the mammals. The *Sunday Mail* of 30 August 1987 reported some comments on this matter by the Minister of Tourism, Ms Wiese, as follows:

Ms Wiese later admitted the Government had been concerned about the treatment of the Marineland dolphins before the complex had been taken over by new operators.

She was referring to the Abel family. What action was taken to investigate possible maltreatment of dolphins in particular, and also the sea lions? If no action has been taken, is this because the Government wants to avoid the responsibility? I say this because this maltreatment occurred while the West Beach Trust had direct responsibility for the welfare of the mammals before the Abel family took over. Does the Minister agree that since the Abel family took over the responsibility early in 1987 the welfare of the animals has markedly improved? In confirming this, will the Minister dissociate herself from a letter written by her Cabinet colleague, the Deputy Premier, to a constituent. The letter is dated 17 April 1989 and I have a copy if the Minister wishes to see it. In that letter Dr Hopgood states that there was no prospect of the dolphins remaining at Marineland. He then continued:

This is nothing to do with the lack of Government support. Indeed the Government has already supported Mr Abel with that aim in mind but got its fingers burnt.

Will the Minister admit that the Abel family is not in any way responsible for the Government's getting its fingers burnt (as the Minister put it) and will the Minister confirm that the Abel family has applied a high standard in animal husbandry to look after the Marineland mammals?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This is nothing more than a rehash of the member for Hansen's questions during Question Time in the Parliament. The member for Hanson has suggested that the dolphins were mistreated in 1987. He produced photographs that he peddled around the Parliament (I will not tell the Committee what he reminded me of) and he also raised all these allegations. So, as the Minister responsible for animal welfare, I then contacted the Receiver, Mr Heard, and I told him that these allegations had been made about this terrible maltreatment of dolphins and asked whether these were the same dolphins now in Marineland. I had to ask him that because he now owns the dolphins. The dolphins had been under continuous veterinary treatment from Dr Needham, and Dr David Obendorf had assessed all the dolphins. I released this public report that he had given me so that everything was on the table about these dolphins. They have had more assessment and medical attention than, I suspect, has any human in this community.

However, I said to him, just so that we can ascertain for all time whether or not these dolphins have been mistreated, surely the proof will be in the condition of the dolphins at that moment. Mr Heard thought this was a reasonable proposition and he opened Marineland for the media to look at the alleged maltreated dolphins. What was found were these very healthy and happy dolphins swimming around, being properly cared for, fed and looked after, with no apparent medical problems. We are still waiting for the results of all the plethora of tests carried out to ascertain the absolute peak of health of these animals.

To now allege that somehow the current Minister responsible for animal welfare has not done her duty in terms of these animals is absolutely ridiculous. One only has to look at these dolphins—and the whole of South Australia has seen them on television—to realise that the allegations are wrong. I totally reject this question. The greatest allegations about maltreatment have been raised by the Opposition's own colleague, the member for Hanson. The Minister of Tourism has not raised this matter in the past 12 months since I have been the Minister responsible for animal welfare.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister of Tourism raised it in 1987.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I certainly was not Minister then, so I cannot be responsible. I will read from a veterinary report about the health or otherwise of these particular animals. The public report is based on the observation of Dr David Obendorf and states:

This report is based on observations made on 19 May, discussions with Marineland personnel and examination of the health reports prepared by Dr Needham (consultant veterinarian).

Dr Needham is a consultant veterinarian, so obviously it is a slur on Dr Needham. The report further states:

Marineland currently maintains 13 Australian sea lions, four fur seals and six bottle-nosed dolphins. Currently no animal is experiencing any life-threatening illness although several have chronic debilitating conditions. All the pinnipeds and dolphins which I observed were bright, alert, displaying normal movements and feeding behaviours. Decisions to transport any or all of these animals cannot rely solely on their current health and fitness.

The request for two separate veterinary opinions as recently as this year about the alleged maltreatment of the dolphins is nothing short of ludicrous. Are we interested in the present state of health of the dolphins, or are we trying to make some kind of beat-up story about the dolphins? I will let the readers of *Hansard* draw their own conclusions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As a supplementary question, I want to make sure that the Minister realises that the reason for asking that question was to seek an admittance from the Minister that the Abel family is not in any way responsible for the statements that have made in recent times about the maltreatment of the dolphins.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am very relaxed about that. The only statements that have been made in recent times about maltreatment of the dolphins have been made by the member for Hanson. I categorically state that there has not been any assertion by this Government, by me as Minister responsible for animal welfare, or by anybody whom I know that the Abels have mistreated the dolphins. I do not think we can be clearer than that. That was not the question that was asked initially.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If people read *Hansard* they will realise the import of that question. When will the Crown Lands Bill be introduced; is it intended that a Green Paper will be issued first; is a draft Bill in preparation; when will that draft legislation be available; and is it intended that rents will be altered under the new legislation, in particular, in relation to the 22 000 perpetual leases?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I certainly have not taken any proposal to Cabinet regarding the Crown Lands Act. Quite obviously, nothing will happen this year. I imagine that we will look at a Crown Lands Bill in the New Year. I cannot answer any of the questions because I have not taken a proposal to Cabinet at this stage.

Mr ROBERTSON: In relation to the potential trade-off between the land that has now been taken out of the pastoral rural B land and is to be included in the marina development and other land in the hills face zone, is there any possibility of some form of trade-off between the land that will be alienated by the project to the east of the Noarlunga railway line and land further east, for example, as has been mooted as part of the Glenthorne Farm further along Majors Road?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think that about 90 hectares of land will be taken from hills face land and about 214 hectares comprise that particular tract of land which is known as the Glenthorne CSIRO land. It is my intention as Minister for Environment and Planning to ensure that we keep what I like to call an urban lung on that whole Glenthorne area. It is a large tract of land, which is very visible from a large number of areas in the southern com-

munity. Because it runs parallel and right up to South Road, it is seen by everybody who drives backwards and forwards. It can also be seen by a large number of residents in the southern area. Perhaps it is appropriate to tell the honourable member that the reason why the land was zoned hills face in the first place was not that it could be seen from the plains and that it has some enormous significance as hills face land. It was zoned as such in the first place because it was deemed many years ago that the infrastructure costs of putting E&WS services—I presume electricity services, not to mention roads, kerbing and guttering—would be so expensive that it would never be used for development.

Someone had a brilliant idea to zone it hills face land. We are not talking about land in a prime position in terms of its designation and, having looked at it this morning, I note that it could not be seen from anywhere much at all. It is in a reasonably deep valley. Notwithstanding that, the land now is not accessible to the public: it is either private or Crown land; it is fenced off and the public has no access to it.

As I said this morning, the housing development that will take place in the hills face land will also incorporate some sections of the designated open space, green belt, linear park or whatever one calls it. It is difficult to give actual numbers. If one looked at a balance sheet, the amount of land to be returned permanently as publicly owned open space would far outweigh the amount taken out of the hills face.

With respect to Glenthorne, it is not as cut and dried as one would like. Members will recall that at the housing summit the Federal Government offered that land for urban consolidation housing solutions *viz-a-viz* the eastern States. The Premier immediately wrote back and said that South Australia was not interested in the Glenthorne land because we believed it should remain in its current zone—currently it is zoned rural B—so that it could not be developed. I have been having discussions with my Federal counterpart Stewart West about this and we intend to ensure that the land is never developed, that it remains exactly as I have described—as an urban lung.

Mr ROBERTSON: In addition, the Minister made the point this morning that the community would gain a fully gazetted conservation park which at the moment is not designated hills face land anyway.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have not added that on because it is open space land and people perceive it as being open space land. I am not in the business of playing with figures to try to make something better than it is. In terms of the final insurance about the Marino conservation park referred to earlier, I will be moving to have that gazetted to ensure that it is there for all time. If one adds all the pieces that have been added to the hills face or added depending on whether we can have the zoning changed from rural B to hills face, there is an enormous addition to open space public land in that vicinity.

Mr ROBERTSON: I turn now to the question of rates, which are something of a sore point. One aspect which emerged from my discussions on the rating systems that councils and the E&WS now use is that the use of site valuation or capital valuation is meant to approximate a person's ability to pay. Of course, it is widely acknowledged that income is a far better measure of a person's ability to pay than the value of a person's estate. Many people have assets but not income, and many people have substantial income and not many assets.

In how many jurisdictions in the world does this system apply or is it only in South Australia where local authorities have no alternative through not having access to information on personal incomes and so have no alternative but to

levy their rates and charges on the basis of property values rather than people's income? How many jurisdictions are stuck with that dilemma because of privacy and tax laws and cannot levy rates and taxes on the basis of income rather than property value? Is it common or are we the odd one out?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This aspect does not fit under any line, but I will be brief. There are a number of ways of setting rates. It is not just a question of income or property values. A number of things can be looked at. We do not have evidence from around the world to be able to say what countries have what systems. Certainly, that information would have to be found.

Mr ROBERTSON: A poll tax is rather less discriminating.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This portfolio is responsible for valuations, not for rating of any kind.

Mr ROBERTSON: The Valuer-General is in a philosophical dilemma and the people of South Australia should recognise that there are few alternatives to using property valuation.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am told that no other country in the Commonwealth uses any system other than valuation for rating and tax purposes, except the UK, which uses poll tax.

Mr MEIER: To what extent will South Australia's coastline be resurveyed over the next five years, how many surveyors or trainee surveyors will be employed in this program, and what is the estimated cost of the resurveying program?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I call on the Surveyor-General to answer the question.

Mr Porter: There is no set program at present to survey the coastline of South Australia. However, an exercise is under way, to monitor the mean sea level, particularly in relation to the greenhouse effect. The Department of Lands has completed a survey of primary marks along the total length of the coast of South Australia but it certainly does not intend to redefine the boundaries or the position of the coastline in the near future.

Mr MEIER: I was under the impression that it was a more extensive survey than has just been indicated and that some of the coastline south of Port Augusta adjoining Spencer Gulf is being resurveyed. I was under the impression that it could be more extensive than just for some kilometres and that extra people were being employed during this period.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask the Surveyor-General to answer that question.

Mr Porter: A section of the gulf is being surveyed associated with the possible freeholding of some Crown land and some work is associated with a national park survey but that is an isolated survey. The use of graduates or undergraduates for that work is probably appropriate; it happens throughout South Australia in different areas. This exercise has not been set aside specifically for the purpose of training surveyor graduates.

Mr MEIER: As a supplementary question, I applaud the fact that survey marks are being put out to monitor the greenhouse effect but in that respect I am a little surprised that some extra persons have been employed. That is open to conjecture—perhaps the Minister will provide some extra details in the next few days. If part of our coastline is being resurveyed at present it might be a waste of money if the greenhouse predictions come true over the next 30 years because we may see the first effects of that within the next 10 years. Therefore, any major resurvey could be a waste of money. Let us wait until we see what is happening around

the rest of the coast before deciding whether there should be a major resurvey. Perhaps insufficient information is available at this stage.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am not sure what the honourable member is asking. The Surveyor-General has said that there is no major surveying program for South Australia. The honourable member will not be aware, but we had a detailed discussion on the greenhouse effect and I was able to point out that a number of expert groups were looking at the whole question. There is the Climate Change Committee and the Mean Sea Level Committee, and the Surveyor-General is a member of the latter. Those committees are monitoring in a technical and scientific way any changes in sea level and climatic effects on the coastline. There is no waste of money. This is a responsible and reasonable way of monitoring whether there are any immediate, medium or longer term changes to the sea level and their impact on the coastline. We do not need to provide the honourable member with any further information because there is nothing to provide him with.

Mr MEIER: I will put down a detailed case in writing and not waste the time of the Committee. Can the Minister provide some details (if not now, in the next few days or weeks or however long we have before the information needs to be put in for *Hansard*) on sick leave? Will the Minister say what amount of sick leave has been taken during the last financial year and indicate how much was taken on a Monday, a Friday and on days immediately before and after holiday weekends?

Will the Minister also provide information on the current salary of the Chief Executive Officer and the salary applying at 30 June 1988 and 30 June 1989 and any allowances that the Chief Executive Officer receives in addition to salary? Also, how many officers are currently employed at EO and AO level?

On the intra-agency support service items, will the Minister provide an itemised rundown of the spending last financial year and budgeted spending for this financial year under the following headings: first, salaries, wages and related payments; and, secondly, administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries? Finally, has the Minister a car phone or cellular phone which is rented and paid for at taxpayers' expense?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That question has been answered.

Mr MEIER: If that question has already been asked of the Minister, I will not proceed further with it.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am happy to provide that information, but I feel that the information regarding the Chief Executive Officer's salary is in the *Government Gazette* and the honourable member is capable of looking through and finding it. We can provide some of the other information right now. The question about phones is in *Hansard* and was answered this morning during Environment and Planning questions.

It is interesting that nobody wanted to know what the Chief Executive Officer, Environment and Planning, is paid. He could probably be insulted by that, but nobody wants to know. I have no idea but if anybody wants to know, they can look in the *Government Gazette* and find out if it is such a burning issue to find out what heads of departments are paid. I am sure they are not paid adequately for the work that I know they do, but that is my personal view, not necessarily the view of the Government. I will ask the Director, Operations Services to give the other information that has been asked for.

Mr Kidd: As regards sick leave, the number of days taken per employee in 1988-89 was 6.48. Statistics maintained by the department do not at the moment provide a breakdown

of the days on which sick leave was taken, but we have developed a system for this financial year which will maintain those records.

On the AO and EO statistics, as at 30 June 1989, the department had 172 officers within the AO/EO employment range. As to the breakdown of inter-agency support services, we do not hold details of the salary components of those charges made to the department by other agencies. The accounts forwarded to us for payment simply advise the overall cost of the service in question. However, details of the component of the support services of the department itself are the salaries, wages and related payments, \$5.6 million; and administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries, \$2.2 million.

Mr MEIER: What revenue would accrue to the Department of Lands, or the Government generally, if the Department of Lands sold for another department property that was surplus to the Government's needs during the past 12 months?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask Mr Kidd to give those details.

Mr Kidd: The overall total is \$35.8 million.

Mr MEIER: Is it possible for a breakdown of that to be provided? I do not necessarily expect you to read it out, but could it be incorporated in *Hansard*?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That information is contained in the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr MEIER: I refer to what I would regard as one of the greatest injustices inflicted on the people living in the south of Adelaide, namely, the Bannon Government's sale of the land for of the north-south transport corridor. Can the Minister identify whether any of the Government land sold off during the past year was to be used for other proposed transport corridors or upgrades of transport systems?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am afraid the honourable member is asking the wrong Minister on the wrong line. I do not know what line he is referring to in this question.

Mr MEIER: I thought the Department of Lands was responsible for the sale of the land.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We are generally, but in this instance one would have to ask the Minister responsible for highways, which is the Minister for Transport.

Mr MEIER: So, you have not sold any of the land off for the transport corridor?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We have sold some inner western land, but not in the southern area. I believe you mentioned the southern area.

Mr MEIER: I was talking about the tragedy which has occurred over the past years. However, I wondered whether the department of Lands has sold any other land which was originally put aside for transport corridors or improvement to transport networks.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The situation is that the Department of Lands is selling the land on behalf of the Highways Department. That information could be obtained on notice.

Mr MEIER: How many extra personnel are to be employed to help administer the new Pastoral Act? Will the Minister say what are the main areas on which the departmental officers will have to concentrate during the coming 12 months?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask Anne Stimson, the departmental officer who has worked closely in this area, to answer that question.

Ms Stimson: The Department of Lands will be employing up to eight field teams, comprising a scientific officer and a technical officer, to undertake land system descriptions and individual lease assessments. Of course, we already have staff employed within the Department of Lands, and

a reassignment of existing staff from other areas, either within the Department of Lands or other Government agencies, will occur. Valuation staff will also be employed to undertake specific valuations of land and field valuations on which they will actually go out to look at leases.

Mr MEIER: Mention was made of eight field teams. What is the average number of personnel in a field team?

Ms Stimson: There are two staff in a field team; one is a scientific officer.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That is a total of 16 personnel.

Mr MEIER: In other words, that it is 16 personnel plus how many others?

Ms Stimson: At this stage, we would have two evaluation staff in the field with an additional officer available to provide support. However, that support would be on a part-time basis.

Mr MEIER: What is the allowance in the budget for administration of the new Pastoral Act?

Mr Kidd: The budget figures would not show that figure, because the administration would be paid for from the Department of Lands working account operations, which do not require the appropriations of Parliament. Therefore, those figures would not appear in the budget estimates.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I refer to the answer to the member for Newland's previous question in relation to the purchase of alternative shack sites. That program also will be funded in the same way, through the department's deposit account. We were not sure from where that allocation would be made. However, there is no specific allocation. Because this is an off-budget department, money will come from the deposits account.

Mr MEIER: If the money for the administration of the Pastoral Act is to come from the Department of Lands working account, is it possible to get a run down of that account, because I would think that an amount must have been considered, or found, from somewhere, for operations over the next 12 months?

Mr Kidd: The details of the Department of Land's working account are also included in the Auditor-General's Report. There are balances in that account that can be utilised with approvals for working capital. That is where the initial funding for this program would come from.

Mr MEIER: In other words, no specific figure that could be identified for the Committee in relation to the workings for the coming 12 months?

Mr Kidd: Not at this stage.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As a member of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Parliamentary Committee and the Maralinga Committee, I have visited the Pitjantjatjara lands each year. On each occasion the committee has visited the Mintabie settlement and the progress association has raised the same issue—what progress has been made in relation to its request for extension to the lands, and so forth. This issue was raised again with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs when the committee visited the settlement recently. On 11 September, the secretary of the Mintabie Progress Association sent a letter to the Premier—with copies to the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. The Committee states:

Re: The Future of Mintabie.

Continuing failure by Government to address basic issues relating to the future of Mintabie has resulted in a continuing poor quality of life for local residents, complete uncertainty as to our future livelihood from opal mining in this area and a drain of manpower, expertise and equipment away from this opal field with a resulting economic disadvantage to the State. Bureaucratic strangulation seems to be a major cause of the continuing neglect of our community and local industry.

Requests to have the Mintabie opal exploration area extended seem to have been made into a vacuum. This matter is a vital component in any consideration of Mintabie's future, the well-

being of the residents of the State who live here and the interests of the local Aboriginal people. Instead of being informed and invited to participate, our association became aware that a 'Mintabie Review' was supposed to exist early in 1988. This was finally confirmed by Mr. Chris Kaufmann of the Lands Department on 9 August 1988, when he advised as follows:

Cabinet has asked me to chair a review of the future role of the town of Mintabie.

The letter then sets out the criteria. It further states:

We were not given the opportunity of making any contribution to the discussion paper referred to. We were sent copies of the discussion paper on 14 November 1988. We found it to be biased against non-aboriginal residents, potentially libelous in places and failing to give credence to the opal industry. Representatives of our association met with Mr Kaufmann in Adelaide in December 1988, seeking a more balanced content for the discussion paper. He undertook to provide this by the end of January 1989. We are still waiting for it.

During 1989 our legal advisor, Mr P. Amey of Stratford and Co., has made numerous attempts to contact Mr Kaufmann re the Mintabie review paper. He has not received any satisfaction whatsoever. On 12 May 1989 the Mintabie review was discussed at a meeting of the Mintabie Consultative Committee. Anangu Pitjantjatjara (AP) representatives readily agreed that the continued lack of progress was totally unsatisfactory and undertook to do what they could to get some action. No results are evident.

On 1 June 1989 we expressed our concerns in strong terms to the visiting Pitjantjatjara Lands Parliamentary Committee chaired by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. The Minister subsequently advised that he had conveyed our concerns to the Minister of Lands together with the request that our committee be advised of the current status of the review. We have heard nothing. It is now evident that the phantom inoperative review is of no value. Its terms of reference as outlined by Mr. Kaufmann do not seem to allow for the inclusion of matters relating to the extension of the prospecting area. Without this, discussions about the town are of limited relevance. Please take urgent steps to have an extension to the field meaningfully addressed . . .

What is the present status of the review and when can we expect some finalisation of the terms and conditions for the final proposal in relation to the town of Mintabie? It appears that not only are the miners and their families concerned about the future of Mintabie, but also the Aboriginal people have a vested interest in it because they gain quite a bit from prospecting within the Mintabie opal fields.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The most appropriate person to answer that is the person referred to in the correspondence, Mr Kaufmann, who is an officer with the Department of Lands.

Mr Kaufmann: Yes, we have been in correspondence with both the Pitjantjatjara and with the progress association endeavouring to arrange a meeting of the committee. We were trying to arrange it for this month, but that has been impossible for the Pitjantjatjara people. They indicated last week that they would be able to nominate six or seven days—different pairs of days—that they could meet in November. We have not had a reply from our letter to the progress association. I would assume that as soon as we have those days we will then write to the progress association and ask it to choose which of those days in November we will meet.

The honourable member is correct in saying that the terms of reference for the review are very limited. They deal specifically with the town. The extension of the mining field, I believe, does not require the attention of anybody but the miners and the Pitjantjatjara. I do not want to labour the delays, but they really do revolve around obtaining suitable membership for the committee. Each time we have managed to obtain some staffing or got people involved they have either resigned from the public sector or gone on sick leave. It really was very sad.

We collected a nominee from the Office of Aboriginal Affairs. Just after he was nominated he fell off a ladder while painting and was off work for seven months. It has just been a saga of misadventure for which we have been

very sorry. So, I would like to assure the honourable member that we are endeavouring to arrange a meeting at Mintabie in November of the various parties, with an aim to establish a clear time-table which we can work to.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Unfortunately, it is another one of these situations that involves the Office of Aboriginal Affairs, the AP and the Lands Department. Like so many of these inter-departmental things where it involves two or three Ministers, it just never seems to make a great deal of progress. I am sorry to hear about the gentleman that fell off the ladder, but it is a matter of someone accepting the responsibility of funding a replacement for him.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I realise that.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: If you really believe legally that it is a matter for the Mintabie Progress Association to work out with the Pitjantjatjara any arrangements for an extension of the field, if that was spelled out to both parties it could be left to them. Certainly, the progress association believes that there has to be some legislative action taken by the Parliament to extend the field.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As one of the relevant Ministers I will undertake to have discussions with my counterpart, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, because it need to be resolved. Whether there will be a successful resolution to both parties I think has a very big question mark over it. I take the honourable member's point that unforeseen things happen in getting different cultural groups together: getting people to meet at any one place at any one time is not easy. The matter does need to be resolved.

I have indicated to Mr Kaufmann that I would like to see him move as quickly as possible to resolution, if indeed there is a resolution. The matter needs to be crystallised into a situation where there are some clear decisions that have to be taken either by both parties in the area or may have to be taken through the Parliament. I will give that assurance.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The letter clearly indicates that the AP and the progress association are meeting on the matter. They are jointly of the view that there is little they can do because they believe that legislative action has to be taken by the Parliament, which is why little progress has been made. This matter has been dragging on and, as a member of the committee, I can say that we go up there every year and the same issue is raised. It involves not only the miners but also their families: about 1 200 permanent residents are at Mintabie. The Government and the Education Department have established sophisticated facilities, such as the school. The town is there to stay but there has to be some stability. The people want to know where they are going.

Representatives of the AP are not opposed to what the people are seeking, that is, the permanency of the town and the extension of the field because the Aboriginal people have a bit to gain from it since many of them are engaged in prospecting within the area.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am also aware that the member for Eyre has been interested in this matter and has communicated with us.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It is in his absence overseas that I raise the issue.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We will ensure that one or both members are kept informed.

Mr MEIER: Over the past few years the statement has been made in Estimates Committees (pages 437 and 443 of the Program Estimates), as follows:

The role of the department is changing from administration and development to conservation and management of lands of the Crown.

Can the Minister identify some specific conservation activities undertaken in the past few years? What specific conservation activities have been undertaken in the past few years? We have had two before us recently, the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill and the Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill. Is the Minister aware that some pastoralists are considering resigning from their local soil conservation boards and that other pastoralists are reluctant to serve on such boards because of the soil conservation and land management that they may wish to promote. The soil conservation Bill provides: 'In conflict between the terms of a notice issued by the Pastoral Board and the terms of a soil conservation order made by a board, the notice of the Pastoral Board will prevail.' In other words, the pastoral rehabilitation provisions override the Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill.

If the Minister is aware of this, is she willing to consider some way of overcoming the concern of pastoralists about serving on soil conservation boards because of this conflict? Does the Minister believe it would be more efficient to concentrate some of the conservation and land management activities under one department rather than as it is at this stage under land, agriculture and environment and planning, with all often doing the same thing?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There are about four questions there and I will try to be brief. With regard to what we are doing, obviously one of the major pieces of legislation that we will now implement is the Pastoral Bill. It was always envisaged in respect of the pastoral lands that the Pastoral Bill would have precedence over any other legislation. That does not mean that there is conflict. I do not believe that the word 'conflict' is appropriate in this case. Both Bills were designed to complement each other.

In both Bills there is a cross-reference to the other Bill. Obviously a misunderstanding has arisen and one wonders whether or not that has been deliberate. There is no duplication—the position is clear. It has always been clear in terms of what Bill would have overriding authority. That is clearly stated in the Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill.

The Pastoral Bill would have that authority. There is certainly no duplication; the Bills complement one another. The Soil Conservation and Land Management Bill is an excellent piece of legislation which will facilitate on-the-ground localised involvement of people in the issues of soil conservation, and that should complement the overriding concerns about land tenure and management of land through

a land tenure system which is provided for by the Pastoral Bill. So, I do not see any problem with that.

The second part of the question related to what other conservation issues the department was looking at, and the answer is that it is looking at the development management plans, the purpose of which is to determine the best use and allocation of land in order to strike a balance between the social, environmental and economic needs of the community. The department is working on management plans and their implementation for land care in the following areas: Baird Bay, Lipson Cove, Ucontit Chie Hill, Coffin Bay Waterways, Redbanks, Pike River, Thiele's Land, Port Vincent Marina Site, Lake Frome, Ewens Ponds, and Karst Features in the South-East.

Other initiatives, such as the south-eastern coastal lakes strategy, involve a review of the lakes extending south west from the Coorong and include a number of lakes, such as lakes Hawdon, Bonney and George. This will attempt to balance the competing social, economic and environmental needs of the community and lead to appropriate land allocation and management. The Eyre Peninsula strategic review is looking at adopting a conservation perspective. A range of initiatives pick up the statement in the budget papers to emphasise that the Department of Lands is working closely and cooperatively with the Department of Environment and Planning. They have the same Minister, and we meet as a collective executive of four and make decisions along that line. We are working very closely at the chief executive officer level with the Department of Agriculture, and I assure the honourable member that I work very closely with my ministerial colleague, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, to ensure there is no duplication and, indeed, that cooperation occurs in terms of the preservation and conservation of lands in South Australia. Of course, this leads to increased productivity.

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

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I extend to you Sir, the Committee's thanks for the professional and fair way in which you have chaired the Committee and brought all of us into line without fear or favour. On behalf of the Committee, I thank you for your patience and tolerance in these proceedings.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 21 September at 11 a.m.