

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Mr P.A. Deegan, Administrative Officer.

Wednesday 12 September 1990

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

**Chairman:**

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings

**Members:**

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore  
 Mr K.C. Hamilton  
 Mr C.D.T. McKee  
 Mr J.A. Quirke  
 Mr I.H. Venning  
 The Hon. D.C. Wotton

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** I intend to adopt a relatively informal procedure. Changes in the composition of the Committee will have to be notified to the Chair before they take place. If the Minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for inclusion in *Hansard*, and two copies must be submitted no later than Friday 28 September to the Clerk of the House of Assembly. I propose to allow the lead speaker for the Opposition and the Minister to make an opening statement, if they so desire, and I suggest about 10 minutes should be sufficient for those statements.

We intend to take a fairly flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions based on three questions per member, alternating the sides. Members may also be allowed to ask a brief supplementary question to conclude a line of questioning before switching to the next member. Subject to the convenience of the Committee, members outside the Committee 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. An indication of this in advance to the Chairman will be necessary.

I remind members that this year there has been a change in Standing Orders to allow members of Estimates Committees to ask for explanations on matters relating to Estimates of Receipts. I stress that questions must be based on lines of expenditure and revenue as revealed in the Estimates of Payments and Estimates of Receipts. Reference may also be made to other documents, such as the Program Estimates or the Auditor-General's Report. Members must identify a page number in the relevant financial papers from which their question is derived and I stress that to members of the Committee. Questions must be directed to the Minister and not to advisers.

Auditor-General's, \$4 269 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan, Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Lands.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr K.I. MacPherson, Auditor-General.  
 Mr K.J. Bockmann, Acting Deputy Auditor-General.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to page 127 in the Estimates of Payments, page 45 in the Estimates of Receipts and pages 339 to 345 in the Program Estimates.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I refer to the Auditor-General's Report and ask the Minister whether she can inform the Committee whether the Auditor-General is satisfied that sufficient funds have been made available for him properly to discharge his duties. On the basis of past evidence, would extra funding lead to at least the same level of savings identified by the Auditor-General?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I remind honourable members that the Auditor-General reports directly to the Parliament. It is appropriate that the Auditor-General should answer those questions directly. I therefore ask the Auditor-General to respond.

**Mr MacPherson:** At this stage we are satisfied with the resources that have been made available to the department. But if a circumstance were to arise where we felt that it was necessary to draw attention to the fact that we were under-resourced with respect to undertaking a particular project we would certainly bring that to notice.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I refer to page iii of the Auditor-General's Report which refers to Scrimber. Is the Auditor-General confident that the Government's investment in the Scrimber project will produce sufficient revenue to compensate for the losses of the past several years? Has the Auditor-General offered any advice concerning further investment in Scrimber and, if so what? What is the Auditor-General's estimate of the total of public money invested in the Scrimber project?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As I understand it, under the Standing Orders the contents of the Auditor-General's Report and the way in which they relate to individual Government agencies and departments must be examined under the line in the Estimates Payments that relate to that Ministry. I therefore respectfully suggest that that question be directed to the Minister of Forests who is the Minister responsible for that item in the Budget process.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I agree that any comments that may have come out of the Auditor-General's Report relative to a particular ministerial portfolio should be directed to the Minister. I am sure that when the relevant Minister is appearing before the Committee that line of questioning will be pursued by members of the Committee. In relation to any particular item that appears in the Auditor-General's report which is within the responsibility of this Minister, those questions are pertinent. In relation to a particular portfolio responsibility which the Auditor-General may have highlighted in his report, it would be better for the member to direct that question to the relevant Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** On a point of order: I remember very clearly last year asking questions of the Auditor-General at this time, but I do not want to waste time. If that is the ruling, that is where we will leave it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Perhaps I did not clarify that point. I understand what the member for Heysen is getting at. The Minister at the table is correct in the response she gave to the member for Heysen. If the member for Heysen or any member of the Committee wishes to elicit information from the Auditor-General as a result of what the Auditor-General has put in his report, they may well do so. Also, the Minister at the table may well feel, and the Chair would support this,

that the Committee would gain better information on that line from the relevant Minister.

If the member for Heysen wishes to pursue that line, I am in the hands of the Minister at the table who may feel that, when that particular Minister appears before the Committee, that Minister may be able to give information to the Committee in regard to that line of questioning.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I am quite happy to leave that. I should like to ask a question of the Minister about a matter that relates to her water resources portfolio. This relates to pages 8 and 9 of the Auditor-General's Report. Given that Commonwealth specific purpose capital payments for water resources were \$56 million, a variance upwards of \$25 million on the payments of 1988-89, why were capital payments for water resources only \$8 million in 1989-90, a variance downwards of some \$24 million compared with 1988-89, and on what were the remaining \$48 million of the \$56 million grants expended?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As I will have my water resources advisers from the Engineering & Water Supply Department present this afternoon at the agreed time, I ask the honourable member to defer his question. I shall be happy to answer it in the time we have allocated for water resources.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is the Minister saying that she will take that question on notice?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Certainly. I shall be very happy to answer it this afternoon.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I accept that, but it is a pity, when we have these specific issues referred to by the Auditor-General. This afternoon we will not have the Auditor-General to assist the Minister, so we are in a very difficult situation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** To make things easier in relation to that question, which deals with one of the Minister's own portfolios, may I suggest that the Minister answer but come back this afternoon with the particular information.

**The Honourable S.M. Lenehan:** I should like to point out to the Committee that this is the first year that I have actually had the responsibility for the office of the Auditor-General, and I am keen to ensure that the separateness and integrity of the Auditor-General be preserved. Had I been aware that all my lines would be open to discussion, since I am the relevant Minister, I would have had all the officers from various departments here.

If that is the case, it means that I am tying up a large number of public servants for quite a long period of time. A more sensible way of proceeding, when looking at the economics of the situation, is to ensure that we actually have the particular areas dealt with at the time when the relevant officers are here.

I apologise to the Committee for not having all the officers present. I think that the Committee would probably understand my reasoning in not having them but, if in the next year's Estimates Committees, the Opposition wished to pursue a similar approach, obviously, we would need all the officers present for the full day and we would not be able to move, in terms of particular departmental areas in a time sequence. I do apologise. I have to say again, this is the first year I have had the carriage of the Auditor-General and his department, and I was unaware that it would be appropriate to have all my officers present for the full day.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I well understand the quandary the Minister is in and I do not wish to stifle any form of questioning, but may I say that yesterday in this Committee—and, I am sure, the same was happening in Committee A—the relevant Ministers were questioned on the Auditor-General's Report and the Minister had to answer those questions, with the advisers present. They did not have the

luxury of the Auditor-General sitting on the right hand of the Minister. I would suggest to the Committee that we have now gone 17 minutes into the proposed half hour that we intended to deal with these lines, and I would hate to think that we were getting bogged down by this matter. I would suggest to members of the Committee that, if they have any line of questioning which may come out of the Auditor-General's Reports, they take the advice of the Minister and wait until those advisers are with the Minister so that we can elicit a full and frank answer on those questions. I thought the member for Heysen fully understood that.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Mr Chairman, I have no intention of wasting a minute of today's time, I can assure you. I presume that the next question is in order because, again, it refers to the Auditor-General's Report at page vii, which states:

A recent inquiry by audit revealed that an insufficient number of returns . . . from agencies had been received to permit a general assessment of progress to June 1990.

I would like to ask, through the Minister, how many returns were received on asset registers and which bodies did or did not file an appropriate return. If it is appropriate, I am happy for that to be put on notice.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I would ask the Auditor-General to provide an answer for the honourable member.

**Mr MacPherson:** I do not have those figures at hand, so I would like to take the question on notice and I will provide the information very soon.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I am not sure whether the Auditor-General would have had the opportunity to study the sixty-first report of the Public Accounts Committee. Some of the recommendations involved much greater scrutiny of the statutory authorities, and, indeed, of the universities. The committee recommended that they be subject to the Auditor-General so that there be a direct line of accountability to Parliament. I would like to ask the Minister whether, in those circumstances, and if that recommendation were adopted, the Auditor-General would foresee private auditors as the agent of the Auditor-General or whether the department's staff would handle those audit issues and responsibilities and, in addition, whether private agents are already used and, if so, to what extent? What proportion of the budget is allocated under contract to private auditors?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I would like to answer the first part of the question first. It seems that the honourable member is asking a hypothetical question of the Auditor-General by asking him to predict, should a decision be taken to place those statutory authorities, including the universities, under the authority of the Auditor-General, what he would think would be the appropriate breakdown of the departmental staff and private auditors.

I do not think that it is appropriate for the Auditor-General to hypothesise on what might happen. However, it would be absolutely appropriate for the Auditor-General to provide the honourable member with a reply to the second part of the question concerning the current situation with the present workload.

**Mr MacPherson:** With respect to the current workload, we have 13 outside contract audits. They are distributed among three accountancy firms in this city. With respect to the proportion of the budget that is committed to meeting contract payments, Mr Deegan can provide that information.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I ask Mr Deegan to provide that information.

**Mr Deegan:** An amount of \$114 000 was paid last financial year to those contractors. That amount was recovered from the clients with a management fee attached.

**Mr HAMILTON:** As I have another forum in the Parliament in which to ask questions of the Auditor-General, I will defer to the Opposition members so that they can ask as many questions as possible.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It is appropriate for the Auditor-General, through the Minister, to comment on 'Part I. Audit Issues', where it is stated:

The following principles of public administration shall be observed in the public sector:

Paragraph (g) states that 'proper standards of financial management and accounting shall be exercised at all times'. Will the Auditor-General explain what is meant by that statement?

**Mr MacPherson:** The intent behind that provision is to bring to the attention of agencies the need to provide adequate resources to the financial management operations within their agency. In times of stringency, it is often a case of seeking to save resources in that area. We are really seeking to emphasise the need to make sure that that area is properly resourced at all times. The auditors who attend on each of the audits seek to assist the agencies concerned by providing observations and advice as to ways in which they could enhance their financial management, and we will continue to do that.

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

Environment and Planning, \$45 601 000

**Chairman:**

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings

**Members:**

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr C.D.T. McKee  
Mr I.H. Venning  
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

Dr I.R. McPhail, Director-General, Environment and Planning.

Mr B.J. Hill, Director, Departmental Services Division.

Mr S.C. Hains, Director, Planning Division.

Mr R.G. Stafford, Director, Environment Management.

Mr C.R. Harris, Director, Environment Division.

Mr N.H. Johnson, Chief Finance Officer.

Mr R. Ware, Manager, Aboriginal Heritage Branch.

Mr B.H. Leaver, Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Dr Morley, Director, Botanic Garden.

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

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** If specific questions relate to other areas or responsibilities of the department, I have officers available, and I will ask them to come forward if and when they are needed to answer questions. I have the following statement that I would like to take to the Committee.

As a clear expression of the Government's commitment to the environment, it is reallocating resources within the Department of Environment and Planning to fund a num-

ber of exciting new initiatives. I will briefly have some of these before the Committee.

**Sustainable Development Strategy:** As part of its election platform, the Government announced its commitment to prepare a State conservation strategy. The purpose of the strategy is to promote and implement the concept of ecologically sustainable development.

The South Australian Government has committed itself to the principle of ecologically sustainable development. It recognises, however, that it is one thing to give assent to a principle or a concept but it is altogether another thing for this to be translated into reality on the ground. We are not interested in simply developing high-sounding principles, rather, we want to ensure that they influence how the community, business, and the Government itself uses and interacts with the environment.

With this in mind, it is intended that, rather than preparing a single all-embracing strategy, a multitude of strategies will be prepared covering specific sectors or activities. It is also intended to establish a steering group, which will address the larger issues concerning sustainability—issues such as economic measurement of environmental goods and services, education for sustainability, and monitoring. I believe that for lasting results—for major changes to occur in people's values, attitudes and behaviour, which affect the environment—the process needs to ensure that the people within the sectors own the process of change.

Accordingly, it is my intention to prepare a discussion paper, outlining the Government's approach and inviting community comment on this. Following this, action will commence on the approach that is agreed to. I wish to turn now to a couple of specific initiatives, which I hope will illustrate the importance with which this Government accords environmental issues.

**Sustainable economics:** we recognise that measures need to be taken to 'green' economics; that is, to ensure that economics reflect and fully take into account environmental costs and benefits. It is intended to mount a series of environmental economic studies into three major areas: first, in providing economic measurement of environmental resources, that is, what is the value of cultural heritage of national parks and of clean air and water? Secondly, in contributing to the development of economic instruments in the management of activities affecting the environment, for example, in relation to pollution and, thirdly, in examining ways in which accounting systems might better reflect environmental costs and benefits, that is, to ensure that resources expended on cleaning up of an oil spill are not counted as benefiting economic growth but actually counted as a cost. We will be working closely with the Commonwealth and other Governments on these issues.

The second area that I wish to highlight is local government. Local government plays an absolutely crucial role in relation to our environment and its actions have a major influence on the local environment in which we live. Issues such as recycling, street-scaping, pollution, residential enhancement and energy conservation are examples of the many environmental issues that can arise at the local level. It is intended to establish a small office within the department to provide advice and assistance to local government about their environmental responsibilities.

In the planning area, my department will make a considerable contribution to the Premier's Planning Review. In the short term, we have contributed a senior officer to the review team, and are cooperating in a number of other ways with the information needs of the review. For example, most of the population, housing and land requirements forecasts will need to be provided by the Planning Division

for the various reports that will be produced by the Planning Review in full consultation with the review. The department is also continuing an active program of strategic regional investigations in the Barossa, the Gawler region, the southern metropolitan area and other key areas. It is also undertaking key administrative reviews, of which the heritage review is the most significant.

The Estimates that have been placed before this Committee describe the normal and legislative requirements of the Planning Division. Inevitably however, the division can be expected to contribute to the Planning Review at a higher level than other areas of the department and for that matter other Government agencies. That contribution will be made in addition to the normal work of the division which is under consideration today.

I should also highlight some of the more progressive measures taken to improve the administration and operation of the department. The department is continuing to implement its equal opportunity management plan developed in 1986, and has been complimented by the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations on its level of employment of people with disability and of Aboriginal origin. The department has increased its recruitment of female rangers very significantly and has been a forerunner in employing female apprentices in the non-traditional trade of gardener/green keeper at the Botanic Gardens.

In the National Parks and Wildlife Service, continuing development and implementation of income earning initiatives via the general reserves trust have been used to improve park facilities and visitor services.

Finally a five year strategic information technology plan has been developed and is being implemented. This plan includes a networking proposal to provide all managers with on-line access to computer based information.

The Department of Environment and Planning will continue to adopt best available technology in order to provide the people of South Australia with a dedicated and effective service to ensure that the environment of this State is properly protected for this and future generations.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** 'The Budget and its Impact on Women' identifies 600 departmental committees. In regard to the environment and planning portfolio, could the Minister provide information on the following: the title of each committee under her responsibility within this portfolio; the names of the members; the functions of the committee; the date on which the committee was formed; the amount of membership fees where fees are paid; the budgeted cost of servicing the committee; and the times that the committee meets, in other words, how often the committee meets? Also, this financial year there has been a significant increase in the provision for payments to consultants. As it relates to the Minister's portfolio, I also ask the following questions: what is the name of each consultant hired during the past 12 months; and what is the cost of the consultancy, the purpose of the consultancy and the release of any reports that have been provided by those consultants? As far as proposed consultants for this financial year are concerned, I would like to know details in regard to the work proposed.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I know that the Minister is very competent and she may well have that information in front of her, but the Minister may have to take the question on notice.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am not quite superwoman, but I am certainly attempting to become that. As to the first part of the question, we will provide that information by 28 September. I refer the honourable member to a question that was asked in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Mr Lucas. We do have the answer to the second part of the

question. I could either read this information regarding the consultancies, etc., which I do not really think the Committee would want me to do because it involves quite a number of pages, or I could actually table this information, which I think would probably be more appropriate.

In so doing, I point out to the honourable member that I will also ask the departments to provide me with accurate figures as to what it costs to provide this level and depth of information. In a time when we are all being asked to be economically astute, to cut costs and to ensure that we have a maximum return for every dollar that is invested by the public in our departments, I am sure that the honourable member would wish me also to provide him with the costs involved in the department's providing that very comprehensive level of indepth information. I am happy, though, to provide that information. I can provide the answer to the second part of the question. I am in the Committee's hands as to how I should provide that information.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If the Minister would table that information that was given in another place, we will have it incorporated in *Hansard*. Is the honourable member happy with that procedure?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I do not care how the information is provided, as long as we get the answers.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Just to make it easier for *Hansard* and so that we have a consistency in terms of the presentation of that information, rather than tabling it immediately, I will ensure that we have some degree of continuity in terms of the way in which the two lots of information are presented. I will give the Committee an undertaking that we will have that information provided to *Hansard* by 28 September.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** At page 22 the Financial Statement states as follows:

The Government's decisions have resulted in an overall reduction of \$130 million in the no policy change expenditure estimates for 1990-91.

However, there is no further information in the budget papers to identify these savings. What contribution has the Department of Environment and Planning made to these savings, with specific identification of program savings and quantification of cost? Again, I am quite happy to have that question placed on notice. Also, over recent years budget statements have contained vague language in calling for productivity savings. However, no targets have been specified or savings achieved. This contrasts with the presentation of the Victorian and New South Wales budgets where targets are nominated. In regard to the Department of Environment and Planning, what productivity savings have been achieved in each of the past three financial years; can these be identified by program and amount of saving; and what productivity savings are budgeted for this financial year? Again, I am happy to take that on notice.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** With respect to the first question, we could provide that information now, but it would take an inordinate length of time, so I think that, in terms of fairness to other Committee members who may have questions, I am happy to take that first part of the question on notice. As to this whole question of productivity, before seeking a comment from either the Director-General or from the financial administrator, I would like to make a general comment. It seems to me that we have to look very carefully at all this. The Department of Environment and Planning is being asked more and more not just by the community but also by members of the Opposition to do more and more with the resources that it has. I believe that the department has greatly increased its productivity with the resources that it has at its disposal.

As the community becomes much more environmentally conscious and sensitive, we can quite clearly demonstrate that the demands, in terms of the community's contacting the department over a number of issues, problems and policy areas as well as the fact that we are moving forward and breaking new ground both with our work on the bigger national scene and within South Australia, require more and more resources in terms of policy development, policy implementation and the assessment of the success of that policy implementation in the community.

In the past couple of years the department has, and will continue to do so, used its reallocating technique, to which I alluded in my introductory statement, to ensure that we have the highest level of productivity from our officers. As the Minister responsible for this department (and I have been responsible for it for about only 15 months), I want to put on the public record how delighted I am to see the level of productivity which the officers are turning out.

With respect to the specific points contained in the honourable member's question, I am happy to provide that information by 28 September. I would ask whether either gentleman sitting either side of me wishes to make a comment, or whether they want to wait until the information is provided.

**Dr McPhail:** In terms of the organisation of our activities, productivity gains in the department cover a very wide ambit of activities. For instance, the department has increased productivity enormously by becoming essentially computer-based in its publishing areas and in relation to the activities of individual staff members. As a result, we have been able to reduce the proposed increase in the number of stenographic, typing and other staff that we would have needed.

We have been able dramatically to reduce the number of staff employed in our publishing section because of the use of machines such as computers and the like. Also, we have looked to increase productivity across the agency as we have looked at ways of properly managing our financial affairs and decentralising financial control to the people in the field and to the people in the cost centres within the organisation. In doing that we have been able to ensure that we can maintain the increased output that is being demanded of us without any substantial increase in resources.

I am happy to join with the Minister in providing a response to the question, but our department must operate on an increased productivity basis simply to meet the increased demands that are being placed on us.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** How many people has the Minister on her ministerial staff? What are the names of those people, the responsibilities of each person, and how many changes have been made to her ministerial staff since she took office?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Again, that question has already been asked by a member of the Upper House. If that information has not been provided through that venue, it has certainly been provided by my office to the Premier's office, because the question was asked of every Minister and every ministerial office.

I remind the honourable member that I am one of those Ministers who have had five or six portfolios in the two years in which I have been a Minister. My responsibilities have included community welfare and marine and harbours. I now have four matters under my responsibility. I have had six portfolios within two years. If there is any problem with changing staff, I remind the honourable member that somebody who might be an excellent adviser in community welfare may not necessarily be the most appropriate person in respect of environment and planning, for example. Again,

that information has been provided, and I am happy to provide a copy of it for the Committee by 28 September.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Before I ask my question, I preface my remarks by making a statement. I congratulate the Minister on her commitment, openness and her responses and those of her department since taking up these portfolios. I am not one who hands out kudos easily, but the Minister's manner, energy, open-door attitude and willingness to discuss controversial issues, in particular those pertaining to my electorate, are refreshing. Many of my constituents—some of them are in this Chamber but I shall not name them—have expressed their pleasure at the way in which the Minister has responded to certain issues that impact not only upon my electorate but also upon the State.

I am personally grateful for the manner in which the Minister has responded to my constituents via my electorate office. The Minister should be congratulated. The manner in which she has carried out her portfolio duties should be put on the public record.

I refer to page 111 of the Estimates of Payments in relation to the Botanic Gardens. I took note of what the Minister requested. Since the opening of the Bicentennial Conservatory, which I have not had an opportunity to visit, how many people have visited the display?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the honourable member for his question. The establishment of the Tropical Bicentennial Conservatory has been one of the jewels in the crown of the Botanic Gardens. I can give the honourable member a short and to-the-point answer. From 18 November 1989 to 9 September 1990, there were 314 457 visitors. Approximately 315 000 people have visited the conservatory from the middle of November until not quite the middle of September of this year. That is quite a remarkable visitation record in the sense that people make a contribution in terms of their visit to the tropical conservatory.

It is important to record my appreciation and thanks to the board of the Botanic Gardens for the way in which they have operated this marvellous adjunct to Adelaide and South Australia. In particular I thank the Director of the Botanic Gardens, Dr Brian Morley, who has joined me at the table should there be any questions relating to the Botanic Gardens that I am not able to answer.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to page 115—I like to deal with controversial issues first—which refers to waste management grants to the South Australian Waste Management Commission. What steps have been taken through the Waste Management Commission to ensure that recycling initiatives in paper, plastic and other commodities are given top priority? What has been done to facilitate cooperation between the Waste Management Commission and various local government authorities?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The Waste Management Commission has taken several specific initiatives. With the blessing of the Waste Management Commission, as the honourable member would know, we have established a recycling advisory committee that has broad representation from business, industry, conservation groups and so on. That advisory committee was responsible for producing the draft recycling strategy which has been released for public comment. The period for submissions has closed. We have received 100 submissions on that draft strategy, the vast majority of which have been supportive and positive.

The plastics industry is working closely at several levels with Government, not just with my department, and with the Waste Management Commission. Indeed, the industry has representation on the Recycling Advisory Committee. As the responsible Minister, I have also met with the Executive Director of the National Plastics Association, and that,

of course, is none other than Susan Ryan. I have had several meetings with her. In terms of getting things done, the plastics industry could not have chosen anybody more dynamic or appropriate.

The industry is undertaking several new initiatives in plastics recycling. The Smorgen product, syntal, which is a synthetic alternative to several products that are currently on the market, is made from mixed waste plastic. That is one initiative. I have met with the proponents of the Smorgen product, syntal. They are keen to establish a plant in South Australia. They already have an operational plant in Melbourne and they are looking to establish plants in Sydney, Brisbane and Adelaide. We are looking at working constructively with Smorgens through my colleague the Minister for Industry, Trade and Technology so that we can ensure that, if such a plant is established, it will be economically viable and commercially able to stand up in the long term.

Another initiative is the PET, which is a container that contains many of our soft drinks and other beverages. A petalite processing plant is being built at Wodonga by ACI. It will granulate PET and use it for other plastic products. I understand that it is a state-of-the-art process.

Thanks to our deposit container legislation, South Australia has always had a viable collection system for PET soft drink bottles. Those bottles are now being baled up and stockpiled by State-wide recyclers for processing at the new ACI plant at Wodonga. That means that no recovered PET bottles from Adelaide are going to landfill. I am sure that all members of the Committee will appreciate that aspect. I must confess that the second part of the honourable member's question has escaped me.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The other part of my question related to consultation with various local government authorities.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** There has been widespread consultation. It is important to consult with local government, particularly in this whole area of recycling. Local government will play a critical role in ensuring the ongoing and sustainable success of a proper recycling industry for South Australia, since it will be able to provide a guaranteed source of supply of materials for recycling. As well as being involved in terms of a commitment to ensure that we remove litter from the litter stream and that the waste is properly collected and sorted, local government will be vital in providing feedstock for new and developing recycling industries.

What we have done, therefore, is establish a liaison with local government so that there is ongoing discussion at all levels. I recently launched a recycling manual, which will give local government access to much information about the ways in which it can collect kerbside materials for recycling, and a number of very useful hints and information for local government in establishing its own recycling collection systems. As well as that, we have a small unit within the department which works with local government, and the Waste Management Commission and the Recycling Advisory Committee have representation from local government and, I believe, work very positively with local government in this area.

**Mr HAMILTON:** One supplementary question the Minister may take on board refers to the recycling of used oil. Can South Australia be guaranteed that the proposed ANM newspaper recycling plant at Albury will accept a reasonable quota of newsprint from this State? This is a controversial matter; there has been considerable discussion in the community and in the media, and it is a matter I believe all South Australians have an interest in.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The recycling of oil is a matter I have placed on the national agenda for Environment Ministers. Mr Mike Madigan, who is substantially the Deputy Director of the department, is now working full-time both in the Waste Management Commission and in terms of the whole area of recycling, so our commitment can be seen by the transfer of this very senior officer into the full-time area of waste management and recycling. Mr Madigan is the officer nominated by the ANZEC Ministers to drive the whole question of a national strategy for recycled oil and tyres. Every member would know the importance of not dumping oil into landfill, waterways or anywhere else because it does not disintegrate—it contaminates.

The other problem area is that of tyres. In this country, never mind overseas, tyres have proved to be a major environmental problem. Recently in Western Australia there was a major fire which not only caused a potential hazard through the spread of that fire but also caused an enormous amount of pollution to the environment. ANZEC will be looking at what we can do at a national level. I have had personal discussions with the Federal Minister (Ros Kelly) who is working very hard to put in place a national collection system and some national manufacturing industries to see what we can do once the tyres are collected.

In relation to recycled oil, on behalf of a national company I have announced that they are collecting oil, treating it, recycling and reusing it. My own ministerial car is running on recycled oil, as part of a pilot test project to see whether this oil lives up to all the claims that are being made. So far that seems to be the case.

With respect to newspapers, I have had a number of meetings with both ANM and APM, ANM being the company that has on the drawing board the recycled newsprint plant at Albury. When this comes on stream, it will be the first and the only plant in Australia which has a de-inking or brightening process. I understand that there is a proposal for a second plant in Perth, which news I welcome, since that will put South Australia in a key position in terms of providing newsprint for recycling. In my discussions with the company, ANM has indicated that our share of the amount of paper that will be required by the plant when it comes on stream in 1992 will be approximately 15 000 to 20 000 tonnes annually.

That will not take all the newsprint we have available for recycling in South Australia, but it will certainly take a major proportion of it. We will still need to sustain those industries that use newsprint in packaging, egg carton production, etc., as well as in the area of animal husbandry, in the whole area of use and replacement of straw. We will still need to supply newsprint to those markets, but it will mean that we have a guaranteed market within our own country within reach of our own supply.

I have been given a guarantee by the company that that will be the case. If anyone is concerned about environmental aspects of the plant, I assure the Committee that I have made it very clear—through my membership of the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council as well as being the Minister for Environment and Planning in South Australia—that South Australia will only be supporting this plant at Albury if it can be shown to be environmentally sound. I believe that the proponents of that plant are very aware that they will need to ensure that the effluent produced from this new plant will be disposed of on land, for the most part, but in winter any effluent put into the Murray River will have to be secondarily treated to such a degree that it will cause absolutely no pollution to the Murray River.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I refer to page 306 of the Program Estimates, the sector dealing with conservation of



the natural environment. What specific drafting instructions has the Government given for the Wilpena Pound legislation? In view of the fact that the Minister's letter to the Leader of the Opposition (which was received yesterday) indicates that the drafting process began last Friday, I should like to know from the Minister when the Government actually decided to proceed with the legislation and when Cabinet formally determined that the legislation should proceed? In drawing up the legislation, has the Government received Crown Law advice, and will the Minister make available that advice if it has been received?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am quite amazed at the honourable member's questions. I spoke with him on Friday morning; I rang him in the spirit of genuine cooperation and total bipartisanship. The Premier had made a statement to the House the previous day and, in this statement, indicated that both the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and I would be available to work with any member nominated by the Opposition, or to work in any other way with the Opposition in getting the enabling legislation into Parliament.

I had indicated that I would be introducing a Bill to enable the Parliament to make a decision about the Wilpena Pound redevelopment; I believe that is most appropriate. The honourable member told me on Friday morning that he would get back to me on Monday following discussions with his Leader—and that is totally appropriate. I indicated to him that I had to make representations to my Leader, the Premier, in terms of the time frame and in terms of meeting what I thought at the time was a reasonably genuine request by the honourable member.

That was that any debate in the House would be delayed until the honourable member returned from overseas, and I duly went about carrying out my side of what I thought was a gentleperson's agreement. However, to my surprise, I then discovered the honourable member on the airwaves of this State saying that he had no intention of being any part of any consultation, that there would be no consultation, and so on. I must say that I was disappointed. That certainly was not the way in which I worked with his predecessor in a whole range of environmental issues, let me remind the Committee, in the run-up to a State election. However, if that is the way the honourable member wants to operate and wishes to relate, in terms of some of these issues which, I think are very significant for the future of South Australia, that is his decision.

The Bill is an enabling piece of legislation, and I would have thought that the honourable member, who was Minister for Planning for a much longer period than I have been Minister for Planning, would understand what an enabling Bill is. It is not a huge, long tortuous piece of legislation. We will be consulting, of course, and I believe that my officers have already consulted with Crown Law, and that is most appropriate. In the letter that I received from the Leader of the Opposition, to which letter the honourable member refers, a request was made of me as the Minister responsible for this legislation for the Opposition to see a draft Bill when it had been prepared. I have written back to the honourable Leader, who now enters the Committee, and I have said that I would be pleased to provide the information he requested, so that, when the enabling Bill has been drafted, I will send a copy to the Opposition for its comments on it. I am carrying out the requests that have been made in writing to me by the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I hoped that we might get some answers to some questions. That is why the question was put to the Minister in the first place. As a supplement-

ary question, I just make the point that the Minister gave notice that a Bill would be introduced on the first day of sitting. I have been in this House for 15 years and I have always recognised that, before legislation could be drawn up, Parliamentary Counsel had to receive the appropriate instructions that in turn would come from Cabinet. When did this matter go before Cabinet, and when was it formally determined by Cabinet that the legislation should be proceeded with?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As the honourable member knows, because his 15-year long term—and I will not make the comment—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I would advise the Minister not to comment on whether the member for Heysen has been here too long.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Because of his 15 years (I understand that it was before I entered Parliament that he was the Minister for Planning and was a member of Cabinet), the honourable member would know only too well that Cabinet decisions are not decisions that Ministers would necessarily wish to share with the rest of the world. Those decisions are taken in confidence and the timing of Cabinet submissions is also a matter for Cabinet itself. So, I think the honourable member is trying not very subtly to cloud the whole issue.

I will restate the Government's position. In an attempt to ensure that the Opposition had as much notice as was possible, the Premier made a statement to the Parliament more than a month before the Government intended to introduce a Bill which would enable the Parliament—which is the highest authority in this State, in terms of being the democratic voice of the people—to state its intentions clearly with respect to the redevelopment and the relocation of the current facilities at Wilpena.

In his statement, the Premier also indicated that, as the appropriate Minister responsible for this area, I would be giving notice so that everybody was clear about the Government's intentions. I duly did that last Thursday; I said that I would be introducing an enabling Bill; that I would be requesting the Opposition to have consultations in terms of formulating that Bill; and that there would be in excess of a month between the time the Premier made the public statement and when I introduced the Bill. That is exactly what is happening. We will follow every correct procedure, as I am sure you, Sir, and other members of this Committee would expect.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Then I will ask again: when did this matter go before Cabinet and when did Cabinet determine that legislation should be proceeded with, and has that determination been forwarded to Parliamentary Counsel?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** If the honourable member is suggesting that somehow I as a Minister am able to make these decisions without reference to Cabinet, he obviously does not understand the system. The honourable member knows full well that, of course, Cabinet would have given approval for such a course of action, and it is appropriate—

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

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is the business of the Cabinet. Certainly, Cabinet has made a decision on this matter and, of course, it will then be referred to Parliamentary Counsel for drafting. I can only guess what the honourable member is trying to get at. Is he trying to suggest that we will not introduce a piece of enabling legislation and that we will not get Parliamentary Counsel to draw it up? I really do not understand the subtleties of the honourable member's question. It is a very straightforward situation: we have followed every procedure according to

the rules that the Premier lays down for the Cabinet and according to normal procedures.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I thought my question would have been perfectly clear. As a supplementary question, I have asked specific questions and the Minister has refused to answer them. The Minister has indicated that she explained to the House clearly—

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I have answered every question.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister has indicated that she explained to the House clearly last Thursday the reasons for the legislation. That was not the case.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The Premier clearly enunciated in his statement why we were introducing the legislation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I would like to remind members of the Committee and the Minister that I expect all members to act in a very professional way. Looking around the Committee and noting the time that members have served in this Parliament, I would expect a very professional approach. I would also remind the members of the Committee and the Minister that questions, answers and statements be directed through the Chair. I do not think that is too much to ask. We have a long day ahead of us, and I expect a certain amount of goodwill to emanate from both sides of the Committee.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I think I can clarify this matter. The honourable member is obviously trying to ascertain whether the decision in the Parliament was taken before Cabinet approval was given. To put him out of his misery, I can give the honourable member the clear assurance that no Cabinet had given its approval before the actions took place. I do not intend to pursue any other matters relating to Cabinet, because the honourable member well knows the way in which Cabinet operates in this State, because he was a member of Cabinet.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** As the Minister is not prepared to tell me when the matter went to Cabinet, I ask why the Government has decided to introduce legislation to deal only with Wilpena, and is it likely that we will see similar legislation introduced in regard to all development and, particularly, any development in national parks?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thought I made it very clear before the last election, when I made an announcement on behalf of the Government, that the Government did not intend to have any new major—and I emphasise 'major'—developments in our national parks. Therefore, the second part of that question is irrelevant. It seems to me that the Government has acted very properly in this case. In terms of whether we have enabling pieces of legislation lying around in cupboards somewhere waiting for other developments, that is absolute nonsense, and the answer to that is 'No'.

I would have hoped that the honourable member might see the importance of supporting this piece of enabling legislation—indeed, in supporting this project, which is an incredibly environmentally sound project. This has been demonstrated through the EIS assessment and the subsequent Cabinet decisions that took note of the requests and comments in the EIS. I can only say that the Government's record in terms of the environment is second to none in this country. Certainly we will be looking at situations as they arise. There is no proposal by this Government to have any major developments in national parks, and I wonder whether the Opposition would make that same commitment to the people of this State. I do not recall their making it before the last election; certainly, I did not read it anywhere.

The honourable member well knows the situation with regard to Wilpena. The actual three kilometre relocation of

the Wilpena facilities which are currently in the national park is in a disused pastoral property that was used for 130 years for grazing. I am sure he well understands the situation with regard to this location as well as I.

**Mr McKEE:** Referring to program 2 on page 111 of the Estimates of Payments, how have National Estate Grant Program funds been used to advance the cause of Aboriginal heritage in South Australia, and what national estate money is currently being used for this purpose?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** We actually have an officer from the Aboriginal heritage program present. I will answer this question generally and ask Mr Bob Ware to provide further information if necessary. The National Estate Grants funds have been available since 1970s. Approximately one-third of the annual funding is available for Aboriginal heritage. The funds are used for Aboriginal heritage projects such as site protection, interpretation of sites and places, and studies and research. The funds are available to Aboriginal communities and to local and State Governments.

A total of \$323 655 is available for 29 projects. This total amount is currently being used for those 29 projects. Those projects range from a Lower Eyre Peninsula site survey, to which \$45 800 has been allocated, to the Nullarbor Plain Aboriginal Antiquity Study. I am really looking forward to the results of those studies because I think we will find that our Nullarbor region is not only the most exciting new addition to our national parks but also will have an incredibly significant effect in terms of the preservation of Aboriginal heritage and culture in the Nullarbor region. A total of \$34 600 has been made available for that study, and \$35 000 has been made available through that fund to protect Aboriginal sites. If the honourable member wishes to ask about any specific aspects of that question, I will ask Mr Ware to provide further information.

**Mr Ware:** I think the Minister has capably answered the question.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Referring to page 306 of the Program Estimates and program 6 on page 112 of the Estimates of Payments, the original stage 1 as identified in the 1988 EIS for Wilpena proposes 120 hotel rooms, 32 cottages, 32 bungalows, 30 cabins, 60 dormitory beds, 300 unpowered camping sites, 100 powered camping sites, 15 bus sites and 65 rooms for staff, with a total of 34 000 visitors per annum. The brochure that was recently released by Tourism South Australia for stage 1 of the development has not 120 hotel rooms but 182, 60 cottage rooms instead of 30, bungalows and cabins are not given (presumably they have been deleted), 180 dormitory beds, 100 unpowered camping sites and 300 powered camping sites, with 10 bus sites. The total number of visitors per annum is identified at 55 000. However, the estimated income for the first year is \$17 million.

If there are 55 000 visitors, each one would be paying \$309 per day, which is clearly unrealistic. If there were 34 000 visitors, as for stage 1, each of those visitors would be paying \$500 per day, which is also totally unrealistic. The Minister would know that visitor nights rather than visitors is the measurement by which accommodation capacity is reckoned. If the Ophix estimates of occupancy rates, namely, 80 per cent for hotels and cottages, 75 per cent for dormitories and 30 per cent for camping sites were to be realised, there would be 469 560 visitor nights which, of course, would bring a far more realistic daily rate of \$36.20. Which of these figures should we consider to be accurate?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Before we go any further, I indicate to the Committee that the Leader of the Opposition in a letter to me indicated his support for the 1988 stage 1.



I will ask the Director of National Parks and Wildlife Services to comment on that because the 1988 stage 1 proposal also included a golf course, and Cabinet subsequently deleted the golf course because we believed it was not appropriate. I can only hope that the Leader of the Opposition has made an error and that he is not suggesting that we should proceed with the golf course.

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Well, that's what we have received from him in writing. It is my understanding that there are currently in excess of about 30 000 visitors to the Wilpena area. I am sure my colleague the Minister of Tourism would be able to provide the accurate numbers at this date. Certainly, it was close to 30 000 some time ago, and I presume that that figure has been maintained. Let us be clear that 30 000 people visit the very degraded camping site at the very sensitive mouth of Wilpena Pound at this stage, and have been so doing since the early 1940s.

I will ask the Director of National Parks and Wildlife to talk about that slight difference in terms of the stage 1 description that the honourable member has pointed out. I have been through this matter for the past 12 months. As indeed had my predecessor before me, and it seems that some sections of the South Australian community seem to thrive on fear and scare. I am sure that the next fear and scare headline will be that we are proposing facilities for 469 000 visitors. Let me make it very clear—

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Visitor nights.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Visitor nights, but that would certainly be many thousands of visitors over and above the stage 1 proposal. Before any members of the media present wish to suggest that that will in any way be like the proposal, I make it very clear from the outset that this is yet another fear and scare tactic, and we will be rejecting it absolutely. I will ask Mr Leaver to comment on the honourable member's suggestion.

**Mr Leaver:** The financial viability studies are not undertaken by the Government. They are not necessarily supported or disproved by the Government. They are undertaken by the financial advisers to the lessee. The lease is carefully structured to set an upper limit on the scale of development and the lessee, through further marketing and financial studies, has obviously prescribed a development that reflects those far more detailed studies that were undertaken since the EIS was placed on public exhibition.

It also includes the lessee's taking on board the All Seasons group of companies as the resort operator. It has a great deal of experience in Australian tourism, particularly outback Australian tourism, as it is the majority operator in terms of the number of beds at Yulara. It is that sort of advice and expertise that has been brought to bear to ensure that the optimum mix of accommodation within the constraints of the lease will be going into the project.

In general terms it is fair to say that the change since the EIS tables on the staging of the project has been to place an increasing emphasis on the middle of the range budget accommodation for park visitors, to the detriment of the large camping area. That component of the project has been scaled down. The kind of cabin scale and the hotel room scale will be at 3½ star standard, so it is certainly not a resort standard that one would normally associate with some of the high standard Queensland developments. It is very much targeted to the middle of the range part of the market. The current market emphasises those findings. The financial studies have been undertaken by PKF Financial Advisers. A separate supporting study has been undertaken by Colliers, and a third study has been undertaken by Ayers Finnis. This includes an analysis of the visitor trends and

the various components that make up a financial feasibility study.

Beyond the provisions of the lease the department has not got involved in those studies. The lessee has leasing obligations and has a minimum standard of resort to construct by 30 June 1994. He has an upper limit to which he can develop that site. That is the extent of the department's involvement in the mix, except that any amended lease within the constraints of the lease require the written approval of the lessor.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I wish to ask a supplementary question, because I do not believe that the Minister or Mr Leaver picked up the purpose inherent in the first question. Acknowledging that only Ophix can deal with the financial matters, I return to the question of why stage 1, which was originally to have 120 hotel rooms, has now become 182 hotel rooms. As we all know, hotel rooms are the most costly component in that development from the consumer's point of view. Why has 120 rooms originally approved now become 182, as confirmed by the Premier when he said that stage 1 is now 90 per cent of the project?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask Mr Leaver to answer that question in terms of the actual room numbers. If he is unable to provide all the information, we will get it for the honourable member.

**Mr Leaver:** In general terms, building on the answer that I gave earlier, the current mix of accommodation, including the number of hotel rooms referred to by the honourable member, is a consequence of the marketing studies that have been undertaken by the financial consultants and the All Seasons group of companies, the operator. That is the basis of the current range of accommodation now proposed for the site.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Still on program 6, page 306, in respect of the Wilpena Resort, the Flinders Ranges National Park Plan of Management 1983 established that the cost of managing the park was \$223 000 per annum and that \$4 million of capital work had to be done. According to the lease agreement, Ophix will pay NPWS \$100 per annum until mid-1991, \$300 000 per annum for the following five years, and either \$300 000 or 1.2 per cent of the annual gross income, whichever is greater, for the next five years, and no more than 2.5 per cent of the annual gross income for the rest of the lease.

According to the EIS and the plan of management 1988 (pages 15 and 30), all revenue derived from the lease is to be directed to the natural and cultural conservation of the park and the provision of maintenance of facilities and services within the park. According to the Tourism South Australia document, which was recently released, at page 9 it states:

Beyond the \$1.1 million which the State Government has approved for the airport, it is proposed that the remaining \$2.5 million would be loaned to the District Council of Hawker by the Local Government Finance Authority and this loan would be repaid from the balance of the income stream from the Wilpena Station Resort lease after park management requirements have been met and would be guaranteed by the Government.

Clearly, 3.6 million is going to be taken out of a fund that the EIS and the plan of management stated would be directed wholly and solely towards park management. On whose authority did this change of policy occur? What status does the plan of management have if it is able to be changed in this way, and what are the current costs of managing the park? How much of those costs are expected to be met out of the Ophix lease?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I think that there must be about six or seven parts of that question, and I am certainly happy to provide the information. I will ask the Director of the

National Park and Wildlife Service to respond to the honourable member. We may not have the actual amounts in terms of costs at our fingertips, but we will be able to provide that information for the honourable member.

**Mr Leaver:** The EIS also drew attention to the need in the rental negotiations associated with the lease to include a component for subregional infrastructure. The lease discussions in terms of rental were protracted and fairly arduous, and included throughout the discussions the need for the project to make a contribution to the subregional infrastructure as a flow on from the project. The \$300 000 mentioned in the lease that will operate from the opening of the facility—which is indexed to the CPI—is the first call for park management. The added benefit to park management from the operation of the proposed project is the release of a fairly substantial amount of money that currently goes towards the operation of the existing facilities at the existing resorts at Wilpena Pound.

It is not only the \$300 000 that the park management will receive for management purposes. In fact, it is the capacity to divert funds from the existing arrangements associated with the existing resort, and also the visitor facilities and services that will be provided under the proposed development in the lease with Ophix, which will provide an important dimension in terms of the provision of visitor facilities and services, which are the responsibility of the lessee.

These relate mainly to recreation, interpretation and cultural programs and restoration of historic features of the area, and so on. So, the \$300 000 forms a component. The money released from the drain going towards the existing resort will be released, plus the very substantial amount of lease obligation to provide visitor facilities and services.

As I said, a component of rental is always to be directed towards subregional infrastructure. This is mentioned in the EIS as, indeed, is the upgrading of Hawker airstrip. That is the framework for the recent Government decisions.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I would like to highlight one point for clarification; that is, it has been banded around in certain sections that they are only paying \$100 a year, or whatever, for the lease. Let me make it very clear that from the first day the doors open, the \$300 000 comes into being immediately. I think that needs to be clarified because there has been some misinformation that people may not have understood and it is important that people recognise that.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In releasing a statement last month, the Minister of Tourism said that the Government's agreement to provide funds for infrastructure—the airport and the power line—was dependent upon the construction of the resort commencing by 1 November. If construction has not commenced by 1 November does that mean that the Government's undertakings are no longer binding? What then will the Government do to require construction to commence?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Quite obviously, as the honourable member knows, when my colleague the Minister of Tourism made that announcement it was clearly understood that the proponents would start construction by 1 November. Obviously Cabinet would reconsider that particular deadline should that be necessary. I think that at this stage it is probably premature to canvass what might or might not happen. However, quite obviously, Cabinet made that decision initially and, as the honourable member would know, if the proponents of the development should approach my colleague or me in terms of that deadline then Cabinet would reconsider the matter. I am sure the honourable member, with any other sort of project, would expect the Government to have that degree of sensitivity and flexibility

in terms of working for the benefit of South Australia. It all depends on where you are coming from, I guess.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I refer again to program 6 (page 306). Can the Minister give an estimate, or even be precise, as to the cost of staff resources that have thus far been allocated to the Wilpena resort project?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Quite obviously, I do not carry that figure around in my head. We have officers operating and working in a whole range of areas in relation to the careful management of the parks and wildlife of this State. The Director-General (Dr McPhail) will provide a general response to this question.

**Dr McPhail:** Apart from some involvement by a specific officer in the drawing up of the lease which, of course, is a function that we carry out across a very large number of leases that the NPWS has with various commercial users, the bulk of the expenditure from the department has been in the operation of the Director's time. There will obviously be, and there obviously have been, meetings involving the district ranger and his staff in that part of the National Parks operations and also in establishing the necessary project control arrangements. However, in terms of the total expenditure of this department, as opposed to the expenditure by the proponent in this case, our outgoings have been quite small.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I would like to congratulate the Minister and her department at the outset on their management of the parks and wildlife. One would have thought from the questions asked today that Wilpena is the only area of concern. I congratulate the department on its achievements especially in view of the limited budget that it has to administer. I turn now to the Adelaide Botanic Gardens. I am a constant visitor to the Botanic Gardens, which I think is one of Adelaide's gems. The gardens certainly make Adelaide a very pleasant place in which to live. I notice that quite a deal of redevelopment is being undertaken at the back gate of the gardens. Footpaths are being taken up and it must involve a lot of replanting. However, there is not a very big increase in the budget. The salaries and wages component has risen to \$3 120 700, which is not a big increase. Will that increase go towards the redevelopment of the bottom back end of the Botanic Gardens? Similarly, I notice that it is planned to refurbish the old shadehouse, or glasshouse. There does not appear to be anything about that on page 111 of the estimates. When is the shadehouse likely to be upgraded and refurbished? Has the refurbishment of the restaurant in the Botanic Gardens meant additional rent income to the department? Has there been an increase in the number of people attending the restaurant? I notice on page 306 of the Program Estimates the following reference:

High visitation in parks continued the demand for public facilities and maintenance needs in parks.

Has the department been able to judge whether there has been an increase in the number of visitors to the Botanic Gardens?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I appreciate the honourable member's interest and the fact that he is so supportive of the gardens and the future direction of the gardens. I will answer the question generally from a Government policy position and I will then ask the Director of the Botanic Gardens to provide the specific information that the honourable member has asked for with respect to attracting people to the gardens, I think that the question I answered earlier about the tropical conservatory highlights the fact that we are drawing people to that specific and particular aspect of the gardens.

However, the Government believes, and I as Minister believe, that because of its strategic location with respect to the cultural boulevard of Adelaide—namely, North Terrace—its proximity to the central business district and its accessibility by means of public transport we can probably do a lot more in the future to attract a greater range and diversity of South Australian citizens to the gardens. The production *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, staged in the Botanic Gardens at the last Festival of Arts, which I attended one evening, was extremely successful and was booked out for months before the festival commenced.

This led me to a discussion with the Premier about future directions in terms of theatre—and I would not have to remind everyone of the Premier's great support for the arts and theatre in this State—whereby we could look at using the facility of the gardens for such things as summer theatre programs. Particularly with daylight saving and the marvellous facilities of the gardens, we could look at hosting either visiting or Australian theatre companies. I note the attendance in this Committee of the member for Gilles, who would have a great interest in the employment that would be generated and created for groups belonging to Actors Equity.

I think there is enormous potential for the use of the gardens. One of my colleagues suggested to me this week that, as it is spring, perhaps it would be appropriate for the fashion houses with headquarters in South Australia—and I will not name all the fashion houses; I am sure some of my colleagues would be aware that in South Australia we have a number of fashion houses that are national centres of fashion—to have their spring collection displayed and promoted in the Botanic Gardens.

All these functions would draw people to the gardens. It would also be a revenue source for the ongoing maintenance and support of the gardens.

We could also look at lunchtime concerts—everything from orchestral string concerts to mildly modern things and, indeed, such things as jazz—which would attract responsible people into the gardens. I am thinking of workers from the central business district visiting the gardens and spending some time in the sunlight and sharing in the beauties highlighted by the honourable member in his question.

As Minister, I would like to see the gardens take a broader direction in the future that picked up a greater and more diverse group of Adelaide citizens and visitors to our State and interpreted the beauty and majesty of the gardens for these groups.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Does the board agree with that?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I hope that it will, and I think that is important. I think it is important also that the Minister of the day, who provides the funds for the gardens, should also be prepared to provide some direction and, if you like, some vision. As a result of my discussions with the Chairman of the board, I imagine that he is aware of my views and I hope that he shares those views. I think it is appropriate that I set the scene for the second half of the question, which looked more specifically at some of the funding implications from the budget line. I would like to ask Dr Morley if he wishes to comment on the specific aspects of the honourable member for Henley Beach's question.

**Dr Morley:** As to the honourable member's questions about the remodelling of the paths adjacent to the Friends' Gates, that is effectively a maintenance activity and funds have been provided for that purpose. So, there is no problem with funding in that regard. It is part of ongoing cyclical maintenance.

The provision of new shading material for the Simpson shadehouse is also part of the maintenance program, but the funding for that project has been supplemented by an anonymous donation from a member of the public. The Botanic Gardens is very fortunate in that, being 135 years old, we have a lot of very staunch and loyal supporters.

The kiosk and its recreational facilities have been addressed by the board and it is possible to say that the kiosk redevelopment is imminent. Part of the funding of that redevelopment and modernisation will utilise rental received from the lessee of the kiosk. The Bicentennial Conservatory has certainly increased the number of visitors to the garden and this has helped to precipitate some of the legitimate criticism about the kiosk, which is being addressed.

Visitor numbers are increasing at between 5 and 8 per cent per annum. We have not had the first year's intake due to the conservatory, and I anticipate that there will be an increase in visitor numbers. In round terms, we get about 700 000 visitors to the garden and about 250 000 visitors a year to Botanic Park.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I refer to the State and heritage conservation line on page 114. How many additions to the State Heritage Register were listed in 1989-90, and how many are expected to be listed in 1990-91?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The number of places added to the State Heritage Register in 1989-90 was 95 and the number placed on the interim list was 196. As a result of heritage surveys covering eight towns in the Lower North, the Eyre Peninsula, the West Coast, Kangaroo Island, Port Adelaide, Marion and Salisbury, some 250 places are likely to be included in the register for 1990-91.

**Mr FERGUSON:** As to page 114, are the owners of heritage properties ignored by the State Heritage Branch, or have efforts been made to provide them with information which may help them to look after their properties more effectively?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The short answer is 'No', people have not been ignored. In answer to the second half of the question, I believe that all Ministers and Government departments continually say, 'We are doing it well, but we can do it better.' Members may be aware that on the weekend I launched the Green Paper in terms of the review of the heritage legislation and, also, the administration of heritage. That review paper has asked the community to help us define heritage in terms of the community's perception of heritage. I think that is vitally important because, at the end of the day, it is the community for whom we are preserving heritage and future communities. It is important that we get feedback and, also, to ask the community how it thinks we can do it better. The information resources of the State Heritage Branch are always available to owners interested in knowing more about heritage significance of their property and the ways in which they can care for that property to ensure that it will increase in value. In some circles of South Australia there is a myth that if a home is placed on the heritage register that somehow leads to its devaluation. In fact, information and evidence from around the world would say that the situation is quite the contrary. If a property is preserved in line with the guidelines, that is, using the correct colour paints and other types of sensible architectural modifications and enhancements, the opposite is in fact true. I think it is time that we turned around the misconception that placing a house or dwelling on a heritage register devalues that property. The branch will provide that information.

We have certainly established a regular program of contact and liaison with owners of heritage buildings. We are publishing a series of conservation practice notes for guid-

ance to owners. That is important—we should be doing that. We should give guidance to owners about how to look after properties and about what it means to have a home on the State heritage register. Also, in cooperation with councils, we are implementing a heritage adviser scheme. That is happening in several councils. I urge other councils to work with us in providing, through joint funding, a heritage architect who will give advice about updating properties and preserving heritage buildings and appropriate streetscape and heritage areas.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Is it still the Government's intention that the Wilpena project must begin on 1 November for it to receive the financial support that was promised by the Government? Has the developer put in place all the necessary financial arrangements? Are any Government financial guarantees involved?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I believe that I have already answered that question. The honourable member for Coles asked me that question, and I believe that I have already answered it.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I was at the back, and it was not answered appropriately.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I believe that I have already answered that question. If the Committee wishes me to take the time to answer it again, so be it.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I shall consider that answer at a later stage.

I now refer to the MFP proposal as it is referred to on page 307. What specific advice have the police and management branch of the department given to the Minister in regard to residential development at the Gillman site?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the honourable member for that question. I am not sure whether we have an officer here from the Pollution Management Branch. I shall ask the Director-General to make a comment. We can provide any further detailed information for the honourable member and make sure that it is recorded in *Hansard* before 28 September.

**Dr McPHAIL:** The department is obviously already involved in the MFP project and would expect to be even more heavily involved as progress occurs. At this stage the department has been involved in discussions on various matters relating to the site and to environmental issues that would be important in the management of it. None of our activities has gone beyond participating in general discussions. Naturally enough, in due course we would expect to become involved in formal environmental assessment, but at this stage we have simply been participating in discussions within Government on the subject.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Supplementary to that, has the Minister sought specific advice from the Waste Management Branch in regard to the advisability of residential development occurring on the Gillman site?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The department has been involved in working with other Government agencies and with the person within Government who has had the responsibility for bringing all this relevant information together. I have clearly indicated from the outset that, as the Minister for Environment and Planning, I am keen to ensure that any proposals for the Gillman area—of course this is the MFP to which we are referring—will ensure that the area is cleaned up. None of us can be proud of that area. It has suffered enormous degradation. The Government has made clear from the outset that, before any work was commenced, there would be a thorough assessment of the requirements in terms of rehabilitating that environment and that that would be undertaken as a part of the successful procedure of the MFP. That is absolutely appropriate.

All my departments, including the Engineering and Water Supply Department, have been involved in inter-Government agency discussions. I have certainly made sure that that has happened. I believe that I have carried out my responsibility in working with my Cabinet colleagues. The environmental assessments are proceeding.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I want to ask the Minister a question regarding the interim supplementary development plan relating to the Mount Lofty Ranges, which is, in turn, related to the Mount Lofty Ranges review. I understand that a meeting took place last Wednesday between members of local government and officers of the Minister's department to discuss an interim SDP. I understand that members of local government were advised at that stage that a complete SDP was not at that time available.

I am now led to believe that a complete SDP, including prohibitions, was available at that time. I am also advised that the interim SDP has been placed on the agenda of the next meeting of ACOP, with the advice that it is likely that the interim SDP will have been gazetted prior to its being dealt with by ACOP. When was the complete SDP first available? Was it available before last Wednesday and, if so, why was it not made available to the councils at that time?

When is it anticipated that the matter will now be gazetted? It is being suggested that it relates to a development in the Hills, that cannot be connected to a sewer or to an appropriate CED scheme. Will it also include situations where there is further development, such as additions to houses, etc., rather than freezing any development at all?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask the Director-General of the department, who has the carriage of the Mount Lofty Ranges review at Government level, to answer some of those questions. I do not intend to canvass some of the answers, as the honourable member wants, as it would be quite irresponsible. The honourable member, as the shadow spokesperson for the environment, would, I am sure, see the wisdom in that. I will ask Dr McPhail to say when the completed SDP was available.

**Dr McPhail:** First, there was not a complete SDP available, and a final SDP is only now in the process of being completed following the various comments—albeit unofficial—that were received from a number of councils. The SDP that was provided to councils on that day incorporated all the major principles that were behind the intention of the interim SDP.

To answer some of the more detailed questions asked by the honourable member, the intention of the SDP basically is that all development outside sewered townships will be prohibited. However, that prohibition does not extend to any alterations or additions to existing dwellings, to farm buildings (except massive farm buildings), or to farming or horticultural activity. The purpose of the SDP was to provide a holding situation while the very extensive SDP which has been recommended by the final report of the Mount Lofty review is drawn up and put in place.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I appreciate what the Director-General has said, but I have had the opportunity to look at the SDP that was placed before local government, and it is very much an incomplete document. When councils have been given only one week to consult on this and have now been advised that the opportunity was there for them to see the whole document, including the prohibitions, I believe that local councils have been sold a pup on this issue.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I reject that comment by the honourable member. It seems to me that the honourable

member is adopting a position of having a bit each way. In terms of the whole aim of this exercise, I remind the honourable member of questions he has continually raised in the Parliament with respect to the Mount Lofty Ranges review. We are talking about a three-year consultation program—

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Exactly—with the 22 councils involved. Those 22 councils were all invited to attend a meeting with senior officers. In fact, a senior officer of the department briefed those councils last Wednesday. For the honourable member to suggest that the local councils which have been involved for three years in developing this strategy have not been given adequate time to consult is an insult to people's intelligence and an insult to the people of this State. The honourable member is obviously aware of the sensitivity of this issue, and so gung ho was he about it that he and a number of colleagues raised the matter in the Parliament. The honourable member would also be aware that, as a result of his and other people's raising this matter publicly, there has been a flood of development applications in a number of hills council areas. I ask this Committee whether that is responsible action to be taken by a member who believes in the integrity and preservation of one of the most sensitive areas of this State, an area that is primarily responsible for the water catchment for one million people in the City of Adelaide.

My officers, and I as Minister, have behaved impeccably and with responsibility in terms of ensuring the long-term preservation of the very sensitive Mount Lofty Ranges area. The honourable member, having been a Minister for Planning, fully understands the options. One option is a section 50—is that what the honourable member is suggesting the Government should do? Is he suggesting that we just ride roughshod over the councils and not have any period of consultation, albeit a short period?

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am very aware of the implications of the discussion that took place with local government.

I also believe that the honourable member is making assumptions about something that has not happened and is making assumptions about the way in which action should be taken by this Government and the sensitive way in which it would be implemented. I think the honourable member is trying to scare and instil fear into his constituents and the residents covered by the Mount Lofty Ranges review. He has been successful, and he will have to live with that.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Some months ago I had the opportunity to journey to Wilpena to look around without being announced and to make up my own mind about what Wilpena and the proposed Ophix development are all about. I must say that I was suitably impressed by the reception I received from the National Parks and Wildlife people up there, who were the only people who knew I was coming, as I had no intention of advising anyone else. I wanted to make up my own mind. As the Minister well knows, I am reasonably headstrong on a number of issues, and I wanted to determine for myself whether or not the Government was correct in what it was doing, which leads me to the question I wanted to ask the Minister. Can the Minister say whether the Wilpena resort proposals have taken into account the experience of and the lessons learnt from the development at Yulara resort at Uluru National Park?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. As he says, he asks his own questions and he certainly is, in the best meaning of the phrase, his own man. I thank him for this, because it

seems to me that any Government that does not learn from the lessons of another similar situation would be foolish indeed. I can answer the honourable member by saying that I believe that what we are doing at Wilpena has a number of similarities. We will do a number of things differently and some things we will do better. To answer the question quite briefly, yes, we have learnt from the things they have done well and we have learnt from some of the things that, as South Australians, we can do better.

In regard to specific similarities, outdated facilities in a very sensitive area, namely, Uluru, were moved from the base of Ayers Rock, so there are similarities. We are moving our facilities three kilometres into a much better area in terms of management and control.

I refer to the rehabilitation of degraded areas. Again, I think we can learn from what was done at Uluru and Yulara. They have certainly restored and rehabilitated the degraded areas, and that is the intention of this proposal. With respect to better park management, we can learn and have learnt from that, and we will have better park management as a result of this proposal being implemented successfully.

The other aspect is to have better management of visitors, including an interpretive centre. Again, I think we can learn from the situation at Ayers Rock; we can have the sort of sensitive interpretive centre that they have there. In terms of involvement of local communities, including the Aboriginal people, when I was the Chair of the Industries Development Committee, we visited Ayers Rock, stayed at Yulara and visited the Uluru National Park. I was extremely impressed by the involvement of the local Aboriginal communities, and I believe that has proved a model for the way in which Aboriginal people have been consulted from the very beginning. In fact, that consultation will continue and will lead to a very strong involvement of the Aboriginal people in the proposal for Wilpena.

As for the importance of having environmentally sound infrastructure, again, state-of-the-art infrastructure was developed at Uluru. As the Industries Development Committee, we had the opportunity to look at the sewerage system, the electricity generation system, the reverse system and the use of energy in the most efficient and effective way. It is an example for any other outback development that might ever be considered in this country, in terms of starting from that point.

With respect to major economic benefits, the Northern Territory Government recognised the major economic benefits for this development; the removal of the degraded facilities and taking them some way from the Rock, and, at the same time, recognising that it is a vitally important impetus to the economic development of the Northern Territory. One can say exactly the same thing about the facilities and the development in the Flinders Ranges. We have made clear what we will not do in terms of following the Yulara Uluru model: there will not be massive Government investment. The Northern Territory Government made a conscious decision, and its Department of Conservation actually oversaw the development in the Northern Territory; there was a significant and substantial Government investment.

In South Australia we have been fortunate enough to have attracted private investment so, in a sense, we will not be following that aspect of the model. The Opposition has criticised that on numerous occasions. To that extent, we have removed that negative. The other aspect is that, with the development at Wilpena, as Mr Leaver said earlier, there will be control over the final size of that development. It cannot just grow like Topsy. It is closely controlled because

of the leasing arrangements and because it comes under the auspices of the National Parks and Wildlife Act and that branch of the department.

We have picked up the very best things from the Yulara Uluru development and tailored those to the South Australian conditions. At the same time, we have said that we do not choose to go down the same path of having massive Government investments and the actual final decision on the control of the size of the development in the hands of the private developer. I point out to the honourable member that I was a little concerned on Friday when I was asked to be on the media to discuss this matter with a number of other people. I was on 5UV early in the morning and debated with Jacquie Gillen, who suggested to me that, if the Government was serious about Wilpena, it should adopt the Uluru and Yulara model. She asked, 'Why are you not doing it the same way as the Northern Territory Government has just undertaken its development?'

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It is interesting that the member for Coles, who interjects, was actually on 5AA later in the morning suggesting that that was the very worst thing to do and that we were somehow copying that development. It seemed to me quite amazing that, on the one hand, one of the opponents was saying that this was the model to adopt and, on the other hand, one of the opponents was saying, 'Whatever you do, do not—'

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Those were the exact words, and if you want to look at the copy of the transcripts of both those interviews—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the Minister not to reply to interjections.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am sorry; I will not do it again. The answer to the question is important, because this matter has been raised by a number of members on the Committee. I believe that what we have done is take the most environmentally sound and sensitive action that could have been taken to remove what has been in a national park since the 1940s and which has caused enormous degradation, by anyone's standards, to a very sensitive area, namely, the mouth of Wilpena Pound.

The removal of those facilities three kilometres into what was a disused pastoral property will ensure, through an EIS and an assessment of it, that we will have probably one of the best environmentally sound developments, which will at the same time promote the tourism industry and the economy of this State; I am very happy to debate anywhere with anybody the facts of the matter. It just gets a little confusing when not only the ground keeps changing but also people keep contradicting each other and themselves. It really does not do the debate for this State any good at all, and I thank the honourable member for this question.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I was suitably impressed by the new location at Wilpena and I believe I asked a number of pertinent questions. I am reasonably satisfied with the response I received when at Wilpena, but I will look also at the Minister's response and consider that at a later date. As the Minister suggests, it is a controversial issue, and I am pleased to hear her say that she is prepared to debate this matter with anyone at any time. It is a project that I do support.

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr A.A. Wynne, Senior Engineer, Coastal Management Branch.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Referring to page 112 of the Estimates of Payments, what funds will be made available to the Coast Protection Board, and specifically that area which is subject

to dunal erosion between Third Avenue and Mirani Court at Semaphore Park? As the Minister would know, I am very concerned about this matter. There have been a number of meetings down there and I have received much correspondence from concerned constituents that the incursion of the sea is within 22 metres of their properties. I understand that the Coast Protection Board will look at this issue if that incursion by the sea creeps to within 20 metres. Justifiably so, my constituents have expressed concern that the biggest investment in their life—their house—could be under threat from the sea, and they have asked me to raise questions with the Minister as to what guarantees the Government will give to protect that investment.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I appreciate the member's concern for this matter of coastal protection. When I first became the Minister, I realised how deeply committed he was to his constituents and the protection of the sand dunes, and the whole issue of coastal protection. I remind the honourable member that the major sand replenishment programs which last year were targeted at North Glenelg and Somerton were funded to the tune of \$1.6 million in 1988-89 and \$2.53 million in 1989-90. This year we have allocated \$1.4 million for the total metropolitan area sand replenishment. My departmental officer will provide the specific answer to the honourable member's question shortly.

There are a number of areas along the metropolitan coastline which require continuous monitoring and work in terms of sand replenishment. In fact, I had an on-site meeting with the member for Bright a few weeks ago when we looked at a number of ways to control sand movement near the Brighton Sailing Club, the Surf Lifesaving Club and the boat launching ramp where there were conflicting uses. Some people wanted the sand there; others who wanted to launch boats did not want it there. There can be those tensions within communities in trying to balance the program. Once humans interfere with the normal sand movement, it becomes very hard to obtain a simple solution, and the department has found this to be so over the years. I believe it now more clearly understands the way that sand moves, the way groynes can be used and sand replenishment programs generally.

Last year, for the first time, we had a fairly major pilot program using barges to pump the sand instead of trucking it along the streets of Adelaide. Even though people have not rushed me or the newspapers with letters, there has been a continuous stream of appreciation expressed by those residents of the coastal council areas that we are moving away from the trucking of sand to a system of pumping sand and the use of barges. I will ask Mr Tony Wynne to answer the specific question of the honourable member.

**Mr Wynne:** The coast in question was previously stable. At the time of development, it was almost stable or accumulating slightly to the north. The erosion started at the Mirani Court flats and has subsequently moved north. A study conducted by the department last year using aerial photographs and measuring beach profiles has established a wave of erosion moving north along that coast progressing from Mirani Court at about 40 metres a year. It is obviously of concern because it is fairly close to houses.

The strategy agreed with the Woodville council is to avoid going in with rock protection, which is usually damaging and is to be avoided where possible, and not to do anything unless erosion reaches within 20 metres of the houses. It has just made that 20 metre mark since the member's last advice, and we anticipate a letter from the council asking to arrange for some beach replenishment. The strategy will be minimal beach replenishment to hold the 20 metre buffer and more or less watch this wave go past without putting



in a lot of money unnecessarily or using rocks. We anticipate that the wave will diffuse and die out in the larger bulk of sand at Semaphore when it moves north.

**Mr HAMILTON:** As a supplementary question, I have concerns about what is anticipated. I will monitor very closely the impact this may have on this area. What is the timetable in which this monitoring will take place? Will it be between now and March, for instance? If it is found that it does not match up with the anticipated impact of that wave moving down, what action will be taken by the Government and the Coast Protection Board to address the very real concerns of my constituents?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask Mr Wynne to respond.

**Mr Wynne:** The measuring of beach profiles and the monitoring of markers on the beach is continuous. It seems likely, although it is yet to be discussed in detail and agreed with the Woodville council, that small beach replenishment will proceed within the next few months. It has yet to be decided whether that replenishment will be brought in by truck (it is obviously too small to be dredged) or whether it will be moved by scraper along the beach.

**Mr HAMILTON:** What action will be taken under the Green Street program and how will information on urban consolidation be conveyed to local government authorities? Many people, not just those in the local government arena but those in the local community, are very interested in this concept.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** When talking about the Green Street program, it is vital that we move forward with this whole area. The promotion of small lot housing can be best exemplified in the development being undertaken at the old Rowley Park Speedway site. It is called the new Brompton housing exposition site. We have received money as a result of the Federal Government's calling together the Premiers some time ago to look at where we could try to reduce the costs of housing to people in cities. They looked at this whole urban consolidation program. As Minister of Planning, I received some funding through that program, and part of the funding has gone to this Brompton proposal.

There was also a Woodcroft demonstration estate and a number of other developments looking at the latest in terms of medium density mixed housing and architectural styles. In other words, the kind of housing that many sections of the community are requiring. It gets away from just the traditional quarter acre block with the traditional three bedroom house on it. Information has been provided to developers about things such as super lots in the fringe development and in-fill situations. The provision of funding from the Federal Government is of course an incentive for councils to undertake reviews of their residential regulations.

I do not have to remind members, particularly Opposition members that, while many councils support urban consolidation and a range of housing mixes, when it actually comes to reviewing the regulations that govern their decisions in this area, there are problems. We have tried to target some of these councils with Federal funds to ensure that they are able to look carefully at their own regulations to see whether their regulations are preventing this whole move. The distribution of Green Street literature to all councils, both metropolitan and country, and discussions with planners, engineers and elected members are taking place and will continue to take place. There is also liaison with tertiary institutions concerned with courses in planning, architecture, urban geography, demography for incorporation of Green Street concepts in course material.

It is one thing to talk about having a Green Street concept, but it is another thing to have people properly trained and

able to implement the principles of having a Green Street approach to development in the future in South Australia. We really have to look at this area across the board, from the education and training of people involved in tertiary institutions through to the decision making at local government and State Government level. We are moving forward, sometimes not quite as quickly as I would like but, nevertheless, there is a great deal of working with local government authorities and there is a great deal of support from local government authorities in this area.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I refer to page 113 of the Estimates of Payments and programs 7 and 8 concerning pollution management and planning. My question is about the multifunction polis. In listening to Dr McPhail's reply to an earlier question from the member for Heysen, I understood him to say that the department had only been participating in discussions rather than in specific investigations. Did I hear him correctly? Perhaps I did not take up the full import of his answer. In answer to a Question on Notice from the member for Adelaide, responded to in *Hansard* on 4 September, the Minister identified the environmental and pollution issues that had been identified and studied to date on the Gillman site, as follows:

- soil and groundwater;
- stormwater quality;
- river estuary environment;
- geotechnical and hydrological aspects;
- social planning;
- land use and development;
- hazard and risk identification.

Have those issues been studied specifically by the department on behalf of the Government? If so, are the reports of those studies available, or is that question alluding to the fact that general reports are available? If they are, was the Minister referring to the report of the Department of Mines and Energy of August 1989, which identified the Gillman site as having sediments that are saturated with sands loose and consolidated, with a capacity for large-scale groundwater movement? Is she identifying Adelaide University's geology site report, which identifies massive contamination, the South Australian Waste Management Commission's 1982 report, which also identifies massive contamination and the Adelaide City Council report 1986, which also identifies massive contamination?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** There are a number of questions implied in the honourable member's question. First, it refers to Dr McPhail's answer to an earlier question about whether we are involved in a hands-on way the identification and investigation through a number of branches of the department. That also includes planning as well as pollution management and a whole range of other areas. Also, the Mean Sea Level Committee, which comes under my control, would be involved. He then referred to an answer I had given in writing, referring to a number of studies that have been undertaken. I will ask the Director-General to respond.

**Dr McPhail:** The situation in respect of the MFP or the Gillman site since the announcement by the Government of its interest in the project is that all the studies that are taking place at the moment are being conducted by the MFP unit in relation to that site. The member will recall, however, that there was an earlier discussion about the Gillman site concerning its potential for residential development. That discussion took place prior to any knowledge of the MFP project. The department was not the generator of the studies involved at that stage, but it was involved in those studies that took place then. They were done specifically by consultants. I understand that that information is being held by the MFP team and that they are the people who have all the detail in relation to that site.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** That raises some interesting and, in fact, amazing ramifications for the Government. If the Government's chief administrative agent for dealing with both planning and pollution is not participating in these studies but, in fact, a team under the Premier's office is participating, it would seem that there is an enormous amount of duplication going on in the Government. Can the Minister clarify who is doing these studies? Are they all going out to consultants? Is there no participation by her department in the assessing of consultants' reports? Is all that assessment to be done by the MFP? Is her department, which is the Government agency with the statutory responsibility, to play any part in this?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I do not believe that there is a great duplication—quite the contrary. The fact that the MFP project team is driving the whole MFP makes sense. Instead of having a plethora of departments duplicating each other, the whole idea of establishing an MFP project team was to ensure that we maximised in the most efficient and effective way the resources of Government. At the same time, where we need to have external expertise involved, that will happen. My department is involved in the planning that goes into the studies that are proposed. It is vitally important that the department has an input in planning what sort of studies need to be undertaken, where they need to be undertaken, and so on. I do not see any great problem or contradiction. Is the honourable member suggesting that my department should be running the whole MFP?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It could be involved.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The department is involved and that is the point I have just made.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Interjections are out of order. The Minister should only answer questions that are directed through the Chair.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** There are two aspects of my answer that I want to highlight. The department provides specific advice to the MFP project team on what particular areas which relate to the environment should be studied in terms of having further thorough in-department environmental studies into a number of issues.

At the end of the day I remind members that it is my department and sections of my department that will be assessing the results of those consultancies and assessments. Therefore, it seems absolutely appropriate. Is the honourable member suggesting that we increase the size of the department manifold, to then go out and specifically conduct each and every investigation personally, at the same time that she is asking what kind of productivity we have offered to the Treasury in terms of reducing the size of the department? The Opposition cannot have it both ways. What we are doing is having a direct input. I will repeat that just in case the member for Heysen—who did not ask the question but who seems hell bent on interjecting—wants to hear it again.

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I have made very clear publicly on a number of occasions how important the Government believes the environmental question is for the Gillman land. I repeat: there is specific information, specific advice and specific input being made by officers of my department with respect to the planning for follow-up studies. The honourable member has referred to some base-line studies that have already been conducted. Anyone with any kind of intelligence in relation to moving this forward would say, 'Let us make the base-line studies and clearly identify which areas will require further quantification and in-depth studies.'

The department is involved with the MFP team in identifying and doing that. Secondly, the department will then be responsible for assessing the studies when they are carried out. However, at this stage, the department will not be carrying out all of the studies itself. Surely the Opposition is not suggesting that the department should carry out every single environmental study. However, of course, the department will be a key player in all of this and it will have an important role. I find it quite amazing that the Opposition would be suggesting anything else.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Has your department been involved already?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Well, it has.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Heysen is lead questioner in this Estimates Committee and, just prior to this line of questioning, when I was going to give him the call, he offered it to the member for Coles. I would expect the member for Heysen to wait patiently until the member for Coles has finished her line of questioning. After I have offered questions to members on the Government side, he can go for his life and perhaps ask the questions that he is so keen to ask as interjections while the Minister is attempting to answer questions put by the member for Coles. I do not think that that is too much to ask.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I would like to clarify a point which I think may well—if members are genuinely looking for information—set the record straight. The Premier has actual responsibility for the MFP. He has made very clear on a number of occasions, in fact even when South Australia became the likely choice for the MFP, that the project would proceed only if all of the pre-feasibility studies showed that it was possible for that to happen. One of the fundamental things that has to be proved in the pre-feasibility studies is the environmental clean-up issue. In other words, can we clean up the environmental issues? In answer to a question from Mr Lucas, I said that I believed that these issues will and can be addressed and I hold to that view.

However, if it is proved to the contrary then, quite obviously, it has been made very clear by the Premier that this project will not proceed irrespective of all feasibility studies showing that we can clean up the environment. It is imperative in my view that we clean up the environment whether or not we have an MFP. The Director-General referred to that when Gillman was being identified. This issue has gone back some time when Gillman was being identified as, perhaps, a housing estate, and a lot of work began at that point to try to ascertain what would be required to ensure that the environmental degradation of past generations was rectified and that has not changed.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I take it from the Minister's answer and the answer from her Director-General that the studies referred to in answer to the Question on Notice from the member for Adelaide (*Hansard*, 4 September) are not in any way to do with the MFP; they are to do with the Gillman site for some former requirement of the Government. That is what I understood Dr McPhail to say. I want to be certain that my understanding is correct because this is quite important.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It is very interesting that the honourable member says that this is quite important. Obviously she does not want the answer that we are giving. That is, that the Government has made a public commitment that before any MFP or, indeed, before the Gillman project was to proceed the environmental issues must not only be identified—they must be addressed and rectified. So, if the honourable member wants to split hairs about whether these studies refer to that and the department is not involved or it is involved, I will continue to give the

honourable member the answer that I have given: the Government has given a commitment to the community of this State that everything that is required in terms of an environmental clean-up will be undertaken. If we have to conduct a number of other feasibility studies to ensure that that happens and take a number of other actions to implement the feasibility studies then that is what will happen.

I would have thought the honourable member might welcome the fact that the MFP has been a chosen project for the site, in the sense that it gives us quite a deal of financial input in terms of being able to move forward by years the clean-up of the whole Gillman area. I do not know whether the Opposition thought that the Government would have received the enormous amount of capital to proceed with the clean-up without any kind of development on the site at all. However, it seems to me that the Opposition does not care about those factors; all it wants to do is try to put down projects for South Australia and try to make issues where there are no issues. I am not in any way contradicting the honourable member in relation to the end results of Gillman and its clean-up.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Mr Chairman, I think that I have one more question.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have three questions noted, but I will classify this question as one question. In relation to supplementary questions members have to be very clear that I have been fairly flexible and I intend to continue being flexible. However, I ask all members of the Committee to be very considerate. There are other members wishing to ask questions and they should not use the supplementary system in order to ask more questions than is fair.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The Minister is unduly defensive. I asked a perfectly simple question and was hoping for a 'Yes' or a 'No' answer; instead, I got a debate. In answer to a question from the member for Adelaide, the Minister said:

Results of studies to date indicate that none of the issues identified above [that is, the issues referred to previously] is either too difficult or too costly to be successfully resolved.

Now, the combined report of the Waste Management Commission, the Adelaide City Council and the Geology Department of the University of Adelaide, identify massive problems that, according to a lecturer from Flinders University (Dr Joseph Wayne-Smith) indicate that there is only one main option, namely, that of removing contaminated soil, and digging up and moving away the Wingfield dump *en masse* to some safe location. There are astronomical problems and costs involved in doing that. The Minister herself, in her answer two minutes ago, said that enormous amounts of capital will be required. How does she reconcile her answer two minutes ago, the opinions of those earlier reports and the answer to Dr Armitage's question that none of the issues identified is too difficult or too costly to resolve?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The report from which the honourable member has quoted is one person's opinion about the way in which the solution will be looked at. Obviously, the MFP project team will look at a number of views on the way in which we will proceed in terms of the clean-up. Does one just take one person's view—

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is fine, and that might be the ultimate solution at the end of the day, but we have not completed the whole pre-feasibility study in terms of identification of the exact methods by which the whole thing will be cleaned up. In my answer to the written question from the member for Adelaide, I suggested that, at this stage and with the information we had, none of the problems is too large to be seen as insurmountable or would be of such

enormous cost that it would prohibit the matter's proceeding. I have made very clear at all stages that we are still continuing to ensure that the feasibility study will prove up that very point. It seems to me that I can only provide the answers to written questions of members as I have that information, and that was the information that was provided to me by my department at the time. Therefore, that information is relevant. Let us look at the impossible situation where, for example, at some stage huge amounts of uranium had been buried there *en masse* and nobody knew about it.

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am told so, but again that has not been proved in terms of—

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Yes, in terms of quantities. Some people have made rather large exaggerations and I have asked that those things be investigated. The situation is that, if something like that were found, and it were established that it had so contaminated the whole area, we would have to look again at the cost of rehabilitation. But do I not answer a question in the House of Assembly because we have not finished the whole feasibility study, or do I answer the question on notice with the information that is available to me at the time and answer it as honestly and openly as I possibly can? That is exactly what I have done.

I have clearly put on the public record not only for this Estimates Committee but, more importantly, also for the residents of some of my colleagues who have their constituencies around that area, that it is vitally important that we do move forward with the rehabilitation and a clean-up program. We will be prepared to take on board the views, opinions, reports, research and the feasibility studies of any interested body, organisation or institution. They will be part of the assessment that will be made by the MFP project team, into which my department will have a direct input. I do not think that I can be more open or more honest in terms of my answer.

**Mr McKEE:** I refer to page 114 of the Estimates of Payments and, in particular, program 11, State heritage conservation. I approach this question with some personal interest, because I have a very active involvement in sailing. When I sail, I try not to be the essence of the question that I am about to ask. What action has been taken to survey historic shipwrecks in South Australian waters and what actions will be undertaken by the Government to make information on these shipwrecks available to the general public?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am aware of the honourable member's seafaring interests. The Commonwealth Government has allocated funds from the historic shipwrecks program to the State Heritage Branch to carry out this survey. This is the second survey in a series of three regional surveys.

The first survey was along the south-eastern coast and this will be published shortly but, in terms of current action, the survey will commence in January of this coming year, 1991, with the employment of a suitably qualified person. Although applications have been called, it was decided to wait for a graduate from the Postgraduate Diploma of Maritime Archaeology at the Curtin University. This person is graduating in December 1990, so it seemed appropriate to wait until we had the best expertise available and someone who could carry out that survey and who obviously had studied this for some time.

The survey will involve historical documentation and shipwreck inspections of about 70 different shipwrecks. It

is estimated to be completed by the end of 1991. I am sure that the honourable member will await with interest the result of this survey, because so much of our cultural history is tied up with the sea and so much is related to shipwrecks. We can learn so much from the identification of those shipwrecks and often from surveying what is contained within the shipwreck. I shall ensure that we forward a copy of that report to the honourable member as soon as it is completed.

**Mr McKEE:** Again referring to page 114 and State heritage conservation, what is the purpose of the new historic conservation zones now being explored by some councils and what can councils hope to gain by declaring such zones?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** There is a very important purpose to the new historic conservation zones. The Government believes it is so important that we have provided the opportunity for councils to declare historic conservation zones within the development plan as a means of facilitating the retention of the amenity and historic character of the areas. Within these zones development is defined as including the demolition of buildings and structures as well as the alteration of the external appearance of places. So, the external facades, the type of fences, etc., are very important.

I want to make very clear that these zones do not replace the designation of places as heritage items or State heritage areas under the South Australian Heritage Act 1978 but, rather, they broaden the controls which generally apply to the community's heritage. Historic conservation zones are administered entirely by local councils, with no involvement from the State Government. The first historic conservation zones have been designated in Kensington and Norwood and implemented under the provisions of section 43 of the Planning Act 1982.

It seems to me that as a community this is a very important direction we should take, because I think we will see that there are areas—and we can call them streetscapes or conservation heritage zones—which are vitally important to preserve in total as opposed to preserving a particular building but there must be authority to preserve what is either side of that building or to preserve the streetscape as such.

If I might just be a little political for a moment, I think the whole question of St Paul's raised this whole issue of when something may not necessarily be designated to be absolutely pure in terms of its heritage qualifications, if you like, but where the community as a whole believes it is very important for the ambience of the area and concept of the precinct that buildings, even facades, fences and other forms of our heritage, be retained. It seems important to me that local government should have the opportunity to be able to designate these particular historic zones. In fact, a number of councils are now moving to do that and I welcome that.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** In relation to sand replenishment, in 1988-89 considerable concern was expressed regarding the taking of sand from Torrens Island in order to place it at Glenelg North next to the treatment works. At that time we were told that the purpose was to replenish northern beaches.

Was that sand to replenish the beaches? Is the Government to continue carting sand from Torrens Island—similar to what happened in 1989—to Glenelg North? Was it for some other purpose?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am trying to depend on my memory. Perhaps it is not appropriate or fair to the honourable member for me to do that. I shall ask Mr Tony Wynne to answer the honourable member. If he does not have the detail, we shall be pleased to provide it to the honourable member as soon as possible.

**Dr Wynne:** The sand from Torrens Island was for beach replenishment purposes. It is not proposed to use any more sand from Torrens Island. Most of the resource was used and the remaining sand is less accessible and more difficult to rehabilitate.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Some of that sand may have been used for some other purpose, but it would have been a very small amount. We can certainly ascertain that. Unless the honourable member knows the answer in advance—

**Mr WOTTON:** I am advised that at that time there was an extensive build up of sand at Glenelg North, but the reason that the sand was taken was not for beach replenishment, although it was referred to as such in the House on another occasion. It was brought in for a man-made reclamation area for the then proposed Marineland development.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It seems that the honourable member believed that he knew the answer before he asked the question. I thought that he was asking a genuine question—that is fine; I shall continue to answer. I shall have to take the question on notice. There has certainly been no attempt by me or by the department to create any kind of misinformation. The officer from the department has answered the honourable member's initial question. Perhaps if the honourable member had asked that question in the way in which he asked his second question we could have simply taken the question on notice. I understand that Torrens Island sand is no longer being used. That was part of the original question.

**Mr WOTTON:** I am trying to determine why it was placed there in the first place.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Why did you not ask that?

**Mr WOTTON:** That is the first question that I asked.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Would the Minister and the honourable member for Heysen let the Committee share some time with them? I appreciate that their asides may have made me redundant.

**Mr WOTTON:** My reason for asking was that a previous question was asked of the Minister in another place to determine the purpose of that sand being distributed. We were advised at that stage that it was for sand replenishment works. I have since been advised that that was not the purpose and that it was being used to build up sand for the development to which I have referred. I am just trying to ascertain whether that is the case.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As far as I am aware, that has not happened. In the past, small quantities of sand were used at Glenelg North to try to build a buffer. It was determined that large quantities of sand would be dumped in that area to try to stabilise the whole area.

I do not profess to be an expert in sand management. I have met a lot of people who profess to be experts, but I rely on information from Rob Tucker, who unfortunately cannot be at the Estimates Committee today. He certainly clearly understands much more about sand movement, the amounts that are needed, whether one can trial different things, and how long trials must proceed. I am informed that the large quantities of sand at Glenelg North last year were to try to establish some stability in that area, and that it was not used for the purposes to which the honourable member referred. We can have that checked, Mr Chairman. Mr Wynne may wish to add something further to clarify the matter.

**Mr Wynne:** The amount of sand at Glenelg North affects what happens at West Beach because there is a sea wall. If there is no sand in front of the sea wall there is more erosion of the West Beach dunes, which has been an ongoing problem. There has been steady erosion of those dunes. By

replenishing at Glenelg North we simultaneously slow or stop erosion of the West Beach dunes. There was a combined project to protect Glenelg North and to slow erosion of the dunes at the same time.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is a very worthy thing to do. Questions have continually been raised in the community and in Parliament about the protection of sand dunes. The coastal protection section of the department carries out its duties in a most responsible manner.

**Mr WOTTON:** I shall refer to the previous question later. I now refer to matters of concern that have been brought forward by the Eighth Street Action Group at Bowden.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Could the honourable member refer to a particular line?

**Mr WOTTON:** It comes under pollution control. Is the Minister able to say which department or agency has accepted responsibility for the management of the site that has caused so much concern in that area? I ask that question because I realise that there has been involvement on the part of the Department of Environment and Planning, the Department of Lands, the South Australian Housing Trust, and so on. I also wonder whether the Minister is able to say why action was not taken earlier to control dust and prevent public access to the site when other known contaminated sites are fenced or grassed. Also, why have no rehabilitation solutions been proposed until this time?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** We shall start with the first part; there are three separate questions. The first question is about who now has responsibility for that site? I indicated that—I am trying to remember where it was; I do not know whether it was in Parliament—it is proper for me, as Minister for Environment and Planning, now to take responsibility for that site.

The site had been under the control of the Housing Trust because a small committee had been established and was chaired by an officer of the Housing Trust. However (and I have said this quite publicly and quite openly), we must get a system in place by which a Government department has responsibility not just for Eighth Street but for handling the issue of contaminated land sites when there is a change in land use from industrial to residential. I have made that very clear.

It seemed most appropriate for me to put my hand up. I do not really need any extra responsibilities, as my colleagues will attest. It seemed sensible because I am Minister of Lands, and it is through our lands information system that we can most carefully identify for future information sites that are contaminated.

I am also Minister of Water Resources. One of the things that we shall do in ascertaining where trade waste is occurring is have officers of the E&WS Department visiting a range of industrial sites to ascertain what kind of waste is being put into sewers, what kind of waste is being generated, and so on. The E&WS Department will feed that information into a proper data bank. There are already 1 500 sites in the data bank, and we are already using section 90 of the land information system to ensure that people clearly know what has happened on sites.

I am not suggesting that we shall be able to identify every site. If people have illegally dumped, nobody can be asked to do that unless we test every piece of land in South Australia. The enormity of that would be almost ludicrous. I am prepared to accept that, and I have made that public. However, because there is, in a sense, a changeover position, the Department of Housing and Construction has fenced that site and until now has been responsible for the management of it.

The honourable member also asked why all this was not done sooner. We have gone through a process of public vilification of a competent, loyal and dedicated public servant.

I do not intend to canvass that matter here. Suffice to say that the requirements of the Health Commission were carried out. That public servant contacted a member of the Hindmarsh Development Committee who was stationed in the Hindmarsh council—that person was employed by the Hindmarsh council but was actually an officer on the Hindmarsh Development Committee—and informed him that he had received information from the Health Commission that the site needed to be watered continuously to prevent dust blowing around.

I am not in the business of putting blame on to anybody else. I have stood up publicly—I do not know how much more public I can go than the *7.30 Report*—and accepted responsibility. The council embarked on a program of watering. In so doing, the council determined that, to get its watering trucks in, it would level and compact the site to ensure that the watering was effective rather than rush in with watering trucks and hose around the place.

The council removed a couple of truckloads of soil, which is now being stored under cover at the Hindmarsh council depot.

I want to conclude by saying that we can do it better and we will do it better. We are determined to identify contaminated sites very early. In the House I have given an indication that I will be seeking to amend the appropriate legislation to ensure that, where there is a change of land use from industrial to either recreational or residential, testing must take place on the site before the change of land use can occur.

That is a precautionary measure which should be able to identify the majority of contaminated sites and ensure that those sites cannot move into private or public ownership without some clear identification of the fact that they have been contaminated and that we have moved to do something about it. We will be establishing a rehabilitation program as well as testing, after the rehabilitation program has taken place, to ensure that the rehabilitation program has been successful.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister will be aware of the conflict that is and has been occurring for some time between the Kuyani Association and the Kokatha people in regard to traditional land rights. It has been put to me that one of the major difficulties is that the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 is fundamentally flawed in that it takes no account of traditional Aboriginal tribal jurisdictions.

In fact, section 37 states that nothing in the Act prevents Aboriginal people from doing anything in relation to Aboriginal sites, objects or remains in accordance with Aboriginal tradition. This matter was raised with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in this place yesterday. Will the Minister indicate whether there is any intention to amend the legislation to take this concern into account?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** My colleague the Hon. Mike Rann and I have met with some Aboriginal representatives over this issue as well as over some issues that relate to a particular sacred object and to the whole question of sacred sites with respect to Roxby Management and how these issues can be handled sensitively in the future. I am aware that there are some problems.

I will ask Mr Ware to comment, as he is the officer in my department who is charged with the responsibility of actually organising some consultation. I have no intention at this point of amending the Act, as that is a bit premature. I asked Mr Ware whether he would initiate some consul-

tation and discussion on a number of the issues that had been raised by the deputation which came to see me and Mr Rann. The short answer is 'No', I do not intend to amend the legislation at this stage, as it would be pre-empting what might come out of the consultations and what might be put forward as the best solution.

I believe it is vitally important for Aboriginal people themselves to come up with solutions. I do not believe that it is appropriate for white people to be telling the Aboriginal communities what to do, even if the Aboriginal communities are having areas of disagreement. They have had areas of disagreement historically for thousands of years, and we must be very careful not to be seen as paternalistic and chauvinistic in terms of marching in with our white laws and imposing on Aboriginal communities something that will be shown historically to be quite inappropriate and incorrect.

In saying that, I am not prepared to rush into even talking about amending the legislation; I am doing so out of respect for Aboriginal communities and out of respect for the fact that they should be given an opportunity to solve their problems. I am aware that there has been some interference from a particular white man in that area—and I shall not name this person—who has caused great heartache and hardship for a vast number of Aboriginal people in South Australia. This causes me great concern, but I will not be manoeuvred or bulldozed into taking any action based on the advice or interference of this person. I will be using my officers—who are incredibly competent—to give me the advice as to what the Aboriginal communities themselves want to see done to resolve this matter. I will now ask Mr Ware whether he would like to add to that.

**Mr Ware:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak. The Aboriginal Heritage Act is, in fact, a sites protection Act and not a land rights Act. What is happening around the Olympic Dam-Roxby Downs area is an Aboriginal land rights issue. I am not privy to the information, as the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said yesterday, but, while not passing the buck, I must say that land rights issues rest with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. Over time, we have addressed the issue of sites within the area. There will always be conflict between the different Aboriginal groups; it does not matter where you come from. It is happening in the Northern Territory as well as in South Australia. Unfortunately, most of the conflict arises from interference by non-Aboriginal people in relation to the dollar—and the dollar carries a lot of weight.

Unfortunately, mining has occurred around Olympic Dam, and this is where the conflict arises. It would be good if non-Aboriginal people could keep out of the conflict that is occurring, so that the Aborigines could address the issues and come to a proper answer in relation to Aboriginal tradition. Unfortunately, this will not happen, because the dollar always weighs over everything else.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I refer to the Coast Protection Board. I have noticed that the normal high tides in my area are becoming higher and higher and getting closer to some of the rather large houses along the Esplanade at Henley Beach. People are paying up to \$500 000 for houses in that area and, to my knowledge, there has been no official warning of what may happen if the tides continue to rise. I have seen a projection by the Henley High School of what might happen if the sea rises by one metre. This will put a large section of my constituency under water—which I do not look forward to. Some warning should be given to these people who are buying expensive homes along the beach-front.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Obviously, this is a really serious question. As the honourable member would know, I recently released a report on the projections of the greenhouse effect and what this will mean for planning, for development and for a whole range of environmental issues in South Australia. Some time ago I established in South Australia a Mean Sea Level Committee, chaired by an eminently qualified person and comprising a number of people in this State with expertise in measuring and predicting the effect of a mean sea level rise.

So, we have to see the escalating effect's of the greenhouse situation, because the greenhouse effect has been happening for many centuries and what we are seeing now is an unprecedented escalation in the effects being caused by the production of greenhouse gases and, therefore, the heating of the earth's surface. I do not think it is possible to give an absolutely quantitative prediction at this stage about what the implications and time frame will be for the honourable member's electorate but we certainly can keep a close eye on the situation in terms of monitoring and planning for greenhouse.

In other words, we can take hard planning decisions and take them well enough in advance of possible consequences that will have a detrimental effect on people. I am not sure that the answer is as simple as saying that we just keep having sand replenishment programs because, ultimately, as a community, as a State, as a nation and as citizens of the world, we will all have to take decisions which minimise and prevent this escalation of the greenhouse effect, because no amount of sand replenishment will stop what will be a world tide.

In fact, there are predictions that some islands in the Pacific will be covered completely and will not exist at all. So, I think that what the honourable member is doing is thinking globally and acting locally, to use the phrase of our time. He is seeing the problem literally in his own garden and he is highlighting the fact that we must take collective responsibility and collective action. Those actions are enormous in terms of the type of decision making we will all have to be part of, and in terms of the changes in our collective lifestyles. However, notwithstanding that, there may well be something that the Coast Protection Board can do in the short term to answer the concerns of the member for Henley Beach, I would ask Mr Tony Wynne if he would pick up that specific aspect of the question.

**Mr Wynne:** The Coast Protection Board has given considerable attention to this over the past couple of years. It held a large seminar for coastal councils and others in 1988 and it has been firming up its policy since then. It is currently recommending acceptance of international figures of about 30 centimetres of sea-level rise by the year 2050 and about 60.7 centimetres by the year 2100. It is only a fairly small sea-level rise. It is also recommending planning policy that is yet to be worked through with the Minister and through the planning process, which will largely help to avoid future problems, but that does not address the problems of the Adelaide coast. With the small sea-level rises predicted for the near and later future, beach replenishment would seem the obvious solution for at least the next 30 to 40 years. After that it can get too costly and the strategy for the Adelaide coast may then depend on a mixture of sand replenishment and seawalls.

With regard to monitoring, we are looking at local tide gauges, but that is mainly on an international and Australia-wide basis. Eight precise tide gauges have been installed around the coast at the Australian Government's expense and we have contact with this through the Mean Sea-level



Committee. We will be watching what happens with those tide gauges. We will participate and advise in that program.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I refer to the proposed development at Patawalonga and the Glenelg proposals, and the plans I have seen so far give me some concern in relation to the proposed pollution of the Henley Beach, West Beach, Grange beaches, as a result of both the stopping of the normal sand drift and the possibility of the Patawalonga waters being piped straight out to sea. The pollution from the Patawalonga, which is a problem at the moment, will tend to pollute Henley Beach, Grange, Tennyson and West Beach. It happens now from time to time when the lock gates are open but, if we had open access at all times, this may be a problem to the beaches in my electorate, and I would be anxious that your department would be looking at this problem in the eventuality that the plans go ahead.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the honourable member for his question and, by way of background, I inform the honourable member if he is not already aware, that Cabinet has approved the fact that there will be an EIS for each of the four proposals, but that EIS will be conducted in tandem, as opposed to having four separate, separately funded and separately organised EIS proposals. The idea of this is that, because there are a number of proposals, it is seen as much more appropriate to assess the four proposals and then, once the EIS is completed, an assessment of the EIS will be made. I understand that a draft EIS will be released to the public in the next couple of months for public comment.

It would seem to me that one of the major issues, which will be addressed and which has also been fundamental in any marina development, is sand movement, as well as the other issues of pollution control. I believe that the EIS that is being prepared for each of the four developments will address these issues very clearly. The community will have an opportunity to have an input into that assessment and, at the end of the day, the EIS will be assessed, and the Government will then be asked to make a decision about the most appropriate of the proposals.

I have always said that, whatever the proposal that is successful (and it may well be that it is a composite proposal, picking up a number of the suggestions of a number of proposals; I really do not have any idea at this stage), one of the fundamental underlying issues would be that it was environmentally sound. After all, one of the major reasons for having a development is to ensure that the Patawalonga is restored and rehabilitated and that the pollution and degradation that the Patawalonga has suffered over the years can be rectified. It would seem quite irresponsible to rectify that on the one hand and, on the other, to create enormous problems in the environment somewhere else. So, as I understand it, one or two of the proponents in their initial submission of their projects talked about addressing sand drift and sand movement around the mouth of the Patawalonga.

The question of stormwater going out to sea is another matter. I made it very clear that, at the second stage in this overall program, we would look at working positively and constructively, not just with coastal councils, but with all local government in terms of the development of a proper drainage strategy so that we can control the stormwater runoff that flows out into the marine environment and causes equal if not more pollution and degradation of the seagrasses. I have made that very clear that, once we have the marine environment protection Bill in place and operating, we will move to take on the diffuse sources. That problem will, under the second stage of the Government's program, address this whole question of the marine envi-

ronment. I am not sure whether that answers all the honourable member's questions but if there is any specific issue, perhaps the Director-General might want to pick it up.

**Mr FERGUSON:** The other major problem in my electorate, and the Minister has just alluded to it, is the pollution problem of the stormwater runoff areas. I have a particular problem with the upper reaches of the Port River between Trimmer Parade and Grange Road, where there is a huge collection of rubbish, including milk cartons, plastic containers, used plastic bottles and a whole host of other rubbish. This has been a particular bone of contention for many years in my area, namely, that the stormwater runoff comes from other areas and other councils but it all finishes up in my area.

I am aware of what was said earlier with respect to deposit legislation which would probably solve about 40 per cent to 60 per cent of the problem, but it is still a big problem. Local councils have not been prepared to use their powers so far as on-the-spot fines are concerned. I know that this is a local government matter, but I am keen to see local councils use their power in this area to reach a solution for this problem in the short term.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** There are a number of issues. One is the whole question of the control of stormwater. With respect to stormwater (apart from the question of litter) we are talking, for example, about lead washed off the streets into stormwater drains, rivers and creeks. The E&WS Department will be leading a study directly involving local government to develop a strategy with respect to the issues of conservation of water and the quality of that water for Adelaide and South Australia. If we can get that water back down into the aquifers, we could then see that as a solution to some of our water needs well into the next century. I remind the Committee that the other solutions are duplicating pipelines from the Murray, towing icebergs from Antarctica, and a whole range of other options. The solution, however, might well be in our own backyard, and might be very environmentally sound in terms of that stormwater quality and quantity.

Local government has been incredibly efficient at moving the water out of its areas. I do not say that as a criticism because that has been its role and responsibility until now. The E&WS Department will be picking up that issue and showing some leadership with local government in developing a stormwater strategy and policy for the State.

The second issue of pollution within our waterways, involving plastic bags, plastic containers, milk cartons, etc. A number of things are taking place on a number of fronts. I have had meetings with some manufacturers and representatives of industry involved in producing these items. They are very keen to ensure that people do not litter. I support the honourable member and maybe the time is arriving when we will have to implement our litter laws as opposed to having them on the statute books. I think I am responsible for the litter laws, although local government has the responsibility of carrying them out.

A number of campaigns are being conducted by Kesab and by industry to ensure that young people are targeted in terms of telling them not to throw away their litter. In other words, it is not 'cool' for teenagers to litter. Hopefully, we can then remove some of this from the litter stream. We have also the recycling strategy which we are looking at presently, suggesting that deposit legislation could be used, not only to recycle products but to remove from the litter stream those beverage containers causing the problem. The Government has not made a decision on this aspect because it is important that there be full and open consultation with the community, including industry, conservation groups and

individuals. Suffice to say, a number of programs, both educational and others, are being looked at in terms of managing litter in our waste stream.

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr N.P. Newland, Deputy Director, National Parks and Wildlife Services.

Mr VENNING: My presence on this Committee illustrates that rural people do take the environment seriously. Referring to the Native Vegetation Management Act (page 84 of the Auditor-General's Report), many rural people have been refused permission to clear after they have gone through all the relevant processes. Financial deals are completed and payments are approved, but apparently no funds are left. What can they do? Many are paying 23 per cent interest on their loans, and this year many more claims will be made. What is the situation?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member has been given incorrect information in terms of funds. In this year's budget, \$10.9 million has been allocated for the program. The Government has allocated a total of \$22 million over the life of the Act in terms of implementing the program, so that would indicate to the honourable member and his constituents that the Government is very genuine about saving what remnant native vegetation is left. I am sure I do not need to remind the honourable member that we have a very small part of the original vegetation left, and of the problems that is causing to his constituents in particular and the community of South Australia in general. Not only are we concerned to ensure the preservation of what we have left, but it is important that, by allocating some \$22 million to this stage, the Government has indicated that it does not expect the rural community to single-handedly bear the responsibility of the mistakes of their forefathers and mothers in terms of clearing that vegetation. As a community we have accepted that responsibility right across the board and have been prepared to pay for the retention of that vegetation.

My department has purchased quite large tracts of vegetation from farmers who have found that it would not be viable to retain that vegetation. Where it has been determined that their properties would remain viable, they have entered into heritage agreements, as the honourable member would know, and I believe those agreements have worked extremely well. Ministers from other States have come across to look at what we are doing with our native vegetation retention, and I believe there is a great deal of support across the country for what we are doing.

It is true to say that about 93 per cent of applications to clear have been rejected, but if we look at it positively, it means we have preserved some 93 per cent of the vegetation remaining at the time of the enactment of the legislation. To highlight the honourable member's initial point about being environmentally conscious, the farming and rural communities are now working very closely with Government and the conservation movement, and things like the Ibis Awards demonstrate how environmentally conscious and sensitive the agricultural and rural communities are. We are no longer in this confrontationist situation between the kind of city dwellers who think it is important to retain vegetation and some rural people who thought you just chopped everything down. Those days are gone. There is a really important cooperative spirit. I now invite Nicholas Newland, who has to be the closest thing in this State to a living, breathing expert on this whole area, to comment further.

Mr Newland: So far in South Australia we have 462 heritage agreements covering an area of 238 000 hectares.

At the moment there are a number of other properties in the State currently subject to a valuation by the Valuer-General. It is likely that, over the next 12 months, approximately another 80 to 100 areas will come under the heritage agreement scheme. If the honourable member would like any more detail, I would be happy to provide it.

Mr VENNING: Will that \$22 million cover the expected claims this year? Will the Government definitely be able to fulfil them all?

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

Mr Newland: The \$22 million has already been expended. The amount set aside for this financial year—about \$11 million—will cover the applications outstanding at present.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer to page 306 of the Program Estimates on which there are three separate statements and I would like to ask the Minister whether they are linked in any way. Under 'Specific Targets/Objectives' for 1990-91, it states:

Amendment of National Parks and Wildlife Act.

Underneath that is the following goal:

Incorporation of identified pastoral lease areas of high conservation value into the reserved system.

Complete the investigation of Chowilla Lands and areas of the Gawler Ranges for conservation options.

There is then this statement under 'Issues/Trends':

Increased use of the regional reserve and sanctuary classifications of the legislation to achieve conservation objectives.

Which pastoral leases are proposed to be incorporated into the reserve system? Would that be done by way of an amendment to the National Parks and Wildlife Act? Is it proposed to include the Chowilla lands and the Gawler Ranges into the system?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Although I have the answer in front of me, it is probably more appropriate that Mr Newland reply to that question. I would say that where we talk about the use of increased reserves and sanctuary classifications, we are doing that in areas where we cannot get immediate access over areas that have other rights over them. Rather than just putting our hands in the air and saying that we cannot do anything about ensuring proper management and conservation of those areas, we believe that it is important to at least bring them in under the reserve category so that we have control and input into their management.

I am aware that that is a sensitive issue in some quarters but I can assure the Committee that Ministers in other States believe that we have achieved an enormous amount in terms of preserving some of the areas which already have mining rights or pastoral leases and which are quite productive. Pastoral management has shown a willingness to look at proper stocking levels and good management practices to ensure the conservation of those areas. I want to make clear that we are not talking about bringing lands into the regional reserve or sanctuary classification instead of bringing them under a national parks classification. This applies when there is not an immediate alternative. In this way we can at least get them in the system and as time passes we can move to change the classification to a national parks classification. As to which pastoral leases we will be looking at—because we continually do this—I will ask Mr Newland to respond and also deal with the other part of the question.

Mr Newland: The six blocks in the pastoral area that have been referred to are areas in the Far North of South Australia. They have been picked for two reasons. One is their high conservation significance and the second is the fact that those areas have either not been subject to grazing, or have been only lightly grazed in the past and, therefore,

their value for pastoral purposes, certainly on past use, has been relatively small. The stations are: Kalakoopah West; Kanowana; Tinga Tingana; Cannatalkaninne; Arckaringa and Scrubby Peak. As to the Chowilla lands that the member for Coles mentioned, we are currently negotiating with the pastoral company that runs the Chowilla property, that is, Robertson Chowilla Pty Limited. Those negotiations are still in the early stages and we have not yet reached any substantial agreement with the company at present.

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

---

Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous,  
\$1 270 000—Examination declared completed.

---

Works and Services—Department of Environment and Planning, \$8 300 000—Examination declared completed.

---

Engineering and Water Supply, \$21 800 000

**Chairman:**

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings

**Members:**

Mr N.K. Brindal  
The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr C.D.T. McKee  
Mr I.H. Venning  
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr A.N. Killmier, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Engineering and Water Supply Department.  
Mr P.A. Norman, Director, Technical Services.  
Mr P.G. Cooper, Director, Operations.  
Mr E.G. Haberfeld, Group Manager, Business Services.  
Mr J.W. Bennett, Business Analyst.  
Mr R.E. Mander, Capital Accountant.  
Mr G.W. Drilling, Operating Accountant.

---

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I would like to take this opportunity to advise the Committee of some of the major areas affecting the 1990-91 budget of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. As I outlined to the Committee last year, the department is undergoing a change from a traditional expenditure oriented Government department to that of a Government trading enterprise. Since July 1988 the department has accounted for all of its operations through a single deposit account, thus facilitating a much broader commercial approach to the department's financial management. Revenue collected by the department is directly applied towards departmental operations. As such, funds appropriated to the department now relate only to its capital borrowing requirements and to the grants necessary to support the non-business activities carried out by the department. The department's business plan brings together all aspects of revenue, operations and maintenance, capital

works and Government subsidy, into a single planning document.

The longer term objective of the revised financial arrangements is to enable the department to become fully self-financing, and thus have a nil draw on the State's consolidated account. For 1989-90, the budget allowed for a total impact on the State's finances of about \$53.3 million. Owing to tight budget constraint, coupled with favourable seasonal conditions, the final impact on the State's budget for 1989-90 was \$41.6 million, which was \$11.7 million less than budget.

The total budget impact comprised \$27.6 million of grants for non-business activities, \$1.5 million for borrowings, and a run down of E&WS Department cash reserves of \$12.5 million. The planned impact on the State's finances for 1990-91 is \$30.7 million, comprising \$30.3 million of grants for non-business activities and borrowings of \$400 000.

During 1989-90, in a move to further enhance the department's commercial approach, water and sewage treatment works, water tanks and water storages (other than reservoirs) were revalued, and depreciation raised on the revalued amount. Based on this revaluation, there was an additional depreciation charge of \$12.2 million brought to account in 1989-90 above the charge derived from an historical cost method, and this brought the total depreciation charge for the year to \$33.8 million. In future years, the department will be progressively extending current replacement cost valuation and depreciation calculation to the other categories of fixed assets.

Another major area affecting the department's budget during 1990-91 is the inclusion of an environmental levy applied to sewerage rates, to be used by the department to advance the implementation of a range of measures which will reduce the impact of the department's activities on the environment. The levy is expected to raise \$9.1 million during the 1990-91 full financial year and these funds will enable the commencement of a number of new initiatives, including schemes to achieve the land disposal of sludge from Glenelg and Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works, and schemes to achieve the land disposal of effluent at Mannum and Murray Bridge.

Over a five-year period, the levy is expected to raise \$47 million and a full program of environmental enhancement projects has been scheduled by the department (and this was determined through the joint executive of my three departments) to utilise these funds, to satisfy community demands for environmental improvements.

The total planned capital works program by the department for 1990-91 is \$96 million, including \$4.5 million on environmental enhancement projects as mentioned previously. I would now like to mention briefly some of the other key projects and activities.

Stage 1 of the Happy Valley water filtration plant was commissioned in November 1989. An expenditure of \$3.9 million is planned in 1990-91 on Stage 2 of the plant, which will be commissioned by December 1991. The supply of filtered water to the Aberfoyle Park, Flagstaff Hill and the Blackwood/Belair areas will commence with the commissioning of Stage 2. A further \$1.6 million is planned for works to distribute filtered water to areas south and east of the plant during 1990-91.

An amount of \$1.7 million is planned to be spent on the replacement and upgrading of the existing telemetry system covering water and sewerage operations, water resources and flood warning. This will provide, among other things, continuous monitoring of sewage pumping stations and sewage treatment facilities, thereby minimising the potential for sewage spills.

The department has the responsibility of operating and maintaining some \$2.8 billion worth of sewers and treatment plants throughout the State, and this implies a continuing responsibility for upgrading and rehabilitation. More than \$10 million will be spent in the current financial year to upgrade sewers and sewage treatment plants throughout the State. This will ensure that the Government can continue to provide a high quality service to the public for the collection, treatment and the disposal of human and industrial wastewaters, for the purpose of protecting public health and the environment.

Over \$5.5 million has been specifically allocated for major rehabilitation projects at the three major metropolitan sewage treatment plants at Bolivar, Glenelg and Port Adelaide. This is \$2 million more than was allocated last financial year. Another \$4.8 million has been planned for major rehabilitation of the sewage collection system, including trunk sewer renovations along North Terrace and along Warren Avenue in Glenelg.

The Government, through continuing participation in the Ministerial Council, its work in support of and on behalf of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, and its own water resource management activities within the State, continues to give high priority to ensuring that progress continues to be made in water quality and quantity management, and in arresting land degradation throughout the Murray Basin.

Expenditure authorised by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission for 1990-91 is \$43.2 million. South Australia's share of that expenditure through the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be \$14.2 million, the major projects being the Woolpunda salt interception scheme (\$4.2 million), further work on investigations for the proposed Waikerie salt interception scheme (\$1.7 million) and \$1.4 million on the lock cranes. South Australia's contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission's program for 1990-91 will be \$10.3 million.

Mr Chairman, that gives a very brief outline of the major activities of the Engineering and Water Supply Department as detailed in the budget papers, and I now have the pleasure of presenting those estimates to this Committee. I believe that they represent continuing real progress in improving efficiency and at the same time ensuring a high level of customer service, continued effective management of the State's water resources, and commencement of a program for environmental enhancement associated with the department's activities.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before asking the member for Heysen to commence questioning, I again remind Committee members to identify the page number of any relevant document and the line in question.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Before I ask the first question, could I seek some guidance from you, Mr Chairman, and the Minister? Earlier today, when looking at the environment and planning lines, a number of housekeeping questions were asked and it was determined at that stage that those questions should relate only to the Department of Environment and Planning. Is it possible for me to ask the Minister to take on notice the same questions in regard to the department that is currently being questioned, or is it necessary for me to go through those same questions again?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I will give a ruling on that. As far as the Chair is concerned, it would be acceptable, to put it in your words, for you to ask your usual housekeeping question. I am sure that, if the Minister cannot remember it, it will be in *Hansard*. I will remind the member for Heysen that that will be classed as a question.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am happy to do that, but I remind the honourable member that, in the break, it was

pointed out to me by the Department of Environment and Planning that it involves enormous costs in terms of time and staffing. I will provide those answers, but I will also provide to the honourable member the costs of getting those answers, because I think that, if we are going to be serious about being efficient and effective, we have to look at the true costs of providing some of this information.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** That is okay with me. The Minister has already referred to this subject, but I note on page 321 of the Program Estimates that 'the rehabilitation of Bolivar, Glenelg and Port Adelaide STW was accelerated, with \$3.5 million being spent in 1989-90'. An amount has also been given for this year. On a number of occasions the Minister has given a commitment to ensure that no further sludge is pumped into the gulf after 1993. Can the Minister provide details as to the proposed costing to ensure that that is met?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am delighted to provide the honourable member with the answer to that question. I may have inadvertently misled the honourable member in respect of the amount to be spent this year. This answer will clarify that. We certainly intend to fulfil that commitment. For the Glenelg and Port Adelaide sewage treatment and sludge disposal, it is proposed that in the 1990-91 financial year \$700 000 will be spent. That is when we shall do all the design work and that side of things. In 1991-92 the expenditure will be \$3.2 million; in 1992-93, \$5 million; and in 1993-94—of course this will be completed before the end of 1993—it will be \$900 000. The total is almost \$10 million.

That is the cost that we gave the honourable member when we debated the Bill in the House. That expenditure has been spread over that period to ensure that we can meet engineering and construction requirements. We cannot build the dedicated pipeline to take sludge from Glenelg to Port Adelaide and then to Bolivar in the twinkling of an eye. I am sure that the engineers around me would be delighted if that were the case. However, several issues are involved, not the least of which are complex engineering design and construction issues that require a time frame. We shall certainly meet the deadline by the end of 1993. The department and I are quite determined about that.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Referring to Program Estimates page 314, I note that the proposed expenditure for the collection of sewage will rise from the \$12.9 million proposed in 1989-90 to \$15 million in 1990-91. I note also that the cost of treatment and disposal of waste water, although estimated to cost \$17.4 million in 1989-90, cost only \$15.3 million and is budgeted this year at \$16 million. Why are the costs of collecting sewage rising while the costs of treatment and disposal of sewage are diminishing? Will the Minister make clear whether the treatment and disposal of waste water includes sludge and foreign matter found in sewage?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the honourable member for that question. I shall ask the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Mr Killmier to answer.

**Mr Killmier:** If I understand the question, the honourable member began by saying that the costs of the collection of sewage had gone up reasonably significantly over last year's actual expenditure. I do not think it is any secret that we have been through a difficult period in the past 12 months and are continuing to go through difficult periods in respect of sewage collection. The dry summer led to problems with tree roots. We are having to increase our capacity to clear chokes to ensure that mains continue to flow. We have had several floodings which honourable members on both sides

of the House have pointed out to us from time to time. There is not much that we can do about that. However, we are exploring and have explored ways and means of preventing the ingress of tree roots. In a moment I shall ask Mr Cooper to help me. He can tell the Committee about the technical aspects of trying to maintain a root free environment in the sewers.

The costs of treatment and disposal of waste water are going up in line with inflation. That does not amount to a reduction. The collection of sewage is proving to be a little harder than it was in the past and it will continue to get harder until we can come up with some more novel solutions.

**Mr Cooper:** Our sewerage system is similar to many throughout the world. One of our major collection pipe systems is comprised of earthenware pipes. In the early days pipes were jointed with clay, then mortar, pitch and rubber rings. All those substances were considered to be the right technology for the time, but, unfortunately, they have proven to be easy prey for tree roots in our dry climate. Millions and millions of joints in our underground sewerage system are being invaded by tree roots seeking water, especially in dry summers. We have several programs to combat that problem.

We have inserted a chemical injection into some of our sewerage systems—it is called a vapour rooting system—to inhibit the growth of tree roots. It has been quite successful. We have mechanical methods of cleaning out tree roots on a planned basis. Those methods include modern equipment from overseas. We have motorised driven cutters, and we also have the old fashioned dragging with chains. So, we use an array of devices to control tree roots in the sewerage system.

We have also come up with some productivity improvements. With the agreement of the unions, we have gone to single-manned choke trucks to clean connections to people's properties in particular. All that, with a transfer of some extra resources from other parts of the department, has enabled us to get on to the problem of chokes and floodings in our sewerage system.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I think there is another part of that question which was not answered.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Does the treatment and disposal of water include sludge and foreign matter?

**Mr Killmier:** Yes, it certainly does. Of course, the costs of the proposed sludge disposal main and the operating costs will not start until several years down the track.

I know that the question was more in relation to recurrent expenditure, but even more interesting is the capital proposal, whereby collection costs go up dramatically from \$11 million to \$19 million and for treatment from \$5 million to \$8 million. There are some significant expenditure proposals on the capital side for this financial year.

We are doing much work on the rehabilitation of Glenelg, Port Adelaide and Bolivar, but several sewer renovations are also programmed. One is a sewer in North Terrace for \$1.1 million, and there is another one at Warren Road, Glenelg North, for \$2.5 million. Those two very old sewers are being renovated. We believe that we will reline them, although that will depend to some extent on the tender prices that come in. These will then be judged on whether relining or relaying is the right option. Such decisions will need to be made fairly soon.

**Mr HAMILTON:** In relation to the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, how much will be spent in terms of rehabilitation? What does the rehabilitation entail? What will be the impact upon the outfall into the Port River? What

will be the impact on the coastal environment of the program to reduce sludge going out to sea?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The program for the rehabilitation of the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works includes the treatment process, but the major activities include replacement of engines and instrumentation. Considerable work is being undertaken at pumping stations supplying the works, including odour control within the rising mains. All members will be pleased that we are doing everything we can to control odour from our sewerage system.

A contract has been let to a consultant to review the process at Port Adelaide, and this review will address the need for nutrient removal. The review, due for completion in January next year, may indicate that major changes are required to the works, and this will determine the future course of this project. In other words, until we actually have an objective and in-depth assessment of what we need to do, it would be premature for me to talk about sums of money or particular processes. It makes a lot of sense to obtain some independent and objective advice, and that is exactly what we are doing.

The planned expenditure for 1990-91 is \$1.3 million, with a total project cost currently estimated at some \$6 million. This estimate may increase dramatically, depending on the results of the consultant's review. While I give those figures, I make it very clear to the Committee that they are indicative figures until we get the consultant's estimates. The other thing that I mentioned in my introductory speech was that at all times we try to introduce the best available technology. It might well be that, by the beginning of next year, the best available technology is that which we think appropriate because of the beneficial environmental consequences. That, however, will surely have a price tag.

It is not a cheap matter. When we talk about rehabilitating a treatment works such as that at Port Adelaide, it is a major financial commitment by the Government of the day. I am very mindful of the problems faced by the members for Albert Park and Henley Beach, as well as by the Speaker of the House of Assembly and member for Port Adelaide. Part of the reason for these problems is that in the past we did not get the planning issues right.

We have allowed housing to be built almost to the boundaries of our sewage treatment plants when, particularly in places such as Bolivar, many of those plants were designed to be on the outskirts of cities and not to be surrounded by housing, motels and camping areas. People then come and say 'Minister, can you fix this up?' Nowhere in the world do they have sewage treatment with no odour at all.

I have had the opportunity of looking at other places in the world and, while looking at sewerage plants might not sound the most exciting thing to do, it is very interesting to see what is happening in other parts of the world. We have a problem that we share with the rest of the world, but I can assure members (since a number of them have to cope with some of these issues on a daily basis) that we are doing everything possible within a tight budget. I always welcome any constructive criticisms or suggestions.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I preface my remarks by saying that just over 12 months ago when I was letterboxing in the Tennyson area I had occasion to witness the replacement of pumping equipment in the area. I discussed with some employees of the E&WS Department who were there the matter of the impact that the high salinity had on that equipment. What is the impact of high salinity on pumping equipment in the western suburbs, not only in terms of the equipment but also in terms of copper piping? I am advised that the high salinity sets up an electrolysis process which

adversely affects the copper piping. I undertook to ask this question because many people believe that installing copper piping in their houses is a one-off cost. If that is not the case, I should like to know.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The corrosion of copper water service pipes in West Lakes is not so much due to the saline water as to the electrolysis as a result of a particular soil type and the stray electrical currents that exist in a section of West Lakes. Some of these connections have had to be replaced with higher density poly-ethane pipe within two years. However, it is not a major problem, because it is isolated to a very small area. I want to make clear that the replacement of the pumping station to which the honourable member referred had absolutely nothing to do with the copper pipe problem.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am talking about high salinity.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The copper pipe problem is quite separate, having nothing to do with high salinity. However, the replacement of a pumping station does have something to do with the high salinity level, being caused by high salinity in the groundwater which has infiltrated the sewage pumping system. This water, along with some sand and normal wear and tear from the pumping of sewage, has combined to corrode and erode the pumping units at a significantly accelerated rate.

We have the unfortunate situation of a number of things coming together: the high salinity that is leached into the system, the particular type of sand and the fact that there is normal wear and tear. Apparently, there are no particular difficulties in the Tennyson area. However, there is considerable saline water egress in the West Lakes area, which is covered by 20 pumping stations, currently costing the department about \$20 000 a year to replace corroded pumps—which are lasting between eight months and two years. I do not think that anyone will consider that a satisfactory lifespan. I will ask one of my officers about the technology in terms of obtaining pumps which will not be affected in this way. If we are nowhere near obtaining these pumps, we will need to work with some of the other States.

**Mr HAMILTON:** How much do the existing pumps cost?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will throw Peter Cooper in at the deep end and ask him to answer that question. If these pumps are lasting between eight months and two years at a cost of some \$20 000, perhaps we will have to start looking at alternatives.

**Mr Cooper:** For a two-pumping unit station, it would cost about \$2 000, broadly, to replace the pumping units. These are what we call the cheap, standard material pumps for normal sewage systems. As the Minister pointed out, with the very high saline water the pumps are corroding much more quickly and we are looking at much more expensive material in the pumps, balancing that against replacing them as frequently as we are doing now. It may be best financially to do what we are doing now. When we change to very expensive materials, such as stainless steel, the steel must be specially cast, and so forth. The cost of those can be quite high.

Whilst we get a longer life, we must balance that against a cheaper pump lasting a shorter time. We are doing that examination right now and we will have the answer, I guess, within a month, as to how we plan to cope with this situation in the future. The money is part of our budget so we have been able to absorb this situation and run with it, as it has been operating until now.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I listened with a great deal of interest to the question raised by the member for Heysen in relation to the impact of tree intrusion and the sort of costs that are involved. I do not think any figure was given on the sort

of cost associated with tree intrusion into the sewers and the impact that is having on those pipes. It raises a number of questions in my mind, including the costs associated with repairing pipes which are allocated each year in the budget. It also raises the question in my mind about the answers given to the previous question about the leakages from damaged pipes, particularly in the West Lakes area and the impact that may have upon groundwater and, indeed, whether some of that seeps back into the West Lakes waterway itself. Finally, as part of this whole question, I understand that there are a number of houses still on septic tanks in the Semaphore Park area, because of this treated effluent from this system. Is it the intention of the Government to connect all these septic tanks on the sewerage system and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will start with the first part of the question. I am pleased the honourable member has raised this question of the intrusion of the roots of trees into the sewerage system. It is an enormous problem and it is faced by departments such as mine around the world. We are finding an increase in the number of chokes that are due to the intrusion of tree roots into the system. I am happy to provide to the honourable member an indication of the cost to the community of this matter. I want to pick this up in terms of the broader environmental issue in a minute.

The cost of correcting the tree root intrusion is of the order of \$2.8 million annually. I think that is an enormous amount of money, and this can be broken down as follows. The cost of clearing the connections due to tree root intrusion (that is the immediate response when somebody rings the department saying that there is sewage running down the street) is \$800 000. The cost of clearing mains due to tree root intrusion is \$360 000. The cost of rodding, that is, preventive maintenance amounts to \$430 000. Where we know there are old established trees that will cause problems, it makes sense to have some preventive measures so we have special equipment. I have seen this equipment in operation; it is quite technical and very effective. The cost of dragging, which is another form of preventive maintenance, is \$790 000 and the cost of vapour rooting, which is a new type of preventive maintenance referred to by Mr Cooper, is \$400 000—making a total of \$2.78 million, which is an enormous cost to the community.

Local government authorities write to me, sometimes in relatively abusive terms, demanding to know why I will not give approval for the planting of specific types of trees in streets. The reason is that we know that trees of that type have a particularly aggressive type of root system that seeks out water in our underground sewerage system and literally destroys the pipes. Members should see some of the pipes that have been taken out and see the way in which the root literally collapses the pipe totally and blocks it completely. I try to write back in as gentle language as possible to indicate that it is not because I am not supporting the greening of Adelaide and the planting of trees but that there are specific categories of trees which can be planted and which can minimise the cost and damage to sewerage systems.

Perhaps, one of the things we have to look at as a community is whether local government bodies want to take that risk, and, if so, they have to be prepared to pay for it. Perhaps they should be given that option; either they adhere to the tree specimens that the department has identified as being safe to plant or, if they want to go outside those guidelines, they do so and they accept the risk and they pay for the work. This is because, if one is trying to run a department where we are trying to be cost effective at the



end of the day, and every year, before we even start, we have to write off about \$2.8 million in preventive maintenance and emergency services to enable the system to flow freely because of the interference of tree roots, one really has to start looking at cost effectiveness. So, that is the first part.

The second part of the question related to septic tanks and seepage into West Lakes. I will ask Peter Norman to comment quickly, then the acting CEO to comment on the last part.

**Mr Norman:** I refer to the question of the potential of leakage of liquid from the sewerage system in the West Lakes area into the waterway. If the sewerage system is leaking, the leakage would be inward from the groundwater surrounding West Lakes into the sewer and, therefore, that increases the flow. We consistently get high infiltration into the sewerage system due to the ingress of the surrounding groundwater. So, the leakage is inward rather than outward.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am sure the honourable member's constituents will be delighted to hear that. We are not so delighted because, at the end of the day, that causes us serious problems. However, of the two situations, the leakage inwards is by far to be preferred.

**Mr Killmier:** We have recently done some work in that area and I think the honourable member is aware of that. Only today, I saw the results of that and the reduction in the infiltration was quite dramatic. It has been reduced to about 11 per cent of what it was previously. We will be looking at it in twelve months to see whether the benefit has been maintained and, if it has been, the trial will clearly be worth persevering with, because there are a lot of areas of quite heavy infiltration. If it is possible to achieve an 89 per cent reduction, it has a lot going for it. We have a number of interested parties, including interstate authorities, looking over our shoulder to see how we get on with this process.

If I could turn now to the question on septic tanks, perhaps I could just explain what normally happens. When sewerage systems are extended, clearly, they are often extended past properties that already have septic tanks. Once the mains are available, they are gazetted and rates become payable so, there is some incentive for people to connect, but there are still costs associated with connection, such as the fee payable for the connection. A bigger fee would be the connection of internal pipes to the inspection point. So, many people put off that evil day while their septic tank is functioning. It would probably be surprising to many people present here today that there are still houses on Anzac Highway that are not connected to the sewerage system. Similarly, houses in Blackwood and Belair are not connected.

*The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:*

**Mr Killmier:** Mr Wotton has reminded me of Stirling.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Mr Wotton should not be reminding people of what to say.

**Mr Killmier:** In places like Stirling, Aldgate and Myponga, where the failure to connect could have an impact on water quality, we involve the local council and the Health Commission and, through the council, virtually require people to connect. That has happened at Myponga where there is 100 per cent connection. It happens in the Hills where councils are very cooperative and the Health Commission helps, but in places such as Semaphore Park, I imagine the sandy conditions probably mean that septic tanks work reasonably well, although if they did not, people would have an incentive to connect. I have no figures on the numbers of people who have not connected. If the honourable member becomes aware of any situations that cause problems to

neighbours, such as smells or effluent in the street, etc., the department would be very happy to take up that matter with the householders and ask them to take advantage of the sewerage system.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** We have no legislation.

**Mr Killmier:** Technically, the Sewerage Act provides us with that power, but we tend to be more conciliatory in our approach rather than coming the heavy hand, so we work through the local councils and the Health Commission.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It seems that people are paying the sewerage rates but, as the Chief Executive Officer has indicated, the problem is that there is a connection cost and that may well be prohibitive for some people. If any of the honourable member's constituents are in that category, we have a system of organising for payment on what I think are very fair and humane terms, so we do not just demand a cheque up front. Actually, we have a system of assisting people on low incomes or with financial difficulties if they wish to connect, so perhaps the honourable member might draw that provision to the attention of his constituents.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I refer to page 321 of the Program Estimates. In most metropolitan sewerage works, the raw sewage enters the plant and is mechanically screened to ensure the removal of grit and other large foreign objects. These objects are conveyed to waste disposal bins and I am informed that this waste is used as land fill. Since the waste is wet and may contain micro-biological organisms which might be severely deleterious to the health of humans or animals, what treatment, if any, is used to sanitise the waste? If no treatment occurs, what guarantee can the Minister give that this waste does not represent a danger to public health and, if there is no such guarantee, what proposals are in hand to deal with the matter?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask Mr Norman to comment on the technical aspects of the question.

**Mr Norman:** Mechanical screening facilities are provided at each of the four metropolitan sewage treatment plants—Bolivar, Port Adelaide, Glenelg and Christies Beach—to remove the gross solids at that initial point in the process flow. They are collected by that mechanical screening process and are discharged into bins or containers which are then conveyed without manual handling to land fill disposal facilities which are, in each of the four cases, on the site of the respective works. The disposal of that material is then achieved simply by mechanically discharging the contents of those containers into land fill operations. From an occupational health and safety point of view, these arrangements at each of the plants have been looked into and they meet with recognised standards in that regard to protect the health and welfare of the workers concerned.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** My question related to the consequences for human and animal health if this land fill was used outside the sites of the treatment works. If that does not occur, perhaps the Minister could say how long it will take for land fill to be used up?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I guess that would be something we would need to ascertain. Obviously that forms not a huge part of the disposal of sewage. As the honourable member would know, sludge is used in top fertilisers, etc., but the department would be assessing the long-term viability of particular sewage treatment plants. Not only will we look at how to remove nutrients that cause problems in the effluent discharge but also we will look at the viability of the technology of each of the plants in the metropolitan area, and that would come under an ongoing appraisal of how long that area could be used. I thank the member for her question and we will take that on board in terms of our forward planning to be able to project how long it will be

before the disposal at E&WS property can be contained for each of the sites.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I understand that that waste is not disposed of on site at Glenelg. Am I correct?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Yes.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** In that case, where is it disposed of and that may mean the answer given by Mr Norman in terms of occupational health has further consequences in relation to public health. In other words, as there is public access to sites outside Glenelg, what are they and what precautions are taken to ensure that public health is protected?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask Mr Cooper to reply.

**Mr Cooper:** Some of the screenings from Glenelg treatment works at least are taken to the Wingfield dump and are disposed of there with the approval of the appropriate authorities. I would have to seek further information to provide the details of the permission that we have and the health considerations, but it is approved waste to be disposed of at the Wingfield dump.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** The member for Hayward has a special interest in this area. I believe that moves were made to speed up the discharge of sludge at the Glenelg treatment works in bypassing the current final screening process. Since this process removes small non-biodegradable waste, such as plastic tampon packaging, can the Minister assure the Committee that no further attempt will be made to circumvent the screening process as long as sludge continues to be discharged into the gulf?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Concern was expressed some time ago by people at the plant, and it came to my notice that in fact there was a proposal to make the whole process a little more cost-efficient. Some discussions were held with the unions and workers on site about the whole screening process. To get an accurate technical answer, I will ask Mr Cooper to respond.

**Mr Cooper:** What the Minister has said is correct. We proposed an experimental system, with the approval of the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Environment and Planning, about 12 or 18 months ago and, after discussions with the employees on site who are quite concerned, we abandoned that exercise. We have not bypassed any screens—we never did. We did not start the experiment. We are maintaining and will continue to maintain those screens until the Glenelg and Port Adelaide sludges are pumped to Bolivar.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I understand that in the reduction of manning levels at the Glenelg Sewage Works and the changeover to an automated plant, a number of large lawned areas at the Glenelg works previously watered by the effluent system have been redesigned, as gardens with shrubs fed by a triclone irrigation system and that these shrubs are watered using mains water. Can the Minister explain why in a place, where nutrient-rich water is freely available, the department is choosing to water the shrubery with precious mains water?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am not aware of this situation occurring, and obviously I cannot at any time have available every bit of information about every single sewage treatment plant in terms of the watering system. I would be interested to hear the answer because this is a reasonable question. If sewage effluent is available for watering processes, as Minister for Environment and Planning and as Minister of Water Resources I would concur with the member in wanting to hear the answer. I will ask Mr Killmier to comment.

**Mr Killmier:** As to watering trees with effluent, it has arisen at the trial woodlot at Bolivar. For the first two years the new trees are watered with mains water to get them started. I am guessing now (I will ask Mr Cooper whether he knows), but it may be that to get new shrubs and trees started they have to be watered with mains water initially and then they can be fed with effluent water.

**Mr Cooper:** That was going to be my answer. I will seek information for the member. Perhaps we had part of our reticulation system isolated because of construction work at the site. Other than that, I can only think of the reason Mr Killmier advanced, that is, to get the plants going quickly on fresh water.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I give an undertaking to provide that information; we are all interested in knowing the answer. There is enormous support in the broader community for woodlotting and the use of our treated effluent in a range of activities such as recreation uses, park, gardens, golf courses and so on. I am sure that there was no malicious intent on the part of anyone to somehow use pure water from Happy Valley as opposed to using treated effluent water.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** For the Minister's information, woodlotting undertaken in the Riverland does not require anything other than effluent: they determine the species and use effluent from the word go.

**Mr McKEE:** I refer to page 320 of the Program Estimates, has the Minister or her department developed alternative strategies for the supply of water to the Strathalbyn-Milang system to be applied, in the event of toxic algal bloom? If so, what are the strategies?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am greatly concerned about the matter, as the Minister responsible for the quality of water to be provided to the population of South Australia, specifically to the 1.4 million people who at one time or another drink water from the Murray River. I will not go into the history of toxic algal bloom, because I have done so on a number of occasions in the House and the member knows about as much as I do about it.

Suffice to say, notwithstanding that I am doing a lot of things on the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council to ensure that we move forward in preventing toxic algal bloom, that is the longer and mid-term approach to the whole issue. As to the short term, the summer of 1990-91 is almost upon us. I am pleased to share with the member some of the contingency plans that the department has already put into action.

The Strathalbyn reservoir will be full by November and kept full by either pumping from Lake Alexandrina or by using privately owned bores at Macclesfield to run water down the Angas River to then be diverted to the reservoir. Last year we were caught with the Strathalbyn reservoir not being kept full, because this problem had not arisen for a long time with the severity that we experienced last summer. That is the first thing: we are going to keep the Strathalbyn reservoir full throughout the summer.

The second thing is that we are looking at having agreements drawn up with private bore owners to purchase water for the above, should this be necessary. We are already getting that legal framework in place so that we can have proper agreements with private bore owners. Thirdly, we are having discussions with the Strathalbyn Racing Club about its needs to water the racecourse should water availability be limited at any time. It is most appropriate that the honourable member should ask me that question, because I know he has an abiding interest in the racing industry and is very supportive of it, not necessarily through his hip

pocket, but in terms of his general attendance and support for the employment it generates.

One of our problems is that the Strathalbyn Racing Club does have access to water in order to water its grounds throughout the year and, should we encounter a particularly dry summer and experience this problem again, I am sure that the racing club would be willing to enter into cooperative discussions with us about the need to have as much water as it has had in the past. In other words, we are looking at not only the department's having contingency plans but we are also requiring the community to work with us to ensure that we do not experience such problems as the department carting water for people last year for drinking and other purposes. I hope that I can say with some degree of confidence that we will not encounter that problem next summer.

I cannot guarantee that we will not have toxic algae in Lake Alexandrina and in other places because, if conditions come together in other places and we experience a high turbidity level followed by clear weather and fairly high temperatures, then we get the right conditions for toxic algal bloom. We have to have precautionary practices ready to put into place.

**Mr VENNING:** My question relates to page 321 of the Program Estimates and the chlorination of effluent. I have been given to understand that during the three months of winter, effluent discharged from the Glenelg sewerage works is not chlorinated and is discharged directly to sea. Can the Minister confirm this? Can the Minister guarantee that the microorganisms which are so discharged are neither deleterious to the public health nor to the marine environment? If the statement is not true, will the Minister provide a month-by-month breakdown of the quantities of chlorine used at the Glenelg treatment works?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I must confess that I do not have the answer in my head, but I am sure that, with all the expertise before the Committee, we can provide it. I will ask Mr Cooper to provide the answer concerning the difference between summer and winter conditions. Obviously, we would need to take on notice the figures on a month by month basis. Even with the greatest preparations for the Committee, we could not have that information at our finger tips, but I am sure that we can get it quickly.

**Mr Cooper:** Yes, it is correct that in winter at times we do not chlorinate the effluent at Glenelg. It is chlorinated in summer because the effluent is used by a number of people off the property, including the West Beach Recreation Trust and the Glenelg council. It is disinfected to a very high degree of bacterial safety, obviously for close contact with humans. When it is discharged to the ocean, it does meet the bathing water standards at the appropriate distance from the outlet anywhere back near the beach. Hence, it has not been necessary to chlorinate in the winter, but it is chlorinated in the summer both as a double insurance for bathers and for the purposes of effluent re-use for irrigation.

**Mr VENNING:** I refer again to page 321. The treatment of sludge and sewage works involves the progressive movement of sludge through a number of tanks. Methane is collected and the sludge becomes inert before it is discharged. I am given to understand that at the Glenelg treatment works the final tanks in which the sludge is treated are collecting methane at almost the rate of the tanks into which the sludge is first pumped. Can the Minister confirm this? If this assertion is incorrect, will the Minister provide an estimate by volume of the methane produced by each tank in the progressive discharge process? If the final tanks are producing methane at rates as indi-

cated, can the Minister indicate to this Committee how she can claim that this sludge is biologically inert when it is pumped into the sea? If it is not biologically inert, what is the potential hazard to human health and the marine environment, and what is she prepared to do about that?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** In relation to the last part of the question, I think I have made it very clear on three occasions in the Parliament what I am prepared to do about it. I am prepared not only to enact the environment protection legislation, but I am prepared also to ensure that the Engineering and Water Supply Department will meet every requirement of that Act in terms of the licensing conditions. In fact, we will not be putting sludge into the gulf. Glenelg will be the first plant, because that is where the pipe removing the sludge will start. Therefore, Glenelg will be the first plant to have the sludge removed from its marine environment and disposed of on land.

I am a little concerned at the tone of the question because I believe that the department has done everything possible to ensure that we have the cleanest discharges into the marine environment of any State in this country. It amazes me that we are having this kind of absolute nit-picking, when one considers that in Sydney sewage is discharged without any treatment into places like Bondi Beach, and in the summer there are daily radio reports indicating to bathers whether they can enter the water. Obviously, we are talking here about someone within the department who feels that they must provide the Opposition with these sorts of questions. I will answer those questions; I have absolutely nothing to hide. I believe that the E&WS Department is second to none in this country—I will not go over the top and suggest that it is the best in the world. But, having seen some departments in other parts of the world I can tell the Committee that, on my return, I said very proudly that I have a department that would leave no stone unturned to ensure that we met the health requirements that are laid down in legislation. Also, we have the competence and personnel to do so. Therefore, I reject the last part of the honourable member's question; I think that it is a little mischievous. I will not expect my officers to defend their professionalism; that is my responsibility, and I do that proudly.

However, I will ask Mr Cooper if he can provide any of that information now. If not, I am not sure that I will be able to provide information in relation to how much methane comes from each tank. If that proves to be an incredibly costly exercise that will tie up the time and expertise of a large number of people in the workforce, I think that money would be much better spent in terms of moving forward with the solutions that I outlined in my introductory statement and, indeed, that my officers have outlined as we have gone through this issue. Therefore, I will not give a guarantee that I will provide that level of detail unless it can be done at relatively low cost. Mr Cooper may be able to indicate whether or not that is the case.

**Mr Cooper:** I am not quite sure what I have to answer, but I think I can briefly outline the process to which Mr Venning referred. It is the sludge digestion process, which is the treating of some of the solids that we extract from the raw sewage as it passes through the process. It is still 96 per cent moisture and only about 4 per cent solids. This mixture is pumped into a series of tanks, and is heated and stirred. A natural process takes place with a natural range of organisms that are present in the sewage, and they break down the organic material in the sludge. In doing that, they produce a very nice by-product, which is methane gas and carbon dioxide. That process is world established, and we had one of the first installations in the world. In fact, we

had power generation in 1940 at Glenelg and soon after that at Port Adelaide. I think that that installation was the first in the Southern Hemisphere. We have used that gas to drive engines to generate power to give us about two-thirds of the power for the works.

After 20 to 30 days detention, the digested sludge is pretty inert; a little bit of biological activity might remain, but it is considered inert enough to spread on the sand at Glenelg and to dry—when we had the space years ago. It is now pumped two or three miles out to sea and it is discharged under water. The concern we have, and the principal reason why we are going to divert it to Bolivar, is not the organic concern—or even the pathogenic organisms that are quickly killed in the sea water but the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus in the water, which tends to cause organisms to proliferate on the fronds of the seagrass; they do not like it and tend not to grow well near the outlet. That is a summary of the situation. It is standard, high quality treatment.

**Mr VENNING:** I refer to the use of effluent water on the Morphettville racecourse. I am given to understand that because of increasing problems with its bores the SAJC has made inquiries of the Minister's department with a view to irrigation of the Morphettville racecourse using effluent from the Glenelg works. The costing was done based on a spur line from the southern side of the airport site, down Morphett Road to the racecourse. The SAJC found the cost to be prohibitive. Has any consideration been given to running a pipe along the Sturt Creek right of way to the racecourse? What is the cost differential? If the Minister has not considered this matter, will she request that her officers do so and provide an answer for insertion in *Hansard*?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the honourable member for his question. The effluent is available and the proposal is feasible. There is nothing that I would like more than to supply the SAJC with this effluent so that it can reduce the draw down through the use of its bores. However, of course, it gets back to the old question of cost. Quite obviously, the SAJC maintains that the costs are too high. I do not believe that the department should necessarily subsidise the provision of the effluent to one particular organisation, when the ordinary working person in the community is required to pay for water at the cost that is set down through the parliamentary process.

We certainly are prepared to look into it; it is something that I would like to be able to do. I do not have to direct my officers in this way because, as always, my officers are very willing to examine any proposal that requires a little bit of lateral thought and cooperation with community groups or organisations. I will ask Mr Norman if he has that cost differential. If he does not, I will be happy to provide that and information on whether the proposal that we have been looking at does follow Sturt Creek. We may then have to consider the environmental consequences of that option, because there is always a broader picture. It is not just a simple issue of laying a pipe from Glenelg to Morphettville racecourse and providing effluent. There are two major factors. First, there is the environmental consequences, and one would have to recognise that we would be cutting across a huge number of other services that are provided by the department.

Secondly, there is the question of the actual cost of who pays at the end of the day. The Morphettville racecourse and the SAJC are now probably getting their water for almost nothing, because it is bore water, but they must ask why, if the Government provides it to them at a subsidised cost, every other sporting organisation in every other mem-

ber's electorate in the whole of the city should not come to the E&WS and say, 'Please, E&WS, provide that to us at the same subsidy.' We then come here and are quite rightly asked, 'Why are you not effectively and efficiently coming in on budget and cutting back on your draw on the consolidated account?' So, we really cannot have it every way, but I am very happy to have the department reopen negotiations, if that is the case, I will ask Mr Norman to bring us up to date with the relevant information.

**Mr Norman:** A scheme to transport effluent from the Glenelg sewage treatment works to the Morphettville racecourse was investigated some years ago when the racecourse expressed an interest in such a proposition. At that time, a scheme was conceived which more or less followed the route referred to by the honourable member and allowed for other open space reserves along the way to be provided, if that was their wish.

At that time, the costs that were determined (and I cannot quote them off-the-cuff now) did not meet the favour of the SAJC, so the scheme did not proceed. The Minister is correct in saying that effluent is available and that such a scheme is technically feasible, in which case the question comes down to cost. The alternate source of water is the one that is being used, that is, ground water. I rather suspect that will prove to be the cheaper source of water but, nevertheless, the department could review the scheme that was investigated earlier.

The route of the pipeline from Glenelg to the racecourse followed the Sturt Creek for some, but not all, of the way so that it could pick up some of the other open space reserves which are more or less along that route in order to maximise the use of effluent and then, therefore, the return for the investment.

**Mr VENNING:** As a supplementary question, I understand in a very broad basic sort of sense that the water you are trying to keep out of the gulf is too high in nitrogen and phosphorus, but that is just what the grass needs to grow. If that can be done, the department gets rid of a problem and somebody else is provided with an asset. I understand what was said; it needs to be costed and then we can work out who pays for it.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is exactly what the department will do. We are quite happy to have further discussions and to look at a number of other uses. I think that probably the Glenelg council should be involved in those discussions, because some of those other recreational uses may well come under the Glenelg and/or Marion councils. Perhaps we could look at this whole thing. I think it is an excellent suggestion, but it always gets back to the situation that, once the department is actually footing the bill for something like this, it becomes most unfair if it is not to do it from every sewage treatment plant, not just in Adelaide but all around the State. The department then actually subsidises what communities and local governments are actually paying for currently.

I realise that not everybody thinks that is a reasonable argument but, as Minister of Water Resources, I certainly do. We will look at it again and we will certainly be prepared to enter into any form of meaningful discussions with any parties who may want to take water from Glenelg and any of our other sewage treatment plants.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I also have an interest in the Glenelg and Port Adelaide treatment works. From my limited knowledge of this area, it seems to me that pipes, particularly older pipes, are being plastic coated. It seems logical that a pipe would last much longer if it were coated before being laid in the first place. It would probably also be

cheaper. What sort of pipe is to be used and what is the estimated life of that pipe?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is a very important question. If we are to expend our money to ensure that we provide for sludge removal from the gulf and its land-based disposal, it seems important that we maximise the life of any system that does that, because at the end of the day it will be a very productive thing for the community. I will ask Mr Norman if he can give the honourable member an answer in respect of the sort of pipe that will be used, whether it will be coated in plastic, and whether he has any projections about the life of the pipe that is being recommended, or whether that is all part of the initial feasibility study and investigations that are being carried out.

**Mr Norman:** The pipeline in question will be about 34 kilometres in length in order to track from the Glenelg sewage treatment works via the Port Adelaide works to Bolivar. The design of that system is under way at the moment. The final decision in respect of the choice of material is yet to be made—that is part of the investigations, as the Minister indicated. We are right in the middle of those investigations and design development at the moment. Suffice to say that the material will have to be such as to withstand the corrosive elements not only from the inside of the pipe due to the digested sludge that will be transported but also the corrosive elements outside the pipe in the form of sometimes quite saline ground water. The choice of material, therefore, will be a very important one. We are quite confident that materials are available to withstand those conditions and that a pipeline life of about 80 years would be quite in order.

There are more elements in this system that is being designed than just the 34 kilometres of pipeline. There will be a series of pumping stations to handle the sludge as well as facilities at the Bolivar sewage treatment works in the form of an additional digestion tank, as well as sludge disposal facilities, all of which will have to contend with quite aggressive and corrosive conditions and the potential odour that can be given off in transporting sludge such a distance.

**Mr FERGUSON:** It seems to me that, when the new pipeline is laid, there will be far less work at the Glenelg treatment works than at the moment. What will be the capacity of the Glenelg treatment works and what effect will it have on the works when the pipeline has been completed?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is a fairly technical question and, once again, I will ask Mr Norman if he will give us some indication of the future role and function of Glenelg. I think it is probably much the same as the present, but I will not steal Mr Norman's thunder.

**Mr Norman:** The Minister is quite correct. The operational needs at the Glenelg sewage treatment works will be little different after the pipeline is installed, as opposed to the current position, because activities on site will continue to involve pumping sludge. We now pump sludge out to sea through the four kilometre off-shore pipeline, and we shall simply pump in a different direction towards Port Adelaide and then on to Bolivar sewage treatment works in future. Therefore, the operational needs at Glenelg will change very little.

**Mr FERGUSON:** When will the consultant complete the review? If the consultant recommends nutrient removal, will that increase the cost of the operation?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** We are looking for the consultant's report to give us some fairly clear directions by January 1991. To be safe, I shall say the end of January 1991—January being a month in which many people tend to take

leave and so on. We would be looking at having that report to me by early February 1991. It should give us some clear directions and guidelines about matters such as nutrient removal at Port Adelaide.

**Mr FERGUSON:** As a supplementary question, Mr Norman has already stated that there will be a need for additional capital works at Bolivar to treat additional sludge. Is there any idea of what the cost of that would be?

**Mr Norman:** The Minister quoted the cost in answer to an earlier question. She indicated that the cost of \$10 million for the transfer of sludge from the Glenelg and Port Adelaide plants is a total figure incorporating provision not only for the 34 kilometres of pipeline but also the pumping stations along the way, the additional digester and the sludge disposal facilities at the Bolivar sewage treatment plant.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is a total cost.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** My question may have to go on notice. It refers to a reference in the 1989-90 Estimates of Payments (page 213). Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the \$69 million proposed for waterworks, sewers and irrigation? This refers to an amount 'Financed from internal and other funds'. I should like a breakdown of that figure. At page 8 of the Auditor-General's Report reference is made to major components, Commonwealth: water resources total \$56 million, variance \$25 million. On page 9 under 'Infrastructure', water resources total \$8 million, with \$24 million for variance. I am trying to find out what has happened with the other \$48 million before the grants for capital purposes.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I call on Mr Killmier to answer that question.

**Mr Killmier:** For some years it has been the practice for the Commonwealth to provide additional assistance to the State on recurrent moneys. The heading in the Commonwealth Budget under which that has been done is 'Water quality'. This year the same level of funding was not forthcoming, and the Premier has drawn attention to that. In his Treasurer's report to Parliament he indicated that the level of funding was not as high as it had previously been. Although the Commonwealth has provided that money under the heading of 'Water quality', it was understood by the Commonwealth and by the State that it was to be provided to the State for the State to use in any shape or form that it might choose. This year, in the Premier's Budget statement there is a reference to \$12 million. He said:

However, following the Premier's Conference I was able to negotiate a partial contribution of special assistance for programs associated with water quality. This in turn has allowed the Government to reallocate \$12 million to support the housing program.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I shall follow up that point on another occasion. What revenue will be raised on an annual basis as a result of what I have previously referred to and will continue to refer to as the property tax based on an acceptance of the recommendations of the Hudson water pricing review for an additional charge of 78c for every \$1 000 that residential property values exceed \$100 000? Also, will the rate and property value be indexed annually in line with the CPI?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Again I reject the honourable member's terminology. It is not a property tax. It is a very fair and equitable water rating system. As I have said in Parliament on a number of occasions, Mr Hudson was asked to come up with a fairer and simpler water rating system that was equitable and had elements of social justice and conservation—in other words, it had a conservation philosophy in it.

The major overriding consideration was that it was revenue-neutral. The answer to the honourable member is that the water rating structure and proposal that the Government

has accepted and will be moving to implement on 1 July next year will be revenue-neutral. It is not a money raising exercise. It was never intended to be so and it will not be so.

I shall again explain what the impact may be. I stress the word 'may' because, as I explain the matter, what I mean will become apparent. In terms of the incidental effects, it was ascertained by Mr Hudson that 67.1 per cent of consumers will be unaffected in terms of their water rates, that 16.7 per cent of consumers and customers will be better off, and that 16.2 per cent of customers will be worse off.

Obviously, the honourable member has seized upon that point and believes that because we shall talk about having a 78c amount for property values over \$100 000. I remind honourable members that that is just an amount that Mr Hudson suggested. Such matters are still finally to be worked out, but I can assure honourable members that that will not come into play under \$100 000, so the community will not have the fear and scare tactic imposed upon them again.

Of the 16.2 per cent who, in Mr Hudson's calculations, would be worse off, they will only be worse off if they use the same amount of water they have used in the past. The people who comprise the 16.2 per cent are those with very highly valued properties, somewhere between the \$500 000 and the umpteen million dollar valuations, who currently may pay reasonably high water rates but have enormously high water allowances. The honourable member would know the way in which the system works.

These people currently pay an amount whether or not they use every last drop of that water allowance. In other words, the current system encourages people who are now at the top end of the property valuation system to have no conservation ethic at all. We have the old adage 'If they are paying for it, why not use it?' In this day and age of environmental consciousness, I do not believe that anyone can justify that. The Opposition will find it very difficult to justify such a situation.

Those people in that 16.2 per cent for the first time will control the amount of water they use and will have control over reducing their bill. Whether they wish to reduce their bill will be in their own hands. At the end of the day we could have a situation whereby, if these people adopt a conservation ethic (and they certainly have every incentive to do so since for the first time they will actually be charged for the water they are using as opposed to the current system of having an allowance and being able to use either every last drop or none of it), where we may not see people paying any more for water.

We may well have a situation in which it is not only revenue neutral but in which the department obtains less revenue. No-one can predict that until the system has been in operation for one full year. The one thing we can be sure of is that, unless people in the rest of the community go mad and use three times more water than they have used in the past, the whole thing will be revenue neutral but there will be the proviso for that 16.2 per cent to reduce the amount of water rates and the total amount of their bill. As I said, it is in their hands. How the honourable member can find fault with a system that, on the one hand, is just and equitable and, on the other hand, gives those people who have very high property values the opportunity to reduce their water rates, I fail to understand.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** With due respect, the Minister has not answered my question.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I have—it is revenue neutral. That is pretty clear, isn't it?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It has been suggested that one of the main causes of pollution along the metropolitan

coastline is chlorine-laced effluent. In fact, I believe that that was pointed out in 1968 in the Shepherd report. Mr Shepherd, who was recognised as a senior fisheries scientist, did the study, which took some five years. It was noted how seagrasses were gradually dying near effluent outfalls. He concluded that chlorine was the main reason that that was happening. I do not believe that that report ever saw the light of day. I understand that the said gentleman was admonished for being involved with it; but I do not want to go into that too much.

Can the Minister confirm or deny that chlorine is a major concern in relation to pollution along the metropolitan coastline? I understand that some 10 000 hectares of seagrass has been destroyed in recent times. I know that in previous times the Minister's department has claimed that only a small amount of chlorine is used per litre of water—but when that is added up over a period of time I imagine that it would represent many hundreds of tonnes. So, I am asking the Minister whether she believes this to be a major contributor to the problems that we have with the seagrass.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I do not pretend to be a complete expert in this area, but from the reading I have done and from the information I have gathered I do not believe that that is the case. I believe that the problem with seagrasses off the coast is contributed to by three main issues. The first is sludge, and I think that we all acknowledge that, although we might be squabbling over putting timetables in Bills but, at the end of the day, we all acknowledge that we must remove sludge from the gulf as quickly and as cost-effectively as possible.

The second major pollutant of the marine environment is stormwater and the run-off from stormwater, all the diffuse sources, as opposed to the effluent that is discharged. That is not to say that sewage effluent is not a major cause of the destruction of seagrasses: it is a significant cause, but I do not believe that it is the major cause. All the research that I have seen indicates that it is the nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous), as Peter Cooper so accurately described in the answer to an earlier question, that have caused particular growths on the seagrasses, to their detriment.

I have indicated to the community that we will carry out thorough investigations to remove the nitrogen and, if necessary, to remove phosphorous as well. In answer to a question in the House this week with respect to the Port Lincoln sewage treatment plant (that will probably be a state of the art plant), I stated that we are initially looking at removing nitrogen, with the retrofit to be able to remove phosphorous at a later date if it is seen to be appropriate. With respect to chlorine, we have a problem with maintaining chlorine in our water system to ensure that we provide a standard of water quality commensurate with that required by national and international health standards. Although my chemistry is fairly limited, I do not believe that chlorine is a major problem in terms of the marine environment. However, I will ask Mr Peter Norman whether I am correct or whether the report to which the honourable member referred, which goes back to the 1960s, is still considered to be the current state of wisdom in terms of the major problems in the marine environment.

**Mr Norman:** Much work has been done collectively since the 1960s by the three departments (the E&WS Department, Department of Fisheries and Department of Environment and Planning) in respect of the impact on the marine environment. As the Minister has indicated, it is true that the primary impacts on our metropolitan marine environment are caused by discharges from our sewage treatment plants (which discharge into that water body) as well as stormwater.



Looking at the sewage treatment plants and picking up the figure the honourable member quoted of 10 000 hectares of degradation of seagrass, an area of that order has been affected by sewage treatment works discharges, collectively between the sludge and effluent discharges. Turning to the effluent discharge and the question of chlorine or other parameters of contamination in that flow, there is no doubt that studies since the 1960s have indicated that the primary cause of that degradation is nutrients.

Indeed, it is nitrogen, rather than phosphorus, that appears to be the one of first concerns. The department has been working at each of our plants in investigating measures that might be taken in order to provide facilities to reduce nitrogen and subsequently, perhaps, phosphorus, from the effluent discharge. Certainly, in relation to chlorine, our recent studies indicate that chlorine is not of concern. Chlorine has a beneficial effect and is necessary for the adequate disinfection of our discharges, but it has not been shown to have deleterious effects with respect to seagrass degradation or any other factor.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I would like to turn to the question of algal blooms and an issue that has been of considerable interest to me over the years and, specifically, the research that has been carried out in that area. I am aware that it is a problem that occurs in a number of countries in the world and, specifically, in Australia I think there are problems in Tasmania. Indeed, there are problems in the Port River and, on two occasions of which I am aware, problems were identified in the West Lakes waterway. What research has been carried out into the reasons why we have these red tides and what are the suspected causes? For anyone wishing to do a study of these red tides, which would be the best country or countries to visit?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the honourable member for that question. Certainly, some research is being carried out on the whole question of toxic algal bloom. It does not just include red tides; red tides is just one type, and there are a number of types of algal bloom, some of which are not toxic and some of which are. It is interesting, because, for example, some of the algal blooms can be controlled by dosing with copper sulphate, and the honourable member would be aware of that.

We have the Murray-Darling Basin Commission Nutrient Working Group, and I was fairly instrumental in organising the establishment of this group and ensuring that it is kept very much on the agenda of my ministerial colleagues in New South Wales, Victoria and the Federal Government. They are presently ensuring that methods of controlling algal blooms in the Murray Basin are established through the control of nutrient limits, and they are investigating that. The whole question in terms of the Murray is that we have to control the amount of nutrients that go into the river and that picks up a huge number of issues; it picks up the whole question of proper irrigation practices; it picks up the question of effluent being discharged right along the Murray; it even picks up issues such as detergents and sillage from riverboats and houseboats going into the river. In other words, we have to stop using the Murray as some kind of drain. I think most of the community realises that, notwithstanding that I am not terribly popular with some houseboat owners because we are talking about a phased in two-year period before having sewage and sillage tanks on-board boats and pump-out facilities provided along the Murray. It is not just South Australia; we are talking about the three States working cooperatively to have proper standards and requirements, and I hope the riverboat industry will not see that as anything but a proper use of a resource that they will want people to use in the future. In other

words, if we look after that resource we will create a market for it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** They probably will not; that will be a problem. I hope that we will be able to sit down and talk this through and they will see this not as the heavy hand of Government but as something about which we will work with them to phase in over a period of years.

A series of workshops and seminars has been held, and a workshop was held at the State Water Laboratory on 30 and 31 July 1990 to discuss ways to control toxic algae in water supplies. The workshop was attended by officers from water supply authorities, departments of agriculture and health authorities. Indeed, these people came from Victoria and New South Wales, so we really do have cooperation across the States to get on top of this problem. Professor Falconer from the University of New England also attended, and he is considered to be the Australian expert in this area.

A further seminar and workshop will be held at the Sydney Water Board in November this year. The keynote speaker will be Professor G.A. Codd from the University of Dundee; that might give the honourable member a hint to the answer to his last question. Both these meetings will influence E&WS Department planning for future occurrences. It is also planned to send an officer from the Australian Centre for Water Treatment and Water Quality Research overseas to gain first-hand knowledge from the leading institutions. With respect to the future actions, we will be looking at monitoring water bodies along the Murray River and this will be intensified in the coming summer of 1990-91. A cooperative study on toxic algae in the Murray-Darling Basin, to be conducted by the CSIRO and the Centre for Water Treatment and Water Quality Research, and funded through the national resources management strategy, which is one of the programs of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, will begin in September. In fact, I believe that, if it has not started, it will be starting very shortly, this year. Studies by the E&WS will also be expanded with emphasis on developing water treatment methods. As I have outlined earlier, contingency plans have been developed to control toxic algae.

With respect to the last part of the honourable member's question, I shall provide him with a list of the places that we are planning that the officer from the Australian Centre for Water Treatment and Water Quality Research will be visiting, and I shall ensure that we provide the honourable member with the latest information about where the most up-to-date research is taking place so that, if he is planning a study tour in the future, I would be delighted, as the Minister responsible for him to visit some of these places and bring back the latest in technology and research.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister say whether my constituents in West Lakes Boulevard who had problems with sewage entering their home (and the Minister would be aware of that particular incident) have had that matter resolved to their satisfaction? Before the Minister responds, I would like to place on record my appreciation of the Minister and her staff for the manner in which they carried out their duties and expedited the clean-up of those four units. As I have indicated to the Minister previously, we hear a number of people who are very quick to ridicule Government agencies and public servants, but rarely do we hear someone who is prepared to give them the praise they justifiably deserve, as in this case.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The short answer is, yes, it has been resolved. I would like to put on public record my thanks to and appreciation of the officers of the department for the sensitive way in which they handled a very emo-

tional trauma for people living in that area. If Peter Cooper has a word about anything I have not covered, I would be delighted for him to speak.

**Mr Cooper:** On a slightly lighter note, I have discovered that Football Park sewage goes into that system, so I will pay close attention to that system in the next four weeks and, in fact, I will ask my officers to measure how much comes out of Football Park so that we do not have any further embarrassment over that period.

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

**Mr HAMILTON:** The last question and answer before the dinner adjournment indicated that the problem of my constituents who live in the four units in Woodbridge Court may have been attributed in some way to the sewage coming from the South Australian National Football League headquarters. If that be the case, I would be most interested in the implications for the State Government and perhaps for the SANFL, with which I have a good relationship. Does it indicate that there is a problem created by the sewage that flowed from the headquarters system into the E&WS system?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask the appropriate officer, Mr Cooper, to elaborate on what he felt was just a light-hearted note on which to finish prior to dinner. It is not my understanding that the SANFL facility at West Lakes actually caused the problem. The statement was made that it is actually in the same sewer system.

**Mr Cooper:** It is correct that the SANFL discharge from Football Park was nothing to do with the flooding at Lakeside Village. When we examined that system to design a long term fail-safe system to stop the recurrence of that flooding, we realised that the SANFL system was connected to it. It is a large connection but it has been designed for it. We thought it prudent to check the flows that will come out at Grand Final time to ensure that everything is under control. As it is a key sporting event, and if the Commonwealth Games are held there in 1998, we want to be on top of the situation. Out of interest, we will measure the flows during the finals series and that information will help us in the design of a permanent overflow system from the total collection system into surrounding systems to ease the load. I will ensure that standby pumps are available for that system over that period so that we have no further problems such as the Lakeside Village flooding, as well as servicing other equipment. I assure the honourable member that we are doing everything we can, and we are looking at this permanent overflow system to be installed. It will cost some money, but it will be a proper engineering solution.

**Mr HAMILTON:** As a supplementary question, what sort of cost is envisaged?

**Mr Cooper:** We have not estimated the cost. It may be \$100 000 or more.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Under 'Issues/Trends' on pages 319 to 321 of the Program Estimates, there appear three tables which compare the performance indicators over the past four years of the department in responding to various consumer demands, both in the financial sense and in the practical engineering sense. I find it worrying that some of these targets for 1990-91 represent in fact a decline in standards of service over previous years. Particularly, I refer to the number of priority 1 bursts per 1 000 customers, which rose from 1.8 in 1988-89 to 2.1 in 1989-90, and the target for 1990-91 is to keep them lower than 2.5.

Similarly, the 1990-91 target for the time to restore supply to 80 per cent of priority 1 bursts is less than 12 hours, in

other words, a less speedy response than last year. There is a reduction in the percentage standard of samples of filtered water at consumer's tap of acceptable microbiological quality, and there are other quite serious reductions in standards in the other tables. This seems to be a strange set of goals because normally we try to improve our performance. What are the reasons for this decline in standards in setting goals for the department at a lower level than previously achieved?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The honourable member would be aware that, for some time, the Government has required agencies to reduce their operating budgets and to give up a productivity amount, as we said this morning, so we can actually cut back on the total budget. The fact that the E&WS Department has cut its workforce (and Mr Killmier will be able to provide the exact figures) by half in about the last eight years indicates that we have very serious pressures on the department to provide the same standard of service with fewer personnel but with greater economic pressures. These pressures are not confined to this department, State or country; they are worldwide economic pressures. We have adopted a realistic approach to the kind of service we can provide.

I have said in the Parliament and publicly on a number of occasions that we are still not charging the full amount of what it costs the department to provide a water supply and to take away sewage. Looking at what happens across the State, one sees that we actually subsidise country consumers. I do not have a problem with that because country consumers have disadvantages associated with distance from major regional centres, etc., but we sometimes lose sight of the fact that the department is subsidising a number of areas within the department, including country areas. As members might know, we have a situation with respect to the provision of irrigation. We are subsidising the provision of irrigation water in the Riverland and other parts of the State.

Against that backdrop, we are expected to provide greater services, because I remind the honourable member that our services are being extended into the new and developing suburbs while, at the same time, we are expected to provide the same quality of service in terms of response times, etc. It is realistic to suggest that we may not be able to do everything we have done in the past, plus increase the number of services that we provide, and the quality of the service, and to do so in a sense with the same or fewer resources. That is the general explanation, but I will ask the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Mr Killmier, to further elaborate with respect to the question.

**Mr Killmier:** In looking at response times and taking account of what the Minister has said, it must be borne in mind that one of the measures of performance is the cost to the ratepayer. Before we get to the actual response times, you will notice in the case of the metropolitan water supply that in fact the real operating expense per customer has been brought down, admittedly only marginally, from \$125 to \$122 in 1989-90. In the case of the country water supply, the real operating expenses have come down from \$296 per customer to \$240—a very significant reduction in charges.

Going over a little further, one of the success stories of the department in recent years has been the reduction in irrigation costs, where the real operating expenses per rated hectare have come down from \$664 to \$458, with a target this year of \$451. The targets are set with a view to their being something that should not be exceeded, rather than being something that we are aiming to get to. Clearly, we are not aiming to have 2.5 priority 1 bursts per 1 000 customers.

We must bear in mind, although the Committee might not believe this, that bursts do not occur consistently. As a result of weather conditions and a whole range of other factors the rate of bursts is somewhat cyclical. The figures set are seen as being an upper limit rather than something that we would be happy to see occur.

In respect of water quality complaints there has been a significant reduction from 7.6 to 4.4 per 1 000 customers, which is almost half. Given the number of water quality complaints that we got three or four years ago, getting it down to 4.4 is a clear indication that the Government's initiative in water filtration has been highly successful. We have set a figure of 5, but it may be that the end result is even less than 4.4.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As I announced earlier, as we move to stage 2 of the Happy Valley water filtration plant and beyond, in terms of providing filtered water to the whole of Adelaide, we would expect considerable improvements in some areas, but those improvements have a cost. One cannot provide for small amounts the quality of water filtration that we have to provide in this State: huge capital injections requiring a high level of sophistication of engineering skills are required. We must look at the situation in total against a backdrop of an ever increasing squeeze from Treasury. That squeeze comes from beyond the State borders as well. We are trying to provide a quality of service at an affordable cost and, at the same time, undertake all the community's requirements.

**Mr Killmier:** One area about which both Mr Cooper and I are concerned is the number of chokes in sewers. We readily concede that the number of chokes has been increasing. It went up from 42 to 52, and then 54. We have set a target of fewer than 50. We are talking about a number of initiatives, some of which we alluded to earlier, where we will be using chemical means to reduce root infiltration of sewers. We have increased the number of choke trucks on the road, and we are increasing the frequency with which we are able to drag and clean key sewers, so that we can avoid difficult situations. Nobody likes choked mains or connections, as happens from time to time: they are no fun for anyone. We are not complacent about it.

Only within the past week or so I asked the Director, Operations, to undertake a review of the allocation of funding to try to see whether we can put more of our funds in that direction. However, if we do that, someone else must get less of the cake. As water filtration has had a big run for the past 10 or 15 years, the day may be coming when we realise that sewers are extremely important. After all, they can have health implications and, although water filtration has some health related aspects, generally much of the filtration is associated with aesthetics. It is not easy and there is a limited amount of capital. Every year we must try to steer our way between the competing demands for funds.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** As I understand the Minister's response, she is admitting that standards are falling because of inadequate resources; there seems to be no other way of reading it. Whilst I acknowledge that response times have generally been fairly good, the slowing down of response times in respect of burst mains and sewers is a serious health risk, as the Director-General would know, because I had to attend to one recently in my own electorate. The table on page 321 is very serious indeed, because it indicates that the percentage of program samples of acceptable effluent quality from sewage treatment works in 1989-90 resulted in 40 per cent of those samples not being acceptable.

That seems to carry serious health risks. The department has a goal of 85 per cent in this financial year, and that means that the department is willing to tolerate a situation where five years ago 91 per cent was acceptable, and in this current year 15 per cent will be unacceptable. Can the Minister say what is the Health Commission's attitude to that level of unacceptable effluent quality? In assessing that quality, can the Minister say whether the samples will be taken on a similar basis of frequency this year as in the past years? Of course, it is easy to reduce the percentage if the frequency is also reduced.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I want to pick up a couple of points made by the honourable member. The explanation given by the Acting Chief Executive Officer and me did not suggest that, because we have reduced resources, we must therefore reduce standards. It was made clear that in some areas we have increased the standard. We have talked about reducing the number of water quality complaints. What we have done has been to be honest about the situation and acknowledge—

*The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** We are not trying to hide anything, and that needs to be acknowledged. There is an increase, and I answered the question honestly before the adjournment: we have had an increase in the number of chokes caused by the infiltration of tree roots. I acknowledge that we are spending almost \$2.8 million a year in this area, but there is not a real understanding in the community that, when the Minister of Water Resources says, 'No, you cannot plant those sorts of trees,' somehow that is taken to mean, 'We will ignore that and we will plant trees, anyway.' At the end of the day it is the same community that must pay for this maintenance. If we said that we wanted to reduce the number of chokes in sewers, we would have the trucks on stand-by 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We would then have to be honest and tell the community that, if it wants a quicker response time as a result of the increasing number of chokes caused by old sewers and, more importantly, by the planting of inappropriate trees, or poorly planted trees, where councils have not consulted with the department about how such plantings should be undertaken, any Government, Minister or the Opposition must say to the community that, if it wants trees and does not want the problem of choked sewers, which is the sort of the problem that the honourable member experienced in her area recently, someone must pay for it. People must be honest enough to recognise that.

To make the simple statement that, 'Resources are being cut so therefore standards are being reduced,' is not correct; and I want to make sure that that is on the public record. There is an increase in the number of chokes, and they are increasing quite markedly because there is not this support at the local government level for proper and responsible planting of trees and for councils to work with the department in a number of areas.

I must clarify that for the record. We have cut some of the response times and the number of complaints in a number of areas. In some areas we have not been able to do that, not because we have said, 'Too bad, we will cut the resources', but because those things have increased as the population of the State has increased, particularly in outer metropolitan suburbs of Adelaide. I will ask the Acting CEO and, perhaps, Mr Cooper to comment on the specific question about the Health Commission and the quality of effluent.

**Mr Killmier:** Mention is made of a reduction in the rate of program samples acceptable being down from 89 per cent to 60 per cent. We have acknowledged that on the right-

hand side of the page. We say that there are problems at the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works, which resulted in substandard effluent being discharged into the Port River. One of the reasons for that was that we were unfortunate enough to receive a slug of trade waste that we did not exactly invite. Mr Cooper will explain the impact of that sort of thing in a moment. It is well known (at least I hope it is known; this was mentioned in the Hudson report and other documents), that it is the department's intention—and we are working strongly towards this—to become far more active in the trade waste area. There are a number of reasons for that: we must ensure that effluent going out of the plant contains the least quantity of substances such as heavy metals, and whatever, that we can possibly get. The way to do that is to ensure that people using the sewers are not abusing them, because abuse of the things can mean not only that the plant effluent is substandard—or can be substandard—but also that, if it is bad enough, the whole process can be knocked over. Perhaps Mr Cooper can give a more technical explanation of what happens in those circumstances.

**Mr Cooper:** First, I would like to respond to the honourable member's question by pointing out that the percentage of program samples of acceptable effluent quality does not refer to health; it is not an indication of the pathogenic level of the effluent. The effluents are chlorinated in the summer at Glenelg, as I explained earlier, and all the time at Port Adelaide in relation to outflow to the Port River. They are quite safe and meet the standards from a disinfection point of view.

The level that we are measuring and on which we are reporting is the level of biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solids in the effluent. The waters that have received those discharges at Glenelg, Port Adelaide, Christies Beach and Bolivar have quite happily taken the slightly higher levels. In fact, the levels are just over the target we set, a target that we have imposed on ourselves ever since we designed and put in those plants in the 1930s and onward. We were marginally over the targets of BOD and suspended solids. I wanted to make clear that it is not a public health measure; it is a measure of biochemical oxygen demand on the water.

As the Acting CEO said, Port Adelaide was upset by an illegal toxic discharge, which is almost impossible to trace. Currently, we are developing methods that may enable us to fingerprint the system, as it were, and to go back and find the source of the discharges. We would dearly love to get a prosecution on this. This is a problem throughout the world. As members would obviously have read in the press in Sydney and Melbourne, it is very easy to hide obnoxious materials down the sewer. I hope that that clarifies the honourable member's question. We can supply information in relation to disinfection if the honourable member so desires.

Just to refresh the memory of honourable members, we are also having Port Adelaide totally reviewed by an interstate consulting engineering firm. The team is expert in waste water treatment, and, as well as looking into the nitrogen and phosphorus removal as a possibility, it is also looking at the whole process to see whether the system needs in any way to be made more efficient, robust, and so on.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Rather than take up the time of the Committee with chemical information, I will put questions on notice about the impact of BOD levels on the sea and rivers. Program 5 on page 119 refers to irrigation services. At least I assume that this is the right line under which to ask this question. I refer the Minister

to the report of the annual general meeting of the Australian Wine and Brandy Producers Association, in which the President referred to the Premier's agreement to establish a wine grape resource development committee, charged with assessing all the resources that contribute to the production of wine, including human, water, soil, conservation, grapes, technology, education, and so forth.

The Liberal Party, in its wine policy, undertook to examine ways in which the resource base of the wine industry could be strengthened, in respect of both yield and fruit quality, recognising the importance of water management as a vital component in achieving good yield and quality. I know that my colleague the member for Culance, who represents the Clare Valley, which produces some of the State's most famous wines would be interested in the answer to this question. What resources have been allocated by the department this year to assist the wine industry through the wine grape resource development committee in achieving improved water management to assist in producing good yield and quality?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I can answer the question generally. The South Australian Water Resources Council has considered this issue, and the honourable member may recall that, as a result of the successful passage through the Parliament of the Water Resources Act, we have now established a new Water Resources Council. That council is dynamic, it is representative in its membership and it has certainly addressed this whole question with respect to the issues of water and water quality. Just to ensure that there may well be some other specific measures that have been taken or that are being taken, I will ask Mr Norman to respond.

**Mr Norman:** Of course, the wine industry has been active in this State for many years. Over probably the past 15 to 20 years there has been a shift in the activities of viticulturists with respect to the use of and the demand for water. About 20 years ago the practice was almost exclusively not to irrigate vineyards. However, since that time there has been an increase in the acreage of vineyards under irrigation.

In fact, nearly all vineyards established today have permanent irrigation facilities provided, which was not the case in the past. What has happened over that 20-year period is that production of grapes on a State-wide basis has increased quite substantially by about 30 to 50 per cent, due not only to the increase in area planted to vines but also to the irrigation of those vines, which increases the yield per hectare. The vineyard operators have found that that increased yield has not jeopardised quality, so water has been used increasingly over that period.

That has meant that there has been an increasing demand on the State's water resources to support the viticulture industry to the point now where, in the Barossa Valley, and recently the Willunga Basin area and the Southern Vales area, it has been necessary to proclaim those areas in order to properly manage the ground water resources in both those areas. In other areas such as Padthaway and Coonawarra those ground water resources have also been proclaimed because of not only viticultural activities but also the mixture of activities that goes on in all those areas, including the Barossa, the Willunga Basin and the South-East. In the Clare-Watervale case, there has been increasing demand on the ground water resource for similar reasons and, indeed, that resource is also coming under some degree of stress.

To sum up, I think it is fair to say that the water resources exist in the areas where soil and climatic conditions are such that viticulture is practised in this State, but the water resources of South Australia are becoming a limiting factor. That is not because of any management practice or alloca-

tion policy on the part of the Government or the E&WS Department but is due simply to the fact that the resources are finite and, indeed, the point is being reached where further demands will not be able to be placed on those limited resources. Therefore, I think it is fair to say that, if a limit is being caused because of the water resources aspect in respect of viticultural activity in the State, it is due to the fact that we have only a finite resource to tap.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Page 322 of the Program Estimates indicates that nitrogen and phosphorus reduction facilities will be added to the Hahndorf sewage treatment works. What is the reason for incorporating these facilities at the sewage treatment works and when will the consultant's report be received?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The treated effluent from Hahndorf currently discharges to the Mount Bold catchment area. Nitrogen and phosphorus in the effluent contributes to elevated nutrient levels in Mount Bold reservoir and that promotes the growth of algae that can cause taste and odour problems at the Happy Valley water treatment plant. The answers to these questions are usually very expensive ones.

The engineering consultants, Guthridge Haskins and Davey, were engaged to investigate options to reduce nutrients in the effluent. Their concept design report for upgrading the Hahndorf sewage treatment works has now been submitted to the department and the recommendations of that report are to upgrade the works from a design capacity of 3 000 persons to some 4 600 persons. The design is to include facilities for the removal of nitrogen by biological techniques and for the removal of phosphorus by the addition of chemicals.

The capital cost of this proposed upgrade is approximately \$2 million. Again, I remind members that any proposals which do improve the water quality with respect to either drinking water in this State or the treatment of effluent and waste waters always involves a large capital cost.

A submission is now being prepared to seek approval to proceed with the detailed design of the treatment works. I hope that the plant can be commissioned by June 1992. Again, this is one of our commitments to improving the quality of water and it is one of the commitments that I believe we will fund through the environmental levy.

**Mr FERGUSON:** As a supplementary question, what areas will be covered by the scheme to improve the water quality?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As I indicated earlier, if we can reduce the nutrient levels in the Mount Bold reservoir, and if we can reduce the nutrient problem, that may well be passed through to the Happy Valley filtration plant. We are talking about 400 000 people who are actually supplied with filtered water from the Happy Valley filtration plant. So, we are really talking about 40 per cent of the population of Adelaide. It is an important move forward and I believe it is one with which we must proceed as quickly as possible.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Page 324 of the Program Estimates states that the Woolpunda ground water salinity interception scheme will be commissioned in September 1990. Is the project on schedule and will the scheme be commissioned this month as planned?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It is vitally important that we keep before the general public the fact that we have continuing salinity problems with the water coming into South Australia from the Murray River. It has been determined by both the Murray-Darling Commission and the ministerial council that we have to attack this problem on a number of fronts. One of them is to provide immediate engineering solutions and, again, those solutions are expensive. How-

ever, I believe that they are vital, as does the commission and the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council.

One such scheme was the salt interception scheme at Woolpunda, which entails the sinking of bores with small pumps on the end of them. We intercept the very highly saline water before it actually reaches the Murray River and pump that highly saline water out to properly located and environmentally sound—obviously, we will not put it back into the system for thousands of years—evaporative basins.

In March 1989 I had the privilege of going to the Riverland and officially opening the scheme on behalf of the ministerial council and commission. The scheme has proceeded on schedule with the pump testing commencing in July this year. The scheme comprises some 49 bores along a 30 kilometre reach of the Murray River between Waikerie and Overland Corner. When one considers that that is 49 bores over a 30 kilometre distance, we are talking about a very substantial scheme.

In addition, 24 bores in the western half of the scheme are now pumping to the disposal basin at Stockyard Plains, which is starting to fill already, so as we sit here discussing this matter, the bores are pumping away and they are filling the evaporative basin at Stockyard Plains. This particular aspect constitutes phase 1 commissioning of the project, with half the bores pumping at double capacity and the disposal pipeline at full capacity. This high initial pumping rate is required to draw the watertable down to its design level, which should be achieved within a six-month period. After this period, the second half of the bore field will then be brought on-line, with the phase 1 pumps being dropped to the long-term flow, and the construction on the eastern section is currently proceeding on target.

The scheme was approved by Cabinet in October 1988 at an estimated cost of \$25.1 million, of which \$22.7 million was for the detailed design and construction. The expenditure to date is \$15.5 million and it is projected that a significant cost saving in the order of some \$2 million will be achieved. The final saving will now depend largely on the extent of the works required for the control of the deposition within the system. I am excited by this engineering feat with which the department has been involved. We have been given the responsibility in South Australia to oversee the project. It is an exciting project and several similar projects will follow its success.

As I indicated at the beginning of my answer, it is one aspect in mitigating the effects of salinity on the Murray River. We still have to proceed with an overall basin management of our natural resources if we are to achieve long-term benefits and gains in reducing salinity levels. What we are doing is preventing highly saline ground water reaching the Murray River. We and future generations of people who will sit in Estimates Committees must ensure that we get our overall natural resources management right. That will include the farming community and matters such as not having effluent disposal into the Murray River, better management of our land, water and total resource management of the whole basin. We are moving constructively to ensure that we achieve that goal. In the meantime the engineering solutions are vital to ensure that we maintain a reasonable quality of water in terms of the salinity level coming into South Australia.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I ask the Minister about the low pressure water scheme at Port Parham and Webb Beach. At page 320 of the Program Estimates it was reported that a low pressure water reticulation scheme was constructed for the townships of Port Parham and Webb Beach under the Country Towns Water Supply Improvement Scheme. Will the Minister advise on the success of the scheme to date,

bearing in mind the pioneering nature of the design standards, and on the residents' reaction to the standard of supply?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the honourable member for his question. This matter has caused quite a bit of excitement among some interstate colleagues of members of my department. The scheme has been in operation since May of this year. It was as a result of the request from a number of residents who were quite desperate because water was short due to unseasonably dry conditions. A temporary bypass was installed to allow the scheme to be operated prior to the completion of the pump station which was not due to be completed until the end of June.

Applications for a water service were received from 146 of the 223 property owners prior to construction of the scheme, with three more property owners applying since that time. However, to date only about 60 per cent of owners have connected up to the internal system. Following good winter rains, many shackowners are no doubt waiting until the summer before utilising the reticulated supply. Each service is restricted to a flow of 10 mm per minute. I remind honourable members—I am sure that they do not carry such figures in their heads—that the normal minimum departmental standard is 28 litres per minute. We are talking about a low flow, low pressure system. Residents have accepted the lower standard of supply, stating that they believe that it is certainly preferable to the former position.

The use of polythene pipe in fittings and other lower cost design features have so far proven to be successful. The department is always conscious of the environmental impact of any scheme that it implements, but, being particularly conscious of the implementation of this scheme, the department has ensured that trees were planted around the pump station and tanks so that they did not cause visual pollution in the environment. That drew favourable comments from several local residents.

The final cost of the scheme is expected to be \$465 000, which is \$52 000 or 10 per cent under the scheme approval. I hope that an official opening will take place some time next month. The scheme highlights that in many places in South Australia people are prepared to accept a slightly lower standard than we in the city demand. They have the immediate problems of being dependent on seasonal rainfall, and when there is drought they are put under great stress. It was a case of the department working positively with the local community and responding to the requests of that community and providing a comprehensive service, but a service that was at a much lower cost than would normally have been anticipated. Indeed, the department probably would not have been able to proceed with the service had we not been able to reach agreement with and get the support of the local community. I publicly commend the community for the way in which they have worked with my departmental officers.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I refer to page 120 of the Estimates of Payments relating to 'Other Community Services'. In the past year an additional \$4.6 million was allocated to the protection and improvement of the Torrens River, including subsidies to councils, administration and other purposes. Will the Minister explain how that money was spent, and why the amount, with which I do not quarrel, was so dramatically increased?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The figure is in thousands.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** I beg the Minister's pardon. I was looking at the wrong range of noughts. For what is the \$18 000 to be used in light of the wishes of the Torrens River Improvement Standing Committee, which could spend

\$18 000 in half an hour on some of the things that need to be done?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I shall ask the Chief Executive Officer to answer that question. I do not know the answer off the top of my head. For a moment I thought that the honourable member was going to ask me about the Torrens River Linear Park.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** That is the next question.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I shall defer my answer. I shall ask the Chief Executive Officer to explain. It is important to point out that we are talking about an increase from \$16 643 to \$18 000.

**Mr Killmier:** The River Torrens Protection Act has existed for a great many years. The Torrens River Committee is made up of departmental officers and representatives of a range of councils and other interested bodies. The amounts of money are minor and they are used for small jobs. For example, from time to time it is necessary to go halves in putting up a new fence or repairing things that fall into no man's land—they must be paid for by somebody. I refer to matters such as weed spraying. The beauty of the linear park—perhaps we should wait until the question is asked—is that instead of having the old situation in which nobody wanted to own the river, so the situation was difficult and derelict, we have been able to handle flood protection, lay the banks back, plant trees, tidy the area and, with the cooperation of councils, hand back responsibility to councils to undertake ongoing maintenance. When the river is dealt with under the linear park, this line will probably become extinct. Members of the Committee will know that the linear park is complete from the city—

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:*

**Mr Killmier:** I am in trouble with the Minister for going too far. The linear park is complete from the city to the sea. Perhaps I shall let the Minister say what is to happen on the other side.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thought that the Chief Executive Officer was pre-empting the question from the honourable member for Coles.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Completion of the park is already four years overdue. It was established as a sesqui-centennial project. The present Government promised, that if it was not ready in 1986, it would be completed for the bicentenary in 1988. We are now in 1990 and, from my inspection of the works that need to be done in the east of the city, it is unlikely that the work will be finished by the end of 1991. Will the Minister advise the Committee of the program and the allocation for the current year, and indicate when this park will be finished?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It has taken longer than any of us thought, and that reflects, again, the very tight budgetary situation that has existed in South Australia for the past four or five years. On the point made by Mr Killmier, the whole of the western suburbs area has been completed and we expect that area to be opened in October.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Lucky you!

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That was the priority.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I should like to make the point that the northern suburbs are not even included in that linear park.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The only areas included are those suburbs through which the Torrens River winds its way. I do not think that we can reroute the Torrens River to suit the member for Napier although, I guess, we could look at that if we were required to. I will read out for the honourable member the priorities that were determined some time ago. Priority 1 would be the whole of the western suburbs; priority 2, the inner eastern suburbs east of OG



Road, Klemzig; priority 3, the outer eastern suburbs east of Silks Road, Paradise; and the final priority, the full completion of the Athelstone to Highbury sector.

The current approval was for some \$28.2 million, and I believe that the final estimated cost will be about \$32 million, so it is a major project with an enormous capital commitment. The expenditure to 30 June 1990 has been some \$18.81 million, so we are over half way in terms of the capital expenditure. That does not include the section of the linear park that was associated with the north-east busway. That was constructed at a further cost of \$5 million so, if you add the \$5 million to the \$18.81 million, the total cost is approximately \$23 million.

In terms of the program for 1990-91, which the honourable member has specifically asked about, the new construction works will be undertaken in the priority 2 area, the inner eastern suburbs. In fact, \$2.2 million has been set aside in this budget for these works, which are due for completion in 1992. The western suburbs area will be handed over, and I hope that we will be able to complete the linear park by 1993. I extended the legislation in the Parliament last year and it is my intention, as Minister of Water Resources responsible for the River Torrens Linear Park, to move completion forward as quickly as possible, given willingness and support of my Cabinet colleagues to ensure that the funds are available.

Once this park is completed, we will have something of which we can be justifiably proud. It will be a 30 kilometre linear park, and I am told that it will be the longest linear park of any capital city in this country. One of the fundamental reasons for proceeding with this work was to ensure that any floods in the Torrens River of up to a one in 200 year occurrence would be mitigated, so that not only do we have a beautiful green area available to the community to cycle, walk and run on, etc., but we are doing very necessary flood mitigation work with the completion of this project.

I take the honourable member's point and her criticism. If funds were available for everything we would like to do, this park would have been completed on time or ahead of schedule. I hope that we will be able to complete the park by 1993.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I agree with what the Minister said about flood mitigation and the unique nature of the park, and I think that the member for Chaffey has never been given public credit for his initiative.

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** I am not suggesting that the Minister has not given him the credit, but it has not been recognised.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It has been a bipartisan project.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Are there any plans to finance some of the work east of Silks Road through the exchange of land between the Government and developers in the Highbury area who want to subdivide land adjacent to the park?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Discussions are proceeding with respect to the completion of that final stage of the park. We are trying to ensure that enough land is set aside for the sections either side of the river so that the park may be completed. A proposal is under discussion at the moment with people in the local community.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** As a supplementary question, if that exchange of land and, therefore, money is to occur, what impact will that have on the sum the Minister indicated will be required to finish the park?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The total sum required to finish the park will be the same.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** How much will the Government save?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I cannot tell the honourable member that at this time, as the discussions have not been completed and the proposal has not been finalised. It would be a little premature to canvass those amounts. I believe that if the proposal is successful it will mean an injection of funds in terms of being able to complete the linear park within a timeframe acceptable to the honourable member (whose electorate is nearby) and to all members whose electorates in the eastern area take in the River Torrens Linear Park.

The total cost of completing the work will remain the same. This will be a way of ensuring that we can commit the funding to the completion of that area and do it in such a way that it is sensitive to the needs of the local community and the local councils. We must ensure the provision of adequate housing in that area, which is necessary, but at the same time ensure the preservation of that quite exciting and unique environment.

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

Works and Services—Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$14 998 000—Examination declared completed.

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous, \$760 000—Examination declared completed.

Works and Services—South-Eastern Drainage Board, \$330 000—Examination declared completed.

Lands, \$14 875 000

Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous \$11 000

**Chairman:**

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings

**Members:**

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore

Mr T.R. Groom

Mr K. C. Hamilton

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr I.P. Lewis

Mr I.H. Venning

**Witness:**

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

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr L.B. Kidd, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Department of Lands.

Mr M.F. Whinnen, Acting Director, Operations Services.  
Ms D.A. Stimson, Assistant Director, Regional Operations.

Mr J.R. Porter, Surveyor-General.

Mr C.T. Backen, Deputy Valuer-General.

Mr J.G. Maher, Registrar-General.

Mr R. Lai, Acting Manager, Management Accounting and Budgeting Branch.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The Department of Lands is continuing to strive for better service to its many client groups, greater job satisfaction and personal development opportunities for its staff and efficiency in the way it gets things done. These objectives underpin everything the department does. They require ongoing review of activities

and procedures for relevance and a continuing search for technical innovation. In this situation, even the review process itself must change if it is to maintain its impact. During 1989-90, a series of reviews of specific service delivery activities was conducted by the management committee of the department. These reviews looked at processes ranging from credit checks on clients seeking to open accounts through to the technical examination of plans lodged with the Registration Division and the issue of land grants. This year, that part of the review process will be aimed particularly at inter-relationships between activities. This will give a different perspective to the same objective—producing a better service with the same or lower resource inputs. A full formal review of departmental objectives and strategies, involving a wide cross-section of staff, is also under way.

Some of the highlights from 1989-90 performance include: the establishment of a small, very active client contact group; the relaunching of the land ownership and tenure system to celebrate its 10th anniversary (involved in that was that connection fees were abolished for remote users and the system was made available on a seven day a week basis); the launching of the computerised title (Torrens Automated Title System, otherwise known as TATS); the introduction of a new land information management training program; developing further opportunities for staff to participate in overseas consultancy projects; improved use of the aircraft through two overseas aerial photography projects; the introduction of a new revenue recording system with the object of improving internal information systems (it has also resulted in substantial productivity improvements and more are anticipated); work begun on implementation of the new Pastoral Lands Management and Conservation Act; and preparation of a green paper for a new Crown Lands Act. The Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, the Survey Act and the Geographical Names Act were also reviewed and proposals for change released for public comment and discussion.

These achievements have been recorded within the budgetary allocations approved for the department. Members of the Committee may have noted from the Auditor-General's Report that the net cost of the department's recurrent operations increased by \$4 million in 1989-90. It is worth recording that a large proportion of that increase was not an additional cost to the consolidated account overall; it was the result of transferring costs of the Centre for Remote Sensing and the survey operations of Sacon and other items which had previously been paid under other headings in the estimates to the Department of Lands. The major item not in the 'accounting adjustment' category was \$1.2 million for wage increases.

For 1990-91 and future years, a new financial discipline has been placed upon the department. The main measure of financial performance will be the net call on consolidated account, a concept which embraces both recurrent and capital expenditures and receipts and requires a planned and agreed reduction in the department's impact on the overall finances of the Government over time. This new approach reflects the department's progress towards a more commercial outlook. It will give further impetus to the objectives of better client service and efficiency through review of activities and improved staff morale, which I mentioned earlier.

**Mr LEWIS:** Under the programs and subprograms referred to in Financial Paper No. 1 on pages 329 and 330, a number of items are used of a capital nature, and they include motor vehicles, although they are not specified in those programs. I would like to know how many motor vehicles are used in each of those programs or subprograms and,

therefore, what is the total in each department, and what increase does this represent over the past year? How many are for the exclusive use of any one executive officer or any other officer of any of those programs within the department?

Would the Minister also identify for the Committee the various categories of vehicles, that is, four cylinder and larger ordinary motor cars, four-wheel drive vehicles, light-weight and heavy trucks, and say how many, if any, are run on diesel or gas, both LPG and mains gas, and, if none are run on LPG or mains gas, whether there is a program for conversion; and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That question obviously has 10 different aspects to it. I am happy to provide that information for the honourable member. I do have some information which would set the general scene in terms of motor vehicles, such as the number and general categories. Some of that specific information will need to be provided at a later date, and I undertake that that further information will be provided by 28 September.

At 30 June 1990, the department vehicle fleet numbered 115 vehicles. Of these, 72 were sedan-type vehicles, while the remainder are larger four-wheel drive vehicles and vans. Also, the department has seven trailers and one fork-lift. These vehicles are divided into a number of sub-pools, as the honourable member has indicated, operating from metropolitan and country offices. Two pools of specialised vehicles operate out of the Thebarton depot for the Survey Division and the Outback Region. The total capital cost of the fleet is \$1.94 million, and the replacement cost for 1990-91 is \$956 000, with operating costs at an estimated \$371 000.

In addition to using these vehicles, the department's officers located in the city use vehicles from the central Government car pool. There are two vehicles on permanent allocation to the Valuation Division and one to the Chief Executive Officer. So, that answers in part some of the honourable member's question. In addition, there are four metropolitan vehicles and a further four country vehicles. The hiring of these and others taken out on short-term hire costs the department about \$142 000 for the year. I will ask the Acting CEO to comment further, but we will need to take some of that question on notice and provide the information to the honourable member later.

**Mr Kidd:** About the only thing I can add to the information that the Minister has given at this stage is that we do have five vehicles allocated to divisional Directors in the department. As the Minister said, one is allocated to the Chief Executive Officer and four are allocated to divisional Directors. However, these cars are not for the exclusive use of these people: they are available for general use of staff. The way we operate it within the Department of Lands is that they are available to staff within the divisions of the Directors to whom they are allocated.

**Mr LEWIS:** Referring to the kinds of support provided to the programs and subprograms by other arrangements within the department, in the document, 'The Budget and its Impact on Women', the Department of Lands is said to have 55 committees. I do not know whether that is an accurate statement, but it is interesting because nowhere can I find any other reference to those organisations—those organs—in the budget papers, or to what they cost.

How many committees are there or have there been during the past 12 months in the department; what are the names by which the committees are known; what are they each established to do; when were each of them formed; upon which of them are there members who are not departmental employees; and upon which of them are there members who are paid a sitting fee and/or other allowance or

emolument of any kind? Further, upon which of these committees are there members who are not permanent public servants?

Who are these people by profession or qualification, and why are they members of the departmental committees? Also, which members of the committees are not permanent employees of either a Government department, statutory authority or trust that has otherwise been established by statute? Therefore, who appointed the residual folk—call them public members of those committees—and, overall, what is the budgeted cost of servicing these committees? In the table of information which the Minister may in good grace and at her discretion choose to provide, how often do each of the committees meet?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** When the honourable member referred to the women's budget, I thought he was about to ask a question concerning equal opportunity. I would have been delighted about that, because the Lands Department has a fine and proud record of the way in which it is implementing the Government's policy in equal opportunity. However, I was disappointed. With respect to the number of committees, certainly we will provide that information to the honourable member. However, I will also provide him with the cost to the department to obtain that information because, if we are serious as a Parliament about looking at cost effectiveness and how well we deliver services in this State, it is important that the Parliament knows the costs incurred in answering questions. It will take quite a deal of time and money in terms of the commitment from a department, to obtain answers to those questions. I am very happy to provide that information. I will certainly do everything in my power to assure that the information is provided for the honourable member by 28 September.

**Mr LEWIS:** I would regard every dollar so spent in obtaining that information as well spent because I suspect that the department does not have a consolidated statement of that type about the committees which function within its overall organisation to achieve its goals and how they spend their time. I therefore seek information about the number of consultants that the department is using, not only within the programs and subprograms but also within all its associated agencies and committees. I refer to consultants to whom a fee has been paid during the past 12 months.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I hate to disappoint the member but, in respect of the comment he made before he asked his second question, the department does have access to that information and it does know exactly what committees—

*Mr LEWIS interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It may well cost money to get that information, but the inference was that there were 55 committees all bundling around with no-one really knowing what they were doing. I can assure the honourable member that we will be able to provide that information, and he will be surprised at the professionalism with which the department operates and, indeed, the importance of the membership of the committees.

With regard to the second question, that information is already at hand. The Hon. Mr Lucas in another place sought that information, and it has been collected. We will be providing the cost of doing that. I ask the Acting CEO if he wants to make further information available to the Committee.

**Mr Kidd:** Concerning how much we know about the internal committees of the department, we do not have the kind of detail that the member is asking for and we are going to have to do quite a bit of work to get that detail

together—there is not any doubt about that—because that is not quite the way we manage the committee operation in the department. However, we have a record of the committees operating internally in the department. We manage that through each member of the committees producing a statement on an annual basis, and we will now get that updated. It shows their participation by the number of hours. That report is consolidated in the Management, Accounting and Budgeting Branch, and it is distributed back to the Directors of the divisions in which those people work.

Through the delegated approach under which we operate, it is then the responsibility of the individual divisional Director to look at committee participation by his officers and determine whether or not that participation is worthwhile on a continuing basis. That is how we manage committee participation. We do not look at the overall cost of servicing the committees; rather, we look at the amount of time that individual people spend on them. As I say, the information that the member wants will take a bit of time to collect, because we simply do not collect it or use it in that way.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister indicate the number of women employed in the department, their categories and the work in which they are involved?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As at 30 June 1990 the department employed 935 people, of whom 315 were women. This represents 34 per cent of the work force, the same level compared with last year. Of the 176 positions within the department that equate on salary to administrative officer 1 (AO1) or above, 14 women were employed in that group. This represents 8 per cent and compares favourably to last year (5 per cent). The remainder are in other classification groups, predominantly clerical, with approximately 91 women shown below the clerical barrier.

Also, 61 handicapped people are employed within the department (7 per cent of the work force). This figure is based on a recent survey questionnaire conducted in 1989-90. The department has been actively seeking Aboriginal recruits for vacancies and achieved the objective of 1 per cent of the work force being of Aboriginal composition. Currently, 10 Aborigines are employed in the department (comprising 1.07 per cent of the work force).

With regard to women in non-traditional work areas, in 1990 the department participated in a graduate careers show, targeting areas where recruiting and retaining staff is often difficult. These areas include surveying, valuation and information technology, and they were portrayed as careers for women; they were given particularly attention. This proved successful, with several inquiries being received.

The Survey, Regional Operations and Operations Services Divisions plan to take a more pro-active approach in recruiting women in the foregoing areas, by visiting educational institutions (both tertiary and secondary) promoting these careers in the Department of Lands and encouraging women to pursue careers in these areas.

In 1988-89 the department employed one female surveyor, three female valuers and eight female information technologists. The Department of Lands currently employs three female surveyors, six female valuers and 14 females as information technologists. I seek leave to have the statistical table of employment distribution inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LANDS

	Males	FTEs	Females	FTEs
AO-1 .....	10.0	10.0	2.0	2.0
AO-2 .....	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
AO-3 .....	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.0

	Males	FTEs	Females	FTEs
AO-4	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
AO-5	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
CMO-1	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
CMO-2	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
CO-1B	1.0	1.0	15.0	12.0
CO-1C	5.0	5.0	23.0	21.5
CO-1D	35.0	35.0	76.0	73.3
CO-1E	16.0	16.0	31.0	29.2
CO-2	21.0	21.0	36.0	35.0
CO-3	27.0	27.0	18.0	17.4
CO-4	21.0	21.0	8.0	7.5
CO-5	18.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
CO-6	10.0	10.0	1.0	1.0
CR-3	2.0	2.0	5.0	4.6
EO-1	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
EO-3	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
EO-5	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
ITT-1	7.0	7.0	4.0	4.0
ITT-2	11.0	11.0	4.0	4.0
ITT-3	7.0	7.0	2.0	2.0
ITT-4	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
MIT-1	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
MIT-2	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
MIT-3	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
PD-3	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
PP-3	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
PV-1	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
PV-2	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
RA-2	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
SHR-5	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
SK-1	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
SK-10	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
SO-1	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.0
SO-2	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
SO-3	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
SU-0	12.0	12.0	2.0	2.0
SU-1A	6.0	6.0	1.0	1.0
SU-2	13.0	12.8	0.0	0.0
SU-3	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.0
SU-4	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0
SU-6	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0
TA	46.0	44.5	29.0	24.8
TO-1	85.0	84.7	26.0	24.6
TO-2	7.0	7.0	1.0	1.0
TO-3	74.0	73.8	4.0	3.6
TO-3X	7.0	6.8	0.0	0.0
TO-4	28.0	28.0	0.0	0.0
TO-4Z	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
TO-5	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
TO-6	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
TO-7	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
VL-1	16.0	16.0	6.0	6.0
VL-2	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
VL-3	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
VL-4	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
VL-6	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
	600.0	597.6	310.0	292.5
Weekly Paid		20.0		5.0

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The important aspect of this question relates to the department, because I want to share with the Committee what one of my predecessors as Minister of Lands said some years ago. I hope that no-one will find it offensive, because it was meant to have a slightly lighthearted ring to it. My predecessor described the Department of Lands and the employees as 'the wild colonial boys'. Of course, the department is the oldest Government department, and it is fair to say that for many years it was a traditional male department.

It is a great credit to the men in the department that they have not only welcomed competent women into their ranks but also, as I as Minister have witnessed first hand, encouraged women within their areas of responsibility. They have given women every opportunity to participate in career development courses and in personal development areas. It is vitally important that members of Parliament realise that it is not enough for Governments to have equal opportunity policies that look at redressing the imbalance of male and

female in the departments; they should also be prepared actively to encourage the employment of people with disabilities, people from different cultural backgrounds and, of course, Aboriginal people.

The Department of Lands is setting a fine example to other Government departments, and I certainly believe that that will continue. Although he is not here (so I will not embarrass him personally), it is appropriate to indicate that the Director of Lands has demonstrated a personal commitment to the implementation of equal opportunity that is probably second to none in the Government of South Australia.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to the development of an imaging system to produce diagrams with computerised type as a specific objective of the department in the program of administration of the State lands titles system. What is the present situation with the imaging system and what effect will it have on the computerised system?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** It is certainly our intention in South Australia to have a title diagram accompanying each computerised certificate of title. That is something that the community believes is vitally important: people like to see a diagram accompanying their title. I have some examples here which we could leave with the member a little later. The kit looks at the whole Torrens Automated Title (TATS) System.

An imaging system is considered to be the best solution to provide this diagram. Extensive tender specifications have been prepared and State Supply has advertised the tender through the media. It is anticipated that an imaging system will be in place and operational in the first part of 1991. The installation of the imaging system will provide the diagram to complement the automated record for allotments in new plans of division and the conversion of the existing title register.

Clients connected with the department's remote user network will also be able to order searches of the electronic records in their office and receive details of these searches and the diagrams by means of a facsimile transmission. It is important to recognise, particularly as there are some members in the House from country areas, that the services to country people will be exactly the same as those available to anyone requiring them within the city. Clients searching in the office will be able to receive copies of these titles immediately. I think it is important to recognise that not only are we providing the latest computer titles but we will also provide diagrams through this imaging system.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to page 335 of the Program Estimates and I note that the 1989-90 specific area targets set by the department include:

Pet Trade Code completed.

A Code of Practice for the Guard Dog Industry is being drafted.

Duck Hunting Review Task Force established and reported to the Minister on 4 June 1990.

Advice was given to the Minister on a range of animal welfare issues.

In relation to animal welfare issues, what action is the Minister taking with regard to the oversupply of companion animals?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** As well as being Minister for just about everything else, I am the Minister responsible for animal welfare matters. It is one of the great pleasures and indeed challenges of my portfolio areas. I thank the honourable member for raising this issue because it touches on the lives of very many South Australians. There is a problem of oversupply in respect of companion animals. The Government, in conjunction with private organisations such as the Australian Veterinary Association, the RSPCA, Pet-care and the Animal Welfare League, is sponsoring a pet

week from 4 to 13 October. My officers have organised a two-day public forum to raise awareness about how we treat companion animals and, indeed, of the responsibilities involved in owning and caring for companion animals—or what we commonly call pets.

In addition, I have approved an interagency working party to look into the problems of stray and feral cats and to suggest options for a coordinated Government approach to these problems. The Minister of Agriculture and I are both very interested and involved in this issue of stray and feral cats.

*Mr HAMILTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Well, foxes, too, but they do not relate to this question about pets. I do not know of too many people who keep pet foxes. I am sure members of the Opposition would know of people in country areas who do, but that has not been a major issue for me in relation to my responsibility for animal welfare. My colleagues the Minister of Agriculture and, indeed, the Minister of Local Government—who will of course be critical in this area because, after all, it will be the local government sector that will play a major role in any long-term solution to the problem of stray and feral cats—also support this move and have nominees on the working party.

I will not pretend that there is any simple solution to actually addressing the problem of oversupply and the problem of irresponsible ownership of domestic animals, particularly in cities, because it is a huge problem and one that I know is of concern to a number of members of Parliament.

*Mr HAMILTON interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Yes, the honourable member highlights the fact that it seems very lovely to buy a cute little puppy or a kitten—or as the member for Murray-Mallee said, a bird or some other kind of pet, be it a rabbit or whatever—but people forget that the animal actually matures into an adult and requires an enormous amount of care, proper feeding, proper veterinary attention, immunisation, desexing—and a whole range of other financial and personal time commitments.

People get sick of the pets and they either dump them or, if they are responsible, at least they take them to a shelter, a pound or the RSPCA. Of course, that is where we have the problem. It might interest honourable members to consider the Government's animal welfare program. We have a grant to the RSPCA of some \$339 000. That probably indicates the kind of commitment the Government makes in this area. That is part of a total budgetary allocation of \$442 316.

**Mr LEWIS:** Can the Minister provide the cost of the preparation of the table that was the subject of the first question asked by the member for Albert Park, given that that is detail already provided and on hand? I am interested in the cost of that table and the other information that the Minister gave to the Committee in answer to the first question from the member for Albert Park.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Does the honourable member want the actual cost of providing the table?

**Mr LEWIS:** I want to know the cost of the preparation of the information about the way in which equal opportunities have been implemented throughout the department, the number of people in the various categories that are employed under the Equal Opportunity Act.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I refer the honourable member to the annual report of the Department of Lands. It forms part of the normal accountability to the community of South Australia, and is contained on page 33 of last year's annual report. That is information which, surely, any responsible department would have available all the time,

as a normal procedure. This information was not specifically gathered together for the Estimates Committee; it is part of the responsible administration of the Department of Lands.

**Mr LEWIS:** In relation to the consultancies to which I have already referred, how much is allowed in total for these consulting services in the Consolidated Account for this coming financial year? What is the purpose of the consultancies that are contemplated? How many such consultancies have occurred during the past 12 months in the preparation and publication of reports and which of those reports have been made public; and is it likely that the others will be made public? If so, when? If the Minister does not have that information to hand, perhaps she could provide it for us in a table.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** Again, that information was sought by another member of the Opposition, and I refer him to the question that was asked in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Mr Lucas.

**Mr LEWIS:** Not all that information is in that answer.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** The vast majority of it certainly is but, yes, we are happy to provide that information.

**Mr LEWIS:** Page 330 details the intra-agency support services and we note that last year the Minister's office employed an average of 12.2 full-time equivalents. It is proposed that there will be 12 full-time equivalents. Comparing that with the proposed expenditure from last year of \$517 000, which resulted nonetheless in \$683 000 being spent, we note that there is to be an increase to almost \$800 000 in this financial year, which in rough terms is about 17 per cent. As the number of full-time equivalent staff employed has not increased, why has there been an increase in cost and, if there has been no increase in the level of qualifications required of the individuals, why does that cost exceed the Government's own estimated increase in the cost of salaries and wages for the entire budget by such a large amount?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** There obviously have been increases in salaries, including the Minister's own salary. The honourable member would be aware that I am also the Minister responsible for the approval of all members of Parliament salaries that are paid through this Parliament. My own salary is paid from my Minister of Lands office. The honourable member would be aware of that and I am sure I do not have to go into the details of that, because I am sure he is quite capable of understanding that there has been an increase in the salaries of all members of Parliament.

In terms of the actual specific details, we had a change of staff midway through the year, because I changed portfolios, and whether or not that accounts for the situation, I just cannot say off the top of my head. However, I can assure the honourable member that every member who works in the Minister's office works flat out. If I get into the office at 8 o'clock in the morning, people are there, and people are still there at 6 and 6.30 at night. I probably have one of the biggest workloads of any Minister's office in this Government and that seems to be increasing because of the high priority and profile of environmental issues, the whole question of water issues and, indeed, the number of areas in which the Lands Department has moved in the past few years to address situations that have been allowed to remain in a state of flux. I refer to things like the Pastoral Bill and the fact that we have now released a Green Paper on Crown lands. We have moved forward, dare I suggest to the member for Custance, on the whole question of addressing shacks. We have raised the whole profile in the area of animal welfare and a number of other areas.

At one stage over a period of a fortnight (and it was not a particularly busy fortnight) we estimated that in excess of 25 000 documents requiring my attention or signature would pass through my hands personally in any one year. I decided not to repeat that this year because I did not think I could cope with the statistics that might be provided to me.

However, I must say that I am very proud of the commitment and the enormous amount of dedication and work that the staff in my ministerial office get through and, when I have spoken to my counterparts interstate, particularly in New South Wales, they cannot believe that we run an office the size of my office with the number of staff. Their staffing allocations on their personal ministerial appointments staff are of the order of the number of staff that I have in total, and that includes public servants who carry out routine responsibilities.

I am happy if either of the officers present would like to elaborate on that question, otherwise I am happy to provide a detailed analysis of just what goes on in my office, what people do and their commitment. In fact, we have already provided that information—again for the Opposition, so there obviously is no coordination—as to who is employed, what they are paid, and I think what they actually do in terms of their responsibility within the office. I was also asked that same question this morning. As there is only one Minister's office, I do not think it will have to be provided on two occasions. I am sure that members of the Opposition can coordinate their positions. Again, it is a great waste of time in terms of the paper that is used in *Hansard* and the duplication of resources. The information is available, and I shall certainly provide it to the Opposition. I understand that it has already been provided in the form for which the honourable member asked.

**Mr FERGUSON:** At page 135 of his report the Auditor-General referred to the basis for estimating the revenue for the South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing. Did the centre reach the target of revenue and expenditure that was set for 1989-90?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** No doubt it is the honourable member's wont diligently to study the Auditor-General's Report each year. I half anticipated that the honourable member might ask me a question—I certainly thought that he or one or two other honourable members might ask me that question. I was unaware that the honourable member for Hartley was on this Estimates Committee.

**Mr GROOM:** I did not know, either.

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I am delighted that he is here. Given that three members of the Public Accounts Committee are on this Committee, we would have had to anticipate such a question.

The budgeted revenue for the Centre for Remote Sensing for 1989-90 was \$165 000. The revenue that was actually received was \$160 146. The simple answer is that we did not reach the target for the predicted revenue. The invoices, however, were to the tune of \$209 308, and they were issued prior to 30 June 1990. Hopefully, if everybody pays the bills, in the final analysis we shall receive in excess of that revenue, although it will not show up strictly in that financial year.

The budgeted expenditure of \$537 766 was exceeded by \$13 649 due to additional salaries and oncosts that were debts accrued prior to the handover to the Department of Lands. That additional expenditure was offset by savings effected in other areas of the survey division, and no additional funds were sought from the consolidated account to cover it.

Before the Director-General of the Department of Lands went on leave, he and I had a discussion about the future

of the Centre for Remote Sensing because the Department of Lands jealously guards its reputation as a fine financial manager. I have been assured by the Director-General and again by the Acting Chief Executive Officer that the Department of Lands intends to ensure that, when we sit at this table this time next year, there will be a different story to tell. I ask the Acting Chief Executive Officer to elaborate on that.

**Mr Kidd:** The important point that the Minister made is that the Centre for Remote Sensing is now part of the Department of Lands. It is simply another branch of the Survey Division. Its operations will be integrated into the business operations of the department.

We have been developing an accrual accounting system for about a year, and by the end of this financial year we shall be in a position to present our accounts on a much more commercial basis than in the past. That process will generate a need to restate the financial objectives of the Centre for Remote Sensing in the same way in which it will do so in relation to a host of other operations at the department. We shall incorporate into those business figures items such as depreciation and the cost of debt, which we have not previously tended to include under normal Government accounting processes. There will be an increase in need over the next couple of years to generate further revenues to cover a reasonable share of those costs.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I am a bit concerned about the quality of reports from consultants to Government departments. I do not blame the Lands Department, as it did not control this situation. On page 135, the Auditor-General's Report states:

My predecessor has, over the past three years, raised concerns about the quality of information provided to support proposals for the investment of funds in public sector programs or projects. He also stressed the need for decision makers to ensure that an objective assessment of the financial factors relevant to a program or project and the financial implications flowing from that assessment are clearly stated and became the base line against which other factors (non-financial) are applied in the decision making process. I fully support those comments and am concerned at this further example where decision makers have not been provided with all relevant financial information.

The original consultants' report for the setting up of the Centre for Remote Sensing was nowhere near the mark in the final analysis of how the department finished up and how the money has been spent, both in recurrent spending and in capital costs. I am disappointed that consultants are able to produce reports such as this and be paid very large sums of money yet be so completely wrong, and there does not appear to be much of a follow-up to these reports.

I realise that this was not the responsibility of the Minister, as she has inherited this problem, but has any check-back been made to the original consultants' report as against what has actually happened in that area? What corrective action has been taken, if any?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is a very perceptive and important question, and I will ask the Acting Chief Executive Officer to respond to it because, as well as his other day-to-day responsibilities, he is also our financial person and it is important that I give him the opportunity to correct some misinformation and to ensure that the answer is absolutely factual.

**Mr Kidd:** The short answer to the question is 'No'. I do not think there have been any checks back to the consultants' report. It is really not a trait of the Lands Department to look backwards: we tend to take what we have and move forward with it. It might be helpful if I describe some of the background to that transfer, and the Surveyor-General may wish to add something to what I have to say.



In 1989, when the consultants' report was presented, the Government, I understand, considered a number of options, including closure of the centre. The Department of Lands submitted that the State would need access to remote sensing facilities one way or another to complement other land information system activities. We thought that, if the remote sensing centre were closed, at some time we would need to recommend to the Government that that investment be repeated.

So, we put to the Government that a better solution may be to hand it over to the Department of Lands to manage. That was accepted on the understanding that the department would produce a business case, and that business case, I believe, is the one that the Auditor-General has referred to in his report. The approval was for the business case to be presented to enable the monitoring of progress of the centre towards full cost recovery. Therefore, as we understand it, the business case was not a prerequisite or a determinant of the decision to transfer the centre to the Department of Lands; it was really to be a measure of our performance in managing the centre after we took it over.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I refer to consultants' reports in general, and not to this case in particular. Earlier in the day, we heard that consultancies will be used throughout the various sections of the Minister's departments. My concern is the quality of the many and varied original reports which have been made to various departments. Does the Minister think there should be some check on the accuracy of the original consultants' reports, because this is a problem that I feel involves not only her area but also a lot of other Government areas?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I take up that question because the honourable member is talking about accountability, and I totally agree that, where there are consultants reports, we must look back and see how accountable these reports are and were at the time. I would hate the honourable member to be giving the impression that all consultancies are somehow not up to the mark or not professionally done. I want to refer the honourable member to a consultancy within one of my other departments. It was given to Mr Hugh Hudson with respect to developing a water rating system that had an enormous number of criteria which, on the surface in some cases, seemed to be almost contradictory. He showed professionalism in the way in which he worked with departmental officers and he came up with an excellent report that picks up a range of issues and translates them into a simple system which can be easily understood by the community and which will prove to be a most effective water rating system for all South Australia well into the next century.

So, there are a number of examples of consultancies which have been highly important to Government to provide a basis for decision making and which have been very useful as tools for providing information and suggesting new ways of doing things and solving problems.

I think it is important to take from the honourable member's question the point that consultancies must be thoroughly examined initially, in terms of the awarding of consultancies. There must be clear guidelines and there must be a clear understanding from the departments about what is required from the consultant and what information is being sought, the consultant must be given those clear guidelines, and there must be accountability in terms of payment for that information at the end of the day.

I think that, probably, the member for Murray Mallee is also alluding to this issue in the questions that he has asked earlier in this section of the Estimates Committee. I totally agree with that approach; I think it is important. If we are

to be accountable for the salaries, the work commitment, the professionalism and the training of each and every public servant within the Public Service, we should be equally vigilant in terms of the accountability of consultants and the quality of their reports, and we as a Government must ensure that we get value for money. I know that that has not necessarily always been the case, but many consultants and consultancies have proved to be enormously beneficial to the Government. So, we must not make a sweeping statement that catches all consultants and consultancies, but we must discriminate, and we must learn from the mistakes of the past. Indeed, that is exactly what the Acting Director-General of the department was saying, namely, that the Department of Lands looks forward, uses the experience of the past and ensures that, if mistakes have been made in the past, they are not replicated in the future.

**Mr LEWIS:** The last question I asked of the Minister concerned the Minister's office. I received a diatribe which lasted for several minutes but which did not address the substance of my inquiry. Some of the statements made by the Minister clearly amazed me, but they were irrelevant to the nature of my inquiry. My inquiry was, quite simply: how come 12 public servants, or 12 ministerial assistants in the Minister's office, will cost 17 per cent more during this coming year than they did last year when there were 12.2 of them? That is not a question, that is a statement! The Minister has had her shot at that.

Therefore, I turn to another matter. All these questions are seeking information which is not readily apparent or available at all—one or the other or both—in the documents with which we have been provided in relation to this budget. In reference to page 13 of Financial Paper No. 2, under 'Fees, Fines and Charges', I seek details of the receipts to be derived from survey services, various fees for services, sales of maps, aerial photographs and sundries that are now paid into the Department of Lands operating account, as is also the registration of transactions of real and personal property and the proceeds from the Valuer-General's offices. Where can that information be found, and can the Minister give a detailed breakdown of each of those four items, either now or incorporated in a table later?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask the Acting CEO to address that matter. It is explained on page 13 that those details for all the (b) areas are now paid into the Department of Lands operating account, but that does not address the honourable member's question as to how much we are predicting for the coming financial year.

**Mr LEWIS:** Can you provide details?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I think we can provide them now. I refer the honourable member to page 126 of the Estimates of Payments which under the heading 'Less—Funded from Other Sources' it refers to Crown land rents, interest on agreements and sundries, \$3 046 000; registration of property transactions, \$25 213 000; survey services, \$1 763 000; valuation services, \$2 988 000; and various other receipts, fees and services, \$6 400 000, making a total of \$39 410 000.

**Mr LEWIS:** Are they payments?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** These are receipts. The question related to the Estimates of Receipts from a number of areas and reference is made to fees, fines, charges and other areas to which the member referred, with the Department of Lands 'Survey services' now paid into the Lands operating account. There were various other fees and services, sales of maps etc., and then there were a number of others, such as the Valuer-General's Office referred to as 'Valuation services'. The language is slightly different, but it is the same services. It seems clear. In my introductory statement

I said that we are now paying directly into the Lands operating account. I refer the member to that statement, as follows:

For 1990-91 and future years, a new financial discipline has been placed on the department. The main measure of . . . performance will be the net call on Consolidated Account . . . [this now] embraces both recurrent and capital expenditures and receipts and requires a planned and agreed reduction . . .

We are now paying these receipts into one Lands operating account. We have indicated that, where that was on page 13, it is now on page 126 of the Estimates of Payments, Financial Paper No. 3.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I draw the attention of the Committee to the need to be brief in asking and answering questions because we have to finish at 10 p.m.

**Mr VENNING:** I congratulate the department on the quality of the work it is doing in mapping. It appears that two or three departments are doing similar work in mapping. My question is not loaded; it relates to my own observation. Can the Minister rationalise the services in some way and let the Department of Lands do the work for the others, or vice versa?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I thank the member for his question. That is what we are doing in terms of consolidating some of the services that we provide across departments. We are working in a number of areas. Mapping is one of these, and we are seeking to consolidate it and bring it under the Department of Lands.

**Mr LEWIS:** On page 12, I see that there is to be an increased contribution from the South Australian Urban Land Trust. How does the Minister explain that increase in estimated revenue from \$1.8 million to \$6 million?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** That is correct, and I do have an explanation. The Government has determined that that is appropriate for the South Australian Urban Lands Trust as a *quasi*-commercial undertaking to make payments into the budget. That is totally appropriate. Payments are to be based on a percentage of the declared annual surplus and are to be up to 39 per cent. The 1990-91 contribution is \$6 million, which is 39 per cent of the \$15.3 million, which is the 1989-90 surplus. As I have indicated, it is intended to introduce legislation this session to amend the South Aus-

tralian Urban Land Trust Act to enable these payments to be made.

I think that that probably provides the honourable member with an answer. It is important that the Urban Land Trust contributes to the Government coffers. The Government certainly believes that it is an important contribution and I would imagine that the Opposition would agree with that.

**Mr LEWIS:** The Minister has said previously that assessments of the pastoral leases would be completed by the end of August; that is on the unimproved or site value net of improvements for fixing rents. Has that deadline been met?

**The Hon. S.M. Lenehan:** I will ask the Deputy Valuer-General to answer that. It is the Valuer-General who reports directly to the Parliament.

**Mr Backen:** No, the individual rentals have not been finalised. They will be finalised by 1 November, which is the date when it is intended to forward the accounts to the pastoralists. A commitment was given to the United Farmers and Stockowners Association pastoral task force that we would meet with them in about July and give some indication of our levels. However, of course, it is a very complex issue in so far as there is not a great deal of information available relative to the rental of the Crown's interest only, which is the land. Of course, a great deal of research has been done to ensure that the rentals that we come up with are, in fact, correct and reflect current market rentals. We have had a meeting as late as last Friday, where certain indications were given to that task force; namely, that the maximum rent is fixed within the Act at 80c per sheep or \$2.40 per beast. Should the Valuer-General determine a market rent in excess of that amount the 80c would, of course, still be the amount paid.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the votes completed. On behalf of the Committee, I would like to thank the advisers to the Minister for their assistance given to the Committee in its deliberations.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.58 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 13 September at 11 a.m.