

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 16 September 1992

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

Hon. T.H. Hemmings

Members:

Mr D.M. Ferguson
 Mr P. Holloway
 Mrs C.F. Hutchison
 Mrs D.C. Kotz
 Mr I.P. Lewis
 Mr J.K.G. Oswald

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a relatively informal procedure. No-one needs to stand and ask or answer questions. I understand that the Minister and the lead questioner from the Opposition have agreed to some form of timetabling for today's proceedings. Any changes to the Committee will be notified as they occur. I would ask the Minister, if she undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and two copies submitted no later than Friday 2 October. I propose to allow the lead speaker for the Opposition and the Minister to make an opening statement if they so desire but not to exceed 15 minutes. We will have three questions per person. We had a problem yesterday on supplementary questions. I intend to allow supplementary questions, if they are pertinent to the answer that the Minister gives, not to allow it as a supplementary if we are just dealing with the same subject matter.

Subject to the convenience of the Committee, if there is any member who is outside the Committee who wishes to ask any question we will attempt to fit that person in if it is convenient before we switch to a following member. I would remind members of the suspension of Standing Orders that allows for Estimates Committees to ask for explanations on matters relating to estimates of receipts, and administration of any statutory authorities. Questions must be based on lines of expenditure and revenue as revealed in Estimates of Payments and Receipts. Reference may be made to other documents, for example, Program Estimates and the Auditor-General's Report. Members must identify a page number in the relevant financial papers from which their question is derived, and questions must be directed to the Minister, not to the adviser. Also, I remind members of Standing Orders that if there is any disagreement with the Chairman's ruling at any time Standing Order 273 adequately covers that particular point.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have a short introductory statement. There is, not unnaturally, a significant interest by members of the Committee on matters that may be contained in the report of the Auditor-General to the Parliament. The Annual Audit Report was tabled on

Tuesday of last week. Honourable members would be aware that the focus of interest on this particular occasion is that of the estimates for the Auditor-General's own department. Matters relating to other departments and statutory authorities should be raised with the responsible Minister at the time of the Estimates hearing for those departments and/or statutory authorities, as the case may be. The Auditor-General will be pleased to assist the Committee with respect to matters relating to his department.

Auditor-General's, \$8 540 000

Witness:

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, Deputy Auditor-General.
 Mr P.A. Deegan, Administrative Officer.

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

Mr OSWALD: I should like to refer to the Auditor-General's lines on page 314. In a press statement on 27 August this year, the Chairman of the State Bank (Mr Nobby Clark) said that the Auditor-General had been consulted about the proposal to separate the Group Asset Management Division of the State Bank from the bank's retail core. What views did the Auditor-General express about this proposal?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Auditor-General, but I refer the honourable member to my opening statement whereby only the lines that relate to the actual operation of the Auditor-General's office are open, as I understand it. Certainly, it has been the practice in the past, although the Chairman would be the person to rule on this, that any specific questions relating to any investigation the Auditor-General is undertaking, be it of a Government body or of a statutory authority, should be addressed to the Minister responsible for that body or authority. Under my line of responsibility to the Parliament, I am not responsible for the State Bank. Perhaps the Auditor-General would like to comment.

The CHAIRMAN: Just before he does, I ruled last year in relation to this matter that the Auditor-General is appearing before this Committee with the Minister on matters relating to the Auditor-General's Department. As the Minister clearly stated in her opening statement, both these Estimates Committees have ample time to question Ministers who may have had their department commented on by the Auditor-General. We had no problem with that last year, and I do not anticipate any problems with it this year.

If one looks at the timetable from last year, the Auditor-General appeared for something like 20 minutes,

which proves that the ruling I made then was adhered to by the Committee. I anticipate that the same thing will happen in this session.

Mr MacPherson: The bank has written to me and has asked me for my views in relation to the auditing arrangements that will apply to the GAMD assets—I think it was the auditing arrangements or it might have been the characterisation of how they were to be dealt with in the balance sheet. The matter of the audit of GAMD is a subject that we will be discussing with the Department of Treasury and it will impose a very significant commitment on our part if we are to undertake that task. That issue is currently still being negotiated with Treasury, so at this point in time the issues of the characterisation are still being discussed and the issues of the auditing responsibility are yet to be finally settled.

Mr OSWALD: I guess that there is some difficulty in this department. I acknowledge that the Minister is not really responsible for the Auditor-General and that in fact the Auditor-General's Department has been lumped into what is already a very large portfolio of interest, and I do not strive—

An honourable member: She answers to Parliament.

Mr OSWALD: That is right; she answers to Parliament. Procedurally I am directing questions through the Minister but I do not expect her to accept ministerial responsibility and therefore be reluctant to answer questions.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I understand.

Mr OSWALD: My next question relates to page 314 of the document. The Auditor-General has been involved in legal action with former directors of the State Bank over the completion of his report into the State Bank collapse. What is the estimated cost of legal fees incurred by the Auditor-General's office in this legal action?

Mr MacPherson: I do not have those figures available but I undertake to make them available in the stipulated time that the Chairman indicated earlier.

Mr OSWALD: Page 314 states that the Auditor-General will be the auditor for the Group Asset Management Division, the so-called State Bank bad bank. As this will be a massive task, has the Auditor-General sought any additional resources for this work? Has he been granted the additional resources that he believes are necessary? What is the estimated cost of this work?

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

Mr MacPherson: The first point you raised is the responsibility for it. We have gained a considerable understanding of the operations of the bank in the course of the inquiry that has been conducted during the past 18 months, and we would be in a position to provide a very close supervisory oversight of any audit. We would not seek to undertake that audit ourselves. What we would do would be to subcontract substantial parts of the GAMD audit, if we were to undertake that responsibility, to a private firm. However, we would supervise and direct the scope of the activities that were discharged by it in the course of the audit.

Mr OSWALD: Despite subcontracting, will you need any additional resources for the task?

Mr MacPherson: I do not believe we will, because we have gained a very thorough understanding of the operations of the bank in the course of the inquiry.

Provided that we scope the audit commitment in a way which meets what we believe will discharge the needs of reporting to the Parliament, I do not believe we will require any additional resources internally within our department.

Mr OSWALD: Also on the same page, the Auditor-General in his last report to Parliament has raised need for 'a whole of Government financial report'; he also indicated that he wrote to the Under Treasurer in April this year raising the question of the availability of Treasury Department resources to assist with the implementation of this development. Is the Auditor-General satisfied that such resources are available?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Auditor-General to respond to that question.

Mr MacPherson: Yes, I believe the resources are available. I will preface my answer to that question by saying that the preparation of a whole of Government financial statement will be a task of some complexity. It is really what one would call a consolidation. In the consolidation there is a need to eliminate or wash out all the interagency transactions. What we were alluding to in the audit report was the need for there to be a whole of Government report to enable an understanding of the Government's financial position *per se*. That has not been achieved effectively in any other jurisdiction to date, but it has been acknowledged very widely within this country and internationally as a need for Government so that Government can say exactly where it stands financially. But it is not a task that you would achieve quickly.

Mr FERGUSON: In relation to the subcontracting work which has been done recently and which we all know has had to be expanded because of the State Bank, this necessitates a very close relationship between the Auditor-General and the consultants. Has this been a learning process on both sides? In other words, are the consultants doing what you want them to do, and has there been a training period?

Mr MacPherson: The investigation has been unique in many respects. I would not like to use the word 'training' in the sense that people did not know what they were doing, because that was not the case. In any investigation, you must pursue a number of avenues, and you find you run into the sand, so you back out and probe another aspect of it.

I have been assisted by people of the highest competence in the private sector. I have engaged auditing and accounting support from three of the top six firms in Australia, and I have engaged legal support from members of the legal profession here in South Australia. I would not like to characterise it as a training exercise. All investigations have their dead ends and dry gullies, and we have certainly run into those. By and large, we are now at a stage where I can say that we believe that we are very advanced, and it is just a case now of allowing the final processes to be completed.

Mr FERGUSON: Would there be a ballpark figure as to how many people are being engaged by the Auditor-General in this exercise?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask the Auditor-General to respond to that.

Mr MacPherson: Again, I will explain that so that it is not taken out of context. Over the entire period of the

inquiry, there would have been approximately 100 people. Some of those people may have been engaged only for a matter of days and in some cases much longer. It would be very misleading to suggest that I have had 'plugged in' 100 people during that period. They have come and they have gone, but the overall figure that I have been given is approximately 100.

Mr FERGUSON: The Parliament has given the Auditor-General more and more responsibility. If we go back through the past couple of years, there are now more Acts that expect the Auditor-General to audit the books of a whole range of organisations. I assume that this will mean that there will be more subcontracting out rather than less subcontracting out in future. Would that be a fair statement?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Auditor-General to comment on that question.

Mr MacPherson: There will certainly be a need to contract out. The key from the Auditor-General's viewpoint in terms of responsibility to report to the Parliament is to determine the scope and depth of the auditing processes undertaken by whoever does it, whether internally or externally. The sort answer is that 'Yes' there may well be a need to expand external contracting, but we will need to determine that in the light of experience.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Through the Minister to the Auditor-General, is the Auditor-General able to respond to the comment about difficulties in presenting the Auditor-General's Report in the front of the report? It has been indicated there that in 1988-89 your predecessor was finding it increasingly difficult to report on time to the Parliament. Will you comment about that limited time available between the end of the financial year and the requirement to report on 30 September?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will pick up that question first. I presume that the honourable member is referring to the section at the beginning of the Auditor-General's Report. I put on the public record my appreciation to the Auditor-General and his staff regarding the time taken between finalising the financial statements by all Government agencies and departments at 30 June and the presentation of his report to the Parliament in early September. To achieve that enormous task in that very short period is something that I feel, on behalf of the rest of the Parliament, that I would like to acknowledge and ask the Auditor-General to pass on our thanks to his staff for the way in which they present this very thorough and detailed report. When one considers that, as I understand it, the Auditor-General does not receive the final accounts from the departments until something like early August. We are talking about a period of close to or less than one month. It really is a Herculean task and it is important to acknowledge that. I note that the Auditor-General suggests that there may be some possible solutions to the enormous pressure placed on his office and I ask him to briefly comment on the question raised by the member for Stuart.

Mr MacPherson: I indicate that no Auditor-General would be able to achieve anything without a very loyal and supportive staff. I place on the record my deep appreciation to my colleagues with regard to their commitment. The departments under the Public Finance and Audit Act have to report to us within 42 days at the

end of the financial year which, as the Minister pointed out, means that by early August we receive the financial statements. We seek to provide the audit report on a timely basis, so that Estimates Committees have available details of how we see developmental operations for the previous 12 months. That means that we have approximately three weeks in which to finalise the material we receive from the departments, have it compiled into the audit report and sent to the printer basically by the end of August, early September.

The complexities that arise have now been compounded by the fact that accounting standards are changing. A significant number of new accounting standards have been promulgated in the past few years and some of these impact directly on Government. One of them is the standard relating to consolidation which requires a total review of departmental attitudes to entities that they control and the need to consolidate those in their financial statements. Another one which has been material this year is the standard relating to the market for insurance companies. That has had its impact in relation to SGIC. The overlay on that is that there was recently a Supreme Court decision in New South Wales, *AWA v. Daniels*, which has underlined the fact that auditors today must be a little more cautious than what they might have been in previous times. But it certainly underlined the fact that there is a very high onus on auditors to verify assets and to be satisfied that they in fact do exist, and that the depreciation schedules and the like that are being applied to those assets are realistic to ensure that the accounts do not materially misdirect the user of those accounts. If that does not help sufficiently, please probe me. I could go on a long time on this.

The final issue with respect to this is that we would like to relate with the Economic and Finance Committee so that we can explore avenues with them so that we can continue to assist the Parliament and at the same time enable us to provide that analytical review of material that is to be presented so that it is more meaningful from your point of view and nonetheless still timely.

Mrs HUTCHISON: As a follow-up to that question, a possible solution is suggested in your report, that is, that the interstate Auditors-General and the Commonwealth Auditor-General have addressed this matter by presenting a number of reports to Parliament. Would you like to comment on that? How viable do you think that way of treating it is in terms of this State?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask the Auditor-General to reply to that question.

Mr MacPherson: We believe that is a viable option but we would see it as being very important from the Parliament's point of view to have all the reports available to the Parliament during the budget session, which would mean that October/November would be the absolute deadline within which we would be reporting on everything. It just means we have not got the task of putting together the whole of Government within that three to four week period that is available from the time of receipt of the documents, or the financial statements, until the time of publication of the audit's report.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Have you investigated any other options, apart from this one possible solution? Do you have any other ideas with regard to the way that this

matter could be treated, given that at the moment you do have a very fine time line to report to Parliament?

Mr MacPherson: I have to confess I have not, Mr Chairman, but I would be very happy to explore other possibilities. Perhaps this is something we could take up with the Economic and Finance Committee.

Mr LEWIS: The one question I have relates to the expenditure made by the Auditor-General's Department in the work which must be done to examine the financial accounts of the Government. Reference to this is made, in a general way, at page 29 of the Auditor-General's Report. My question relates to the kind of computing equipment which has been purchased in the past for use in the Auditor-General's Department and to whether or not that computing equipment will now need to be substantially altered in view of the proposed changes that the Government is making to the kind of computing equipment which it is proposing to install. Will the Auditor-General detail for the Committee, not necessarily now, the amount of money which has been spent in each of the past five years on computing equipment and the amount which he believes will be necessary to spend during the next 12 months?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I believe that the Auditor-General can answer the honourable member's question and I ask him to do that.

Mr MacPherson: With respect to the actual figures, could I please take the opportunity to provide those to you in the next couple of days? With respect to the way we have been moving in computerisation generally, the office in the past 18 months has completely computerised in terms of lap tops being made available to auditors and software appropriate to auditing has been included with that program. We have sought to move our auditing program to a risk based auditing methodology, which puts us in line with what is the current methodology being adopted by the big six. We have acquired software from one or two of the big six firms, which means that the manner in which we are now discharging our auditing responsibilities is at least on a par with what is the best available in the private sector. I refer programs such as Idea, which enables sampling to be undertaken and programs such as A Plus which provide for the automation of working papers and which allow for consistency of approach right across the entire auditing spectrum. In short, we have sought in the past 18 months to upgrade our approach to auditing so that we are meeting the highest professional standards which are available in the private sector. I undertake to provide to you the actual costings of that.

With respect to what I anticipate in the immediate future, I believe we have now put down a foundation in terms of computerisation that will see us through for the next three to five years and that we will not be undertaking major changes in that area within that time. The changes that will happen will be in relation to our personnel and training and seeking to upgrade their skills to meet the demands that arise in practice.

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister or the Auditor-General tell the Committee whether or not he was consulted by those people in other Government agencies who were making the decisions about the change in the computer hardware which have been made, or which are about to be made and, if so, what form that consultation took? For

example, was his opinion sought as to the suitability of the structure proposed for the supplies, given that they will now have a total monopoly of the State's information system?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask the Auditor-General to respond to that question.

Mr MacPherson: With respect to particular audit programs that are undertaken in particular departments, our interest is in ensuring that there are appropriate control mechanisms in place within those installations, so that there is an auditable trail, and that is a matter which we take very seriously. With respect to the matter of whole of Government information technology, we have indicated in the audit report that there is a need for caution in that area, and the Government has responded in that context by saying it is moving very cautiously, and as I understand it, no overt steps have been taken at this stage which would be pre-emptive of our making a contribution in terms of what controls were necessary, or what other steps were required to satisfy auditability in that context.

Mr LEWIS: Did the Auditor-General give the Government any advice about the desirability, wisdom, or otherwise of adopting the computer system it now has? I ask the question because where you have a monopoly supplier the price charged in the first instance to get the work may not be unreasonable, but once the commitment is made you are locked in and you have to pay what is demanded. So, the organ grinder becomes the supplier of the equipment and the software with it, and the price can go anywhere at all and has to be accepted as reasonable since the customer is already using the hardware and software that is supplied and has no choice.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I realise that the honourable member's question canvasses a very wide range of areas in terms of a philosophical principle about whether one has one supplier or a number of them. I will ask the Auditor-General if he would like to comment on those aspects that relate to his own area.

Mr MacPherson: Please do not set me in cement on this because some of these happened before my time, and I am not really privy to exactly what occurred. But, as I understand it, with respect to the early stages of computerisation in this State, there certainly was a locking in to the central computer agency and that, in turn, allowed for the potential to up the price. You were locked in and basically you paid the price, because it was too expensive to get out. Over a period of time there has been an amelioration of that process and departments have introduced their own computer arrangements. The concern that we have in that area—and I use concern not in a sense of indicating a worry or what have you—or the responsibility we have is to ensure that, if a department introduces a particular computer arrangement, there are in place controls so that it is always possible to ensure proper auditability. As I understand it, that has been the process that has occurred over the past few years.

What is now taking place is that the Government is looking at an information technology arrangement which, again, will coordinate the Government's computerised processes, and to ensure that that is done in a way which is going to allow proper reporting and not allow exposures which are inappropriate. We will certainly be

involved in that and we have commenced on that in our Audit Report. Again, I emphasise the feed-back that we are getting, and one of our senior auditing members who is involved in the EDP area is involved in oversighting that. So I can give you the comfort to the effect that we do not feel that there is any exposure there at this point in time that would cause concern.

Mr LEWIS: So the public interest has been protected against the risk of any rapacious demands made by a monopoly supplier.

Mr MacPherson: I understand that to be the case.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the member for Murray-Mallee that the Minister of State Services will be appearing before this Committee tomorrow and that may be the correct venue in which to look at the procurement procedures. I have allowed the questioning to date in regard to computer services because there was a reference in the Auditor-General's Report, and obviously because the Auditor-General's work involves other Government departments it was valid questioning. But if we are starting now to talk about the philosophy of Government procurement, then I suggest to the member for Murray-Mallee, or any other Committee members who want to go down that track, that they address those types of questions to the Minister of State Services who will be appearing before the Committee tomorrow.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Chairman, let me disabuse you: I was not in any way questioning the philosophy, just its prudence in the public interest.

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

Environment and Planning, \$53 835 000

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr B. Leaver, Acting Director-General, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr J. Hill, Director, Departmental Services.

Mr N. Johnson, Chief Financial Officer.

Mr D. Ellis, Acting Director, Planning.

Mr N. Newland, Acting Director, Conservation and Land Management.

Mr C. Harris, Director, Environment.

Mr G. Stafford, Director, Environment Management.

Ms C. Moore, Acting Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Dr Brian Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The administration of my portfolio continues to encompass a very wide range of issues and programs of vital interest to the South Australian community. The community continues to expect that our environments be protected and, where damaged, rehabilitated. Wider public environmental awareness places ever increasing demands for protection of wildlife, wilderness, coasts, air and water quality and heritage. The challenge for the Government is to respond to these expectations in a climate where there are increasing demands for resources. An important

commitment of the Government is the implementation of the Economic Development Strategy. The portfolio will play key roles in assisting with the new directions for South Australia's economy as described in the Arthur D. Little studies. Policies relating to improved planning and environmental management will assist with the economic strategy. Also lands managed by the portfolio have been identified as key priorities for tourism development in the strategy.

The past year has seen even more focus on global environmental issues, culminating in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in June this year. This conference made major strides on issues affecting the planet, particularly on the issues of climate change, biodiversity and the agreements relating to matters of global environmental concern. At a national level a step of considerable significance was the signing of the InterGovernmental Agreement on the Environment in February 1992. This agreement provides for a clear definition of the roles of all levels of government in relation to the environment and establishes a commitment to the principles of ecologically sustainable development and protection of biodiversity in decision making. The agreement also establishes a national approach to environmental impact assessment and the setting up of the National Environmental Protection Authority.

The portfolio's activities reflect these strengthening issues as well as the ongoing environmental matters of interest and concern to the people of South Australia. I will mention the key programs that are of particular interest. These include the establishment of the Environment Protection Authority and the introduction of the Environment Protection Bill, the implementation of the outcome of the Planning Review, adoption of national building control standards, the review of coast protection programs, development of policies to address the feral cat problem, the introduction of revised European heritage protection measures, the development of a storm water drainage strategy, the continued objective assessment of pastoral leases, identification and proclamation of wilderness areas and the development of guidelines for management of native vegetation on private and public land outside the reserve system. The major initiatives are:

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

The establishment of a South Australian Environment Protection Authority is a key initiative included in the budget. The Environment Protection Bill to be presented to Parliament will provide a more effective means of protecting our environment from pollution and waste. These moves will rationalise the red tape of current environmental legislation, covering aspects of seven Acts and giving industry a single licensing framework.

COAST PROTECTION ACT REVIEW

The Coast Protection Act has been in existence since 1972. The Act has concentrated on works to protect the coast, with emphasis on the metropolitan beaches. The review of the Act is considering conservation and management issues and mechanisms addressing long-term funding options for sand replenishment of Adelaide's beaches.

PLANNING REVIEW

The reports of the Premier's Planning Review were released in June 1992 and public comments were invited

up to the end of August. The three reports in the 2020 Vision series are the Planning System, the Planning Strategy for Adelaide and a Development Bill. Public comments are currently being evaluated and it is intended that the Development Bill will be placed before Parliament in this session.

BUILDING CONTROL

The Government is actively involved in the national program to improve the Building Code of Australia, particularly in the areas of performance objectives, fire safety engineering and Australian Standards. This will be a substantial cost savings to the construction industry.

NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL

The Natural Resources Council establishment was an election commitment in 1989. The council will be the peak advisory body on the identification, allocation, use and management of the State's natural resources. The Government has established the council administratively pending introduction of legislation later in this session of Parliament.

CONSOLIDATING THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

The national park system at 20.2 million hectares is of world significance, particularly for desert conservation. The system is now essentially established; however, from time to time important sites will be nominated as park additions. Proposed new areas in 1992-93 include the Murray River Chowilla wetlands in the State border region, the proposed Scrubby Peak park in the Gawler Ranges, the Tinga Tingana additions to the Strzelecki Regional Reserve and the Finniss Springs additions to Lake Eyre National Park.

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

Mr OSWALD: My first question refers to the financial information paper No. 1 on page 269, under Botanic Gardens. Under Garden Development is a line showing recurrent expenditure actual in 1991-92 of \$33 000 going up to \$1.134 million this current financial year. What is the purpose of that line and how will that money be applied?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This is very good news. Under the One Nation funding that was allocated around the country, South Australia received \$1.1 million towards the restoration of Palm House. As the honourable member would be aware, Palm House is of international significance in terms of its construction, the period of construction and its importance. The importance of Palm House to the history and, indeed, to the future of the gardens in South Australia cannot be overstated. In Palm House we have a glass house from the 19th century that is of heritage significance, and in the Bicentennial Conservatory we have something of international significance from this century. It is important that money be allocated for that restoration.

Dr Morley: The building was constructed in 1877 and is now in serious need of restoration. The \$1.1 million for that restoration will be administered through SACON's very fine heritage unit. Since the allocation of the funding, consultants have examined the building and undertaken what is called a dilapidation survey, which has fine tuned the original estimate of \$1.1 million for the restoration and confirmed that figure.

The next stage, therefore, will be the letting of contracts for the dismantling of the building, the sand

blasting of the iron work and taking away the glass while retaining as much of the original glass as can be achieved. Incidentally, the glazing will involve a sponsorship deal with a leading glazing company, so that will reduce the overall cost to the community. This is part of our sponsorship program at the Botanic Gardens. When the sandblasting has taken place it will be possible to re-incorporate pieces of cast and wrought iron into the fabric for those bits that have been rusted, and then we will reassemble the building and reglaze it. We hope that this can be done before March 1994 prior to the Adelaide Festival, because we are planning a number of festival events and would like that building work, that restoration work, to be completed by that time. In a nutshell, those are the aims and objectives.

Mr OSWALD: The Botanic Gardens Board had some very elaborate plans drawn up for a new entrance into the Botanic Gardens—there were to be new wrought iron gates and a palm avenue—but this all depended upon the demolition of tramcar barn A. Senior members of the board have put to me that if the barn is not demolished the project will have to be scuttled. Now that the Minister has decided not to use her ministerial power to allow barn A to be demolished, what is the status of the project? Does this mean that the project will no longer go ahead or are we to see a modified project? If we are to see a modified project, when will the project proceed?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The decision not to have tram barn A demolished has not scuttled (to use the honourable member's terminology) proposals to return I think in excess of five hectares, which was used as the Hackney Bus Depot, to the parklands. All that area, including tram barn A and the Goodman Building, will be returned to the care and control of the Botanic Gardens and the Botanic Gardens Board and therefore will be made available to the public of South Australia.

I think we need to get this whole debate into some sort of context. When we are talking about retaining tram barn A we are talking about retaining a very small part of a very large site that the Government has made a commitment to return to the people of South Australia by way of turning it over to the care and responsibility of the Botanic Gardens Board. Certainly some schematic drawings had been developed in terms of providing, if you like, some visual conceptual drawings to the public and the Government about what might well proceed once the bus depot had been returned to the community. These were not firmed up in terms of having an absolute commitment to them. From discussions I have had with the Director of the Botanic Gardens, I can say that we would be able to have a modified version of the proposal. So, it would be quite wrong and inaccurate to suggest that these plans have somehow been scuttled.

I think it is also appropriate to put on the public record that for the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and the Minister for Environment and Planning to in fact ride roughshod over the current legislation and to have demolished a building that was listed not only on the State Heritage List but on the National Estate I think would of course be seen by the public to be totally and absolutely inappropriate, and I would assume that the honourable member would agree that that would not be an appropriate form of moving forward.

It is important to recognise that there will be a return of this area to the gardens and therefore to the public of South Australia. A number of procedures need to be gone through. First, it is appropriate that we transfer that land across to the care and control of the Botanic Gardens, and the Lands Department is currently, I understand, in consultation with the Director, working to achieve that legal transfer. Secondly, we will have to test the site for contamination because it has historically been used in the first instance for trams and then for buses, and we will have to look at what is contained underneath the asphalt and at the level of contamination for that site. We must also move to look at the way in which we could use existing tram barn A, perhaps in terms of the joint use for the project for the Palm House, which the Director has clearly outlined for the Committee.

Those sorts of things need to be explored across government with the board of the Botanic Gardens, and then we have to look at drawing up the final proposals and at moving forward in terms of a financial commitment. I can say that it will be done in a staged way; we will not be rushing into something. We will be looking at getting funds for the first stage of this project. I would ask the Director whether he would like to add anything further to what I have had to say in terms of providing further information to the Committee.

Dr Morley: The board and the administration will do the best they can with the site for the community. It might be worth mentioning that it would be nice if we could get some Federal funds and have it completed for the Federation celebrations.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It would certainly be our aim to have it completed by the Federation celebrations, but I suggest that we would need some financial support from the Commonwealth. Certainly it has been generous with respect to our gardens, and I think that that is an acknowledgement that we probably have one of the best Botanic Gardens anywhere in this country. The fact that it is so accessible because of its location I think further highlights the fact that, notwithstanding the recessionary conditions prevailing, we have had a very small diminution in the number of visitors who have come to our gardens in the past financial year.

I think that is an acknowledgment of the high standard and maintenance of the gardens and the fact that we are continually looking at providing new and interesting things for visitors to do. We will be moving forward in this project and working together with the community to achieve the return of that alienated land to the gardens and the people of South Australia.

Mr OSWALD: I have no doubt that the area north of tram barn A will be returned to the people of South Australia and that works will take place to make sure that it is revegetated. However, my question related to the piece of land between the Goodman Building and what is now tram barn A; it related to the project which was to put in new gates and run a new palm avenue through to the Conservatorium. My question was whether that project, which was the project put up by the Botanic Gardens Board, has now been abandoned because of the failure to demolish barn A or is a modified version of that plan still to be put in? It was put to me during my formal briefing by the board and the chairman that if barn A was not demolished there was no way they could

fit in the gates and an avenue of palm trees down to the Conservatorium. So, my question gets back to not what you do with the site north of barn A, in returning it to the people of South Australia, but what you are to do with the proposals put up by the board and whether they are to be abandoned now because barn A is not to be demolished?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask the Director to comment on the specifics of that question. It is not proposed to abandon—I think the term was 'scuttle' earlier—the proposals. They will need to be modified: I have made that very clear, that the proposal will need to be modified. However, it was only a proposal: it had not received approval by the Government and certainly had not received any funding commitment. It was merely that—a proposal. I believe that with a small amount of flexibility the proposal will be able to be modified to provide all the things that were suggested in the original proposal. I will ask the Director to further elaborate on what the board is now looking at and say how we would look at moving forward in the future.

Dr Morley: The original proposal to which the honourable member referred was a recommendation that came from the administration after they had worked in conjunction with Cielens and Wark, a firm of landscape architects. At the last board meeting, after having received the information about the retention of tram barn A, the board asked me to go back to those landscape architects and bring forward a new conceptual position for the board to consider which sort to accommodate tram barn A in that landscape.

Preliminary discussions have been held with the landscape architect and, although it would be premature for me to flag precisely what we will come up with, it seems to me that whilst an avenue might not be possible a palisade of palms may be possible, and it also may be possible to continue, as was originally intended, to put some iron gates where they were originally intended. As the Minister has indicated, that is a modification of that original proposal. It should also be stressed that neither the first nor the second proposal has been approved by Government.

Mr FERGUSON: What is the proposed budget to develop tram barn A, which is a very large area?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: In terms of the actual site that is being returned, tram barn A is not a large proportion of the site. The tram barn itself is a fairly significant sized building. In the assessments that were done by the Department of Housing and Construction, it was determined that it was a very solid and substantial building. The actual demolition of that building could have cost anything up to \$500 000, depending on the nature of the demolition, because it is a very substantial construction.

So, we were not talking about a building that was in a state of dilapidation or was about to fall over; in fact, it will be there long after all of us have passed on. At this point, what the Government has determined is that the Botanic Gardens Board will have the management and control of that building. The future uses will be proposed by the Botanic Gardens Board after consultation with the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, and I guess if there are any conflicts in future uses, the Government of the day would make that final decision. However, quite a

number of exciting things have been suggested that might well be used, as the Director has said, in looking at opening up the gardens to the community, at sponsorship, at very creative uses for some of the areas of the gardens.

It may well be appropriate that that building be developed for a number of things, for example, such events as flower shows and functions within the area. It may well be useful to have an interpretive centre for the gardens or, indeed, for other areas in which the gardens want to link themselves across Government. As I have said, possibly even in the Parliament, the ideas that can be brought forward for the use of that building are almost as limitless as one's imagination. The board of the gardens will certainly be looking at consulting across the community for the future uses of that building.

It is probably too early to say what any definitive costs might be in the final refurbishment of the building, because that would depend on the uses to which it was put. However, certainly some preliminary discussions have been held about costs of ensuring that the roof is totally stable and the building can be used in the future. I am not sure whether Dr Morley has those figures, but I can provide those from the Department of Housing and Construction. I am sure it will cost in the vicinity of a couple of hundred thousand dollars in the initial instance to ensure the building is made totally secure for future uses.

Mr FERGUSON: Last year, through the Minister I asked Dr Morley how many people visited the gardens, and I was astounded that he answered it. Has an increase occurred in the numbers visiting the garden during this past 12 months? How are they counted? How do you count the numbers going through the gardens?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, there has not been an increase as I understand it; we believe that the effects of the recession have been responsible for that. It is very interesting that the honourable member should ask that question, because I have asked that question myself. It is very easy to count the number of people who go through the Conservatory, but it is not so easy, I would have thought, to count the number of people who come into the gardens. I have been informed, and I will let Dr Morley fully elaborate, that we actually have a people counting meter that counts the number of people; in fact, it is an automatic counter of which we are not even aware. It counts people as they go in and leave. I guess it does add new meaning to, 'What goes in must come out'; I understand that people do actually leave the gardens in the same proportion at which they enter them. So, there is a proper, objective means of counting the people. It is important that Dr Morley again indicate for the Committee just how many visitors we have had to the gardens in the past financial year.

Dr Morley: We would be very concerned if more people were leaving the gardens than went in. The Minister is quite correct in that we do operate electronic gate counters in the Adelaide Botanic Garden on all seven gates. In the past year, we have experienced some vandalism; in fact, some of the gate counters were stolen, which meant that our statistics had to be augmented by some mathematics.

As the Minister has correctly said, we are down for the Adelaide Botanic Garden on last year, 888 000 this year, 911 000 last year. However, the visitors to Mount Lofty

Botanic Garden have increased. Nearly 49 000 entered Mount Lofty, instead of 39 000 last year. We record those through a pressure pad system, that is, the vehicles that go over a pressure pad. Then we do a computation—I think it is 2.5 people per vehicle.

At Wittunga we also have electronic gate counters. Again, at Wittunga there has been a diminution in visitor numbers, down from 114 000 to 109 000. Visitor numbers decreased in the bicentennial conservatory, and this is primarily (as the Minister has correctly said) due to the recession. For the first time we have made an estimate of the number of people who are visiting Botanic Park, and this we did using, again, a pressure pad over a period, and we then worked out a statistic. This year an estimated 388 000 people visited Botanic Park. It does indicate how popular the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide, as a system, are to the community and what an asset they are.

Mr FERGUSON: It may be against the whole culture of the Botanic Garden Board, but it has often struck me that there would be an opportunity for more commercialisation of the Botanic Gardens if there were a facility to sell plants, as with the Woods and Forests Department. Will the Minister comment on that?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: In the time that I have been the Minister for the Botanic Gardens, we have on a regular basis discussed maximising the use of the gardens so that we get more people to visit the gardens and that we are able to defray some of the ongoing costs of providing what I have already identified as one of the best gardens in the country. We have looked at a number of things. The Director alluded to the program for the 1994 festival. I refer members to the successful program in the last festival of arts, where we have a program of theatre that takes place in the gardens.

This is now the second or third festival where we have had such a program. I have said to the board on a number of occasions that I wonder whether it would not be possible to have a program of summer theatre in the gardens where every year perhaps from about November through to about February or March we provided on an intermittent basis a theatre program where people could go to the gardens on a summer evening and be entertained by a range of theatrical performances, whether plays or other types of performance. Of course you would need to have a fairly well orchestrated and controlled situation, but I believe that the gardens are at their most beautiful on summer evenings. That is a fairly subjective position, but I make no apology for that.

There have been a number of other proposals. The fact that we now have lights down the main driveway means that we will be able to open up the restaurant for functions. The restaurant in the gardens is superb in terms of location and cuisine. A number of things has already been undertaken. The fact that we now have the kiosk means that we can provide for a range of people's tastes and pockets in terms of cost and is another indication of the gardens wanting to provide a greater flexibility and range of services for the community. A number of things are happening and I congratulate the board on the range of programs and ideas that it is bringing forward.

It is important to look at whether it would be possible to sell a range of plants. I am sure that there would be

some logistical problems to overcome, but it is something which I would be prepared to ask the board to examine and on which to provide me with a report. I will ask Dr Morley whether he has any first impressions about such an idea or suggestion.

Dr Morley: We sell plants at Black Hill Flora Centre once a year. The new sale will be held quite shortly. We do sell plants on an annual basis. The board recently looked at the possibility of selling excess plants that the Botanic Gardens no longer needs in Adelaide, and we found that an extraordinary large amount of maintenance and watering would be required to look after the nursery, and we do not have the resources to do so; nor do we believe that volunteers could do it without the nursery stocks suffering. It would be terribly important that it be first class nursery stock.

The other aspect that may need bringing to the attention of the Committee is that we would not wish to compromise the position of commercial nurseries in Adelaide and South Australia. They are having difficult times and we would not wish to be seen as competing with them as the board and administration value very highly the support we get from the nursery industry. It may be, however, that a particular nurseryman or group of nurserymen could sublease and that would be something to look at.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We would not be in the business of somehow using volunteers and undercutting the commercial nursery industry, but certainly it would be worth while looking at whether there could be joint working together with a group of nurseries to see whether we could not look at the proposal. It is worth investigating and the honourable member would be suggesting that we keep an open mind and explore ways in which we can ensure that we maintain the high standard of maintenance, care and initiatives that have been introduced within the Botanic Gardens.

Mrs KOTZ: I refer to page 240 of the Program Estimates. Within the National Parks and Wildlife Service there is a general reserves trust, which contains funds from park visitors for later use by the park. It is argued by the National Parks and Wildlife Service that spending that money to control park visitors protects the natural environment, but at the same time such expenditure on visitors specifically does not control the weeds, eliminate feral animals, draw up recovery plans for endangered species or erect vermin-proof fences.

My question relates to the fact that the general reserves trust is expected to receive \$826 000 this year. What proportion of that revenue in GRT is used for visitor facilities and how much is used directly on the protection of the natural environment in the ways in which have been indicated? Who decides how the money is spent and are the financial details of GRT available on request?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There are a number of questions within that question. I will address the major overriding philosophical question about the fact that this Government introduced admission charges to our national parks system, through our desert parks pass system and through providing facilities for visitors such as guided tours and camping. A significant part of our financial return is from the sale through retail outlets of souvenirs that reflect the national parks system. We have areas of accommodation, leases and licences from which we get

funds to go into the reserves trust, and it is important that all of that money goes back into the better management of our parks system. There is certainly a question of priorities.

Because this is a relatively new program—in other words it has not been running for 25 or 30 years—it seemed appropriate that in the first instance we look at spending a fairly significant amount of money on better visitor management and control because the experiences in the parks that I have visited in the Northern Territory and the United States have indicated that the first and fundamental issue must be good management of visitors. If you can manage people you can lessen the impact through the spread of weeds and destruction, particularly in some of our sensitive parks, of some of the flora and, indeed, the habitat for the fauna.

It is vitally important, therefore, that we put our money, in the first instance, into providing proper facilities so that we can say to the community that we can better manage and control those people who visit our parks. Let us remember that the parks are owned by the people and not by the Minister or indeed the staff of the parks system. That has been the overriding philosophy of this Government (and I have been pleased to continue that for my term of stewardship as Minister).

However, it raises the issue that the honourable member correctly identifies that, as well as putting money into the provision of these services, we have also provided better interpretation of our parks system because, if you can convey information and interpretation of the parks, you will get people who will cherish and value those parks rather than simply trample all over them, leave their litter and cause further destruction to the very things that you are wanting to preserve.

However, there is a vitally important role to be played by the funds being allocated to the implementation of better weed control, removing introduced animals that are of a feral variety and are causing destruction, research, and ensuring that we have a better management in terms of preserving the conservation of those parks.

I would ask the Acting Director of the department if he would like to elaborate on some of the other questions that the honourable member contained in her major question, because it is an important area. I would have to say that we would certainly be looking into the future, at perhaps moving the priority. As we now have in many of our parks. Visitor facilities of an excellent standard would now look at shifting that priority into the areas of conservation and indeed perhaps identification of species that need to be given special protection. How can we do that, provide the resources. That is the policy framework from the Government, I would now like to ask the Acting Director of the department to elaborate on some of these other areas.

Mr Leaver: Whilst the funds received do not go directly to those other important conservation areas such as rehabilitation and control of noxious pests the operation of the trust enabled us to divert more resources to those important issues because prior to the trust so much money was spent on the provision of visitor facilities and services; in fact, that took the lion's share of the budget in years gone by. So, the trust has provided a useful mechanism. There is a closed loop, if you like—the more visitors you get the more revenue you get

and so the more facilities you can provide. The fact that provision of visitor facilities and services is no longer a large drain on the budget has enabled diversion of funds from, I guess, traditional funding levels to those other important nature conservation issues. In fact, this year in the budget there is an 8 per cent increase in the operating expenditure of the National Parks and Wildlife Service separate from the trust operation.

I think I have remembered the list of questions the honourable member has asked; if I have missed them I am sure she will jog my memory. The trust is a statutory established body under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. It is made up of myself as Chairman, the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the department's Finance Officer, Mr Mike Madigan, who has a long history of experience in the department, and the Director of the division of Conservation Land Management. The programs are based on submitted business plans where management units of the agency, normally a field region, would put to the trust a business plan where they detail over a timeframe of three to five years what programs they believe is appropriate to their area, and programs that they want to pursue. These can vary from something as sophisticated as the Cleland development, and the proposed Seal Bay development right through modest programs like seasonal ranger programs and the sale of souvenirs. The trust then approves those programs and they form the basis of an on-going monitoring phase of operations. Are those figures available? Yes. Indeed, we would be most pleased to make them available to any interested person—both the figures and the business plans. There is nothing untoward about it. In fact, it is a very successful operation and has enabled us to considerably expand the range of facilities and services in our parks system which is so popular to our visitors.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There is just one point that I would like to elaborate on. The honourable member asked about whether the General Reserves Trust financial papers are available. They are detailed in the annual report. Therefore, the 1991 analysis is available and I understand that the 1991-92 report will be issued in late September. So, that is a public document and they are in that report. If members need them before that time we will try to get them.

Mrs KOTZ: First, I would like to ask a supplementary on the previous question. I would like to say to the Minister that I do appreciate the details, and quite obviously the management of visitors to the parks is going along in a most admirable fashion, but the question actually directly related also to the proportion of the GRT that may have been spent on the protection of the natural environment, and I do not believe that really was addressed.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It was not specifically addressed. I will ask the Acting Director of the department whether that figure is available, but I think we have to set it into the correct context that, because we now have the General Reserves Trust that we are using to better manage and control visitors and to provide facilities, that has freed up money in other lines of the department to go into these kinds of management, if you like, of the natural environment within the parks system. So to take a proportion of the General Reserves Trust and say that proportion has gone to the management of the

L

conservation aspect of the parks, really would not give the full picture. You would need to add that to other moneys that have been freed up within the total department, if you understand what I am saying. I will have to ask whether we can actually provide that breakdown. We may not necessarily have undertaken that breakdown. It really would not paint an accurate picture of the total, overall management of our parks system with respect to maintaining and enhancing the conservation values, but having set the scene I would like to ask the Acting Director is that possible, to provide that percentage breakdown with respect to the reserves.

Mrs KOTZ: Before the answer to that, perhaps a point of clarification to that question might put it more succinctly. Would it be more advantageous if I placed the question in the form of whether there is in fact a policy under way at present that is directing the finances in part from GRT to the protection of the natural environment?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, there is no policy in place at this point in regard to that particular matter.

Mr Leaver: The reserves trust entirely operates within a framework of providing visitor facilities and services. Other areas of the agency budget are directed towards the matter raised by the honourable member. The strict answer to her question is in fact a zero. There are no allocations within the trust itself directed towards those traditional nature conservation areas of wildlife management, rehabilitation and so on. That is catered for in the other allocations within the agency.

Mrs KOTZ: My next question relates again to page 270 of the Program Estimates. In the area of National Parks and Wildlife but relating to public education, I believe this may be one of the most neglected roles of National Parks and Wildlife Service. There are a number of seasonal education activities throughout the State, but access to trained education officers by schools and the community for running of excursions at other times of the year, or in fact the teaching of teachers and the community to run their own excursions is nearly non-existent. How many members of the National Parks and Wildlife Service staff are trained and engaged in the role of school and public education, and that relates also to how much of the budget is spent on educational materials relating to the role of parks for use by schools, compared with the amount spent on such materials for use by the general community?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like to take the question in its broadest context. In terms of education we are not talking only about education of students in schools. What we believe is a proper philosophical position for the department to adopt is that we have an education of the community, because it is not just about providing a teacher. We certainly have a seconded teacher who works with the department in terms of providing an education resource. I have to say that I fulfil a role in this area. I go out to a number of schools myself and speak about the role and function of a whole range of issues relating to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. As well as that, we have a unit in the department that does not just address itself to national parks and wildlife matters but it covers areas right across the portfolio of environment and planning. As well as that, we produce through our publicity and promotions unit what I would have to say are extremely good

publications and these are, if you like, tools of education. These publications are circulated widely throughout the community. For example, they are provided to people who obtain the desert park passes. They are provided at all outlets of Government, and particularly from our own outlet, at the Environment and Planning Department's public interface, if you like.

We provide for the education of the community in a whole range of ways. We have all sorts of programs that we link with other departments, and I can refer to things like Bazza the Bunyip program, where we educate the community to value, appreciate, protect and preserve our parks system. So I think it would be taking a very narrow perspective to talk only about education in respect of people who are trained teachers and who specifically go into schools. As I have said, we certainly have a unit which does go to schools and which conducts a wide range of programs, but we also work with the Education Department, and we are aware of things like the reintroduction of Arbour Day and programs like that, and we have a very positive and close working relationship with the Education Department and with its educative and publicity and promotions unit, in terms of the environment. So it is very wide ranging.

I shall ask the Acting Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to perhaps talk about a dedicated area. But I would certainly argue very strongly that we would not want to see the educative role of the department confined only to a small dedicated area. I would also like to place on the public record what an incredibly important role and function the officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service play in terms of the education they provide to the community every day of the week in their job. I am in a privileged position because I receive the letters of congratulation and thanks from the community in terms of the role that the trained officers, and indeed all our parks staff, play in the way in which they provide that information and education to the community.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That is the point I am making, namely, that we work across the portfolios. We do not have a dedicated unit that only looks at educating the community. We maximise our resources in terms of a natural resource interface with the community. If I may make one last plug: I hope all honourable members attended the beginning of the environmental trail, which was the natural resource portfolio of Lands, E&WS and E&P, which I think was a highly professional and very successful public interface, in which I understand between 28 000 and 38 000 individuals and families took part and embarked on the environmental trail. It was an incredibly successful use of resources, across departments, rather than the traditional blinkered approach, whereby just one department was expected to carry all the responsibility in terms of the environment. We think that we can do things in a more effective way, and I believe we are doing that.

Ms Moore: I would like to pick up on a point that the Minister made about our trained ranger staff. Most of the ranger staff now have tertiary education and tertiary qualifications. Part of that training involves being trained in the wider aspects of community and public education as well as the specific requirements for school-age

students. The ranger staff work very closely with the seconded teacher that we have from the Education Department in developing the necessary resource equipment and files for school teachers to use when they visit specific parks. We also have a fully trained teacher, who at one stage was based at Cleland but who now works in the wider department and is based in Adelaide. Our ranger staff work closely with the seconded teacher and also with school groups as they come into the parks system. Teachers are required to contact their local park to make the arrangements to visit. They then have access to a wide range of educational material, and the ranger staff are able to dovetail the schools' needs to the particular aspects of interest and viability in the park to those visiting groups. So it is very much a personalised service in that way.

Mrs KOTZ: I refer to page 133 of the Estimates of Payments and to the new EPA. First, Mr Chairman, I want to qualify that the question I shall put to the Minister has three separate parts, and I indicate this to avoid confusion when I ask the questions. But the background is that I understand that the new EPA will have a staff of about 90, including 12 new positions and a budget of \$8 million. It has been proposed that this will be raised by a fuel surcharge (53 per cent), waste disposal levies (32 per cent), licence fees (13 per cent) and expiation fees (2 per cent). It is also proposed that a 21 member forum will meet quarterly. So, my questions are as follows. What are the extra 12 positions and why are they necessary? How does the total operating costs of the new authority compare with the combined costs of its previous components? What are the latest budgeted operating costs of the Environment Protection Community Consultative Forum?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: First, I refer to what the 12 additional positions will be used for. Three of those 12 full-time equivalent positions will be used in the contaminated sites area. Let me just say that this is a problem that is facing every major city in the world and we are no exception. It is vitally important that we can move forward to provide the information and the proper professional support that is needed to firstly identify and then in order to move to decontamination of those sites, if we are going to properly rehabilitate those areas within our cities. So there will be three extra positions for that. The second area involves the motor vehicle emission reduction program, there are three full-time equivalent positions in that area. The other one is the metropolitan recycling area, which involves one full-time equivalent position.

As to the environmental protection orders and policies—which are the current codes of practice which must be developed and which are vitally important—there are three full-time extra positions in that area, and then for environmental monitoring, auditing and reporting there are two full-time positions. That makes up the 12 full-time positions. In relation to the staffing sources for the rest of the 90 positions, what we have done is to consolidate, or we will be consolidating and bringing together, the staffing resources from a number of areas.

The Environmental Management Division of the department will contribute 40 full-time equivalent staff; the Waste Management Commission, 21; the Planning Division of the Department of Environment and Planning,

that is, the Environmental Assessments Branch, 11 full-time equivalent positions; the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be providing six positions, as we move across to the relevant section from E&WS into the new EPA; and, of course, as we have said, there are 12 new positions. I have made it very clear that, in terms of air quality monitoring, we would be looking at multi-skilling and cross-skilling of staff, so that we would be increasing the resources available for the monitoring of air quality within South Australia. I have stated this in the past, and I wish to make it clear, coming as a directive from the Minister, that this is one thing we are moving to in terms of the establishment of the new EPA.

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Ms D. Gayler, Project Manager, Department of Environment and Planning.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Ms Gayler has been doing all the background work on the EPA. She will be able to answer more fully some of the specifics of the question.

Ms Gayler: Two other questions related to the extra funding provided for new EPA initiatives and the costs associated with the Community Consultative Forum. In relation to the extra funding, the additional staff and new EPA programs will be funded by an additional \$2.2 million over and above the existing costs of the Environment Management Division and the Waste Management Commission being combined into the EPA office. Of that \$2.2 million, subject to Local Government Association agreement to the metropolitan recycling program \$1 million will go towards financing the weekly kerbside recycling program by participating councils.

Of the remaining \$1.2 million, a certain amount will go into a Contaminated Site Fund to assist those who find themselves with contaminated sites with appropriate assessment, and to stimulate the cleanup of priority sites, particularly those with multiple benefits such as environmental health benefits as well as some potential for urban redevelopment in inner and middle suburban areas. In addition, \$140 000 will go towards the additional three staff noted by the Minister for contaminated sites.

Another fund that will help industry, local government and other groups is devoted to pollution prevention, waste minimisation innovations and cleaner technology initiatives. That will be a \$200 000 annual fund. \$130 000 will be allocated for a motor vehicle emission reduction program, beginning with a community education campaign relating to motor vehicle noise and air emissions. The balance, totalling \$2.2 million, is also for that additional staffing that I previously mentioned, making up the 12 additional full-time equivalent staff to be added as the new funding measures phase in.

At this stage, it is not clear whether forum members will be paid for their participation. That rather depends on the passage of the legislation through Parliament. Any expenses associated with the operation of the Community Consultative Forum would come from the operating funds, totalling \$8 million.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Does the Port Augusta Arid Lands Botanic Garden come under gardens development on page 275 of the Program Estimates? Is it included in

that program and what is the current status of that development?

Dr Morley: No, at this stage the Arid Lands Botanic Garden has nothing to do with the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide. However, I represent the Minister on an advisory committee that comprises representatives from the Port Augusta council, from Western Mining and from the community. So, it is just a very good idea at this stage, and I am the Minister's representative on that committee.

Mrs HUTCHISON: As a supplementary question, I am aware that some funding has been allocated at Federal level for the development of gardens of this kind around the nation. Are you aware of that funding and is it possible that we can apply for funding under that program?

Dr Morley: Although I was aware that colleagues in the Botanic Gardens system had sought such an allocation, I was not aware that the allocation had been made.

Mrs HUTCHISON: As a further supplementary, could this matter be investigated to see whether any funding is available that we as a State could obtain under that Federal program?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have already raised this matter on a number of occasions with the Federal Minister, Ros Kelly, and put forward a very strong argument that we should obtain some funds. We should be looking at a pilot program, if you like, for the Arid Lands Botanic Garden. I know that the Director of the Botanic Gardens shares my enthusiastic support for this quite innovative project, and that the local member has worked tirelessly to ensure that we obtain these funds.

We as a State will need to lobby the Federal members of Parliament as well as the Federal Minister to try to obtain an allocation. We need almost a seeding grant to get the thing up and running. There is private sector commitment, but it is not yet of sufficient magnitude to be able to get the program off the ground to the extent that we would like to see it up and running.

I take it that we are now finished with the Botanic Gardens?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

[Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2 p.m.]

Mrs HUTCHISON: My question relates to page 285 of the Program Estimates, where, under '1991-92 Specific Targets/Objectives', it states:

Management of Martindale Hall reviewed and manager appointed. Martindale Hall declared a conservation park under the NP&W Act and Conservation Trust appointed.

Could I have further information on that?

Mr Leaver: Martindale Hall had been managed by the department under an *ad hoc* arrangement for a few years with the assistance of a group of citizens. That was not really all that satisfactory; there was no proper management framework and no regulatory framework to manage visitors, the proper receipt of moneys and the proper involvement of that group of citizens. We realised that by use of the National Parks and Wildlife Act we could provide that framework under its development trust provisions. That does not mean that it is managed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service—the service is not

even mentioned in the Act. In fact, it is managed by the State Heritage Branch of the department.

So it is now proclaimed a conservation park which gives it that management framework and protection—in fact that parliamentary protection of its status. A development trust was established under the National Parks and Wildlife Act which gives that body of citizens a formal role in the management of the site, the management of the leasing arrangements as it operates as a commercial venture, and the handling of the moneys. So, it really provides a proper management framework for something that was previously managed in a more *ad hoc* manner.

Mrs HUTCHISON: As a supplementary question, how successful financially has Martindale Hall been in the past 12 months?

Mr Leaver: Quite well, but I would like to give a better answer than that so I ask the finance officer, Mr Johnson, to come forward and answer that. He is also on the Martindale Hall trust.

Mr Johnson: Martindale Hall was shifted from a lease arrangement from 1 October 1991 to a contract manager who was appointed by the department after a considerable call for the very best people who were available. The new manager has performed incredibly well. He has turned the financial performance around from a contribution required by the department through the previous leasing arrangement to a clear profit, which we expect in the coming year to be about \$25 000, according to the business plan. In the past year, because it was only nine months and because there was not a full program of accommodation bookings, the profit was a bit over \$10 000.

I am pleased to report that for the coming financial year Martindale Hall is thoroughly booked for weekends through to Christmas. Martindale Hall is operated out of a trust fund that was provided by a very benevolent person in years gone by, and the profits that are made by its current management arrangement are ploughed back into the trust for the betterment of the building. Being a heritage building, it is very expensive to look after, maintain and provide in the very best manner to the public so that we attract as much of the tourism public as we possibly can. In fact, we are achieving that; the numbers have increased dramatically despite the recessionary times, and the income is very sound. As a business the whole organisation is performing extremely well.

Mr LEWIS: I wanted to ask the Minister some questions about the desert pass system. How much money is raised through the pass system? Are the passes issued once procured for a period of 12 months from the date of issue, or is there some other cut-off point? I recognise that one way of getting revenue for the National Parks and Wildlife Service is by the imposition of an entry fee for vehicles going into parks. I would observe in the process that you could do that by selling admission tickets through retail outlets for fuel, and so on, in the region or on the periphery of the region, in the same way that you can buy STA tickets from delicatessens, and so on, in the metropolitan area. If we had a \$5 entry fee per vehicle we would get about \$30 000 a year at present estimated visitor rates. What possibility of a vehicular entry fee for the Flinders Ranges National Park has been

explored? How much money has been raised through the desert pass system?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As I understand it, in 1991, \$64 000 was raised. In 1991-92, \$104 000 was raised. So, it is a significant contributor to the reserves trust, as I said in my answer before lunch.

Mr LEWIS: What thought has been given to the introduction of a vehicular pass into the Flinders Ranges National Park?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As the Minister responsible I have not actually addressed this issue, but it may well be that people within the department, particularly the Acting Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, may well have had discussions within the service about such a concept. I am not aware of it, so it certainly has not been discussed at ministerial level. I would ask the Director-General of the department to comment on that question.

Mr Leaver: It is a useful suggestion. We have a variety of different entry fee arrangements for the parks around the State, from the traditional entry to Belair through an entry gate, to an automatic receiving arrangement at Innes National Park to a registration system at Mount Remarkable National Park. Very much depends on the features of the park, its entry points, and its capacity to be legally enforced—in fact, legally imposed.

One of the problems with the Flinders Ranges National Park is the amount of through traffic to the region. A lot of the roads that people believe are in the park are in fact not in the park. There are alien tenures from old road reserves which are used by a very large number of people who are sightseeing through the area but not necessarily stepping out and using the park. Our staff constantly turn their minds as to how to impose park user fees. Invariably we find that there is good public response, particularly when they know that the money collected goes back into the improvement of that park.

So, if a system can be developed for the Flinders Ranges, we certainly would be interested in implementing it. Most importantly, the cost of collection should not exceed the revenue you would get, which is the main problem with collection of entry fees. Nevertheless, those added problems of the Flinders Ranges have just deluded us at the moment on how to get a park-user fee in place.

Mr LEWIS: Would you consider using my suggestion of selling tickets through the fuel retailer?

Mr Leaver: In the deserts parks that is how that largely works, that is, through shops, fuel outlets, and so on. It is just those legal problems of Flinders Ranges, with that kind of honeycomb of non-tenured lands on the roads long pre-dating the establishment of roads in the park, that make it a bit difficult to legally impose such a scheme in that location.

Mr LEWIS: I will help the Committee by suggesting that the same technology that was used in speed and red light cameras would be applicable in this instance when it is coupled with reading a microchip. If you did not have your ticket, you would not have your microchip and, when you drive past without the thing on your window, a photograph is taken of your numberplate and you will pay an expiation fee for not having one. The camera would sit there and you could change the film every week or so.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That suggestion could certainly be looked at in terms of some of the more contained parks that are more remote. As the Director-General has said, the problem with the Flinders Ranges is that the whole area and the road system within it is not strictly under the management and control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. So, obviously some different legal situations exist in the Flinders Ranges as opposed to some of our other more remote parks in which that sort of system may well be looked at.

Again, one would have to look at the cost of the technology vis-a-vis the amount of the charge for the entry into the parks. We have tried to keep the desert park path system affordable, particularly as we want to make sure that local people who own the parks, in the sense of being near them or having always lived next door, do not feel alienated.

So, we must address two things: first, to be able to charge a reasonable amount to provide the level of facilities and services such as those we talked about in this morning's questions, and, secondly, to ensure that people feel that they are not alienated from using the parks because of the cost. I take on board the honourable member's suggestion. It is a very sound and sensible one, and we can certainly look at it. I am not sure that that would relate directly to the issue of the Flinders Ranges. I would like to reiterate that at this stage we have not looked at any vehicular entrance fees into Flinders Ranges National Park, so there is no misunderstanding about that. We can certainly look at this suggestion perhaps for other parks.

Mr LEWIS: I will explain the technology to which I am referring so that everybody knows what I am talking about. The *bona fide* locals would be given a barcode for their motor car, and they could automatically come and go as they pleased. If someone wanted to hire a six month access, they could get that very much at a discount on the weekly rate than would otherwise apply to itinerant visitors. The relevant fee rate would be automatically fixed by the person or group responsible for the vehicle. Repairing roads is an enormous cost to the locals, as the Minister (along with her colleague, the Minister of Transport) would understand. At present there seems to be no means by which we can obtain the funds necessary to provide for vehicular access to those areas, and road maintenance costs are enormous.

I will leave that information on the table. It is an interesting way in which technology could be applied, to be very cost effective in the way in which it manages access to and collection of funds which would be used for the purpose of maintenance of visitor facilities, including roads, in and around those parks. I wanted to know from the Minister—and I did ask that a little while ago, although I am sure that was one of the things forgotten in the rush—how the present system works, and in this respect I refer to the length of time for which the permit is purchased.

It used to be quite foolish in that it was from 1 January to 31 December, and if you went there at Christmas time and you were there for three days or so you had to have a permit for both years, the old year through to the new year. I hope that the new system that is operating would ensure that people visiting for a few days did not have to pay twice.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I remember that the honourable member, or one of the members from the House of Assembly, raised that issue with me. I investigated it immediately. In fact, I thank the honourable member, because what he was suggesting made very good sense. We pursued the matter, and we have resolved it. I would ask the Acting Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to respond in detail.

Ms Moore: The system has been changed so that the desert parks pass is now current from date of purchase for 12 months. On top of that, we have a system now where people renewing their pass for a second year get it at a lower rate because they do not get a renewal of the maps and other information unless it needs to be updated.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Commonsense has won the day in this matter, and we now have an effective system.

Mr LEWIS: The other part was to discover how much is spent on the maintenance of visitor facilities by category. Presently, around the area that Europeans have named Ayers Rock and the Olgas, those facilities are maintained by an admission fee. The sorts of facilities at the Olgas, for instance, are a rammed earth building for toilet, bathroom and washroom facilities. Also, established on the roof of that building are photovoltaic panels which charge securely stored lead acid batteries for the purpose of holding the electricity in storage. This is used to light the entire area at night, as well as providing the electricity necessary to pump the water from the aquifer for the amenity that is there. So, you can not only get a drink but also wash your hands and clean up. If you have youngsters, you can clean them up, too. In addition to that, Clivus lavatories—not wet flush; they are non-polluting—have been installed.

All those things are not present in any way, shape or form adequately in our national parks network, particularly in the desert parks area. So, I am suggesting the connection between my early question and this as being quite relevant to the direction in which the department needs to think of going or indeed go.

The CHAIRMAN: Without wishing to be a restrictive Chairperson on the proceedings of this Committee, it does not do the Committee any good for members to preempt any question with a statement as to the justification of that question. This is not being directed strictly at the member for Murray-Mallee: a lot of Committee members have strayed down that path.

I would hate to think that, when we go through that very necessary debate after the Committees have finalised their questioning of the Ministers, someone will say that a particular Minister as opposed to another one answered so many questions. I know the Minister before the table has an exemplary record of answering as many questions as she can, but it makes it rather hard for the Minister to have to go through a 10 minute session of a three part question and then end up with some unfair criticism that there was a reluctance to provide adequate answers.

I can assure all Committee members that they do not have to justify to the Chair why they are asking a particular question. They should just ask it and, if the Minister can answer it, she will and, if she does not answer it adequately, there is the mechanism of a supplementary question.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: As I understood the question, it was whether we are wanting to put a greater

emphasis on the provision of the sorts of facilities that the member for Murray-Mallee has clearly outlined that exist in the Olgas and at Uluru. I have also seen those facilities and they are excellent. The only distinction I would draw is that the number of visitors to Ayres Rock and the Olgas are enormously more than in some of our desert parks. We have also done some work at Dalhousie Springs and provided an upgrading of the facilities there, but it is becoming a very sought after destination because of the beauty of the springs and the Aboriginal history and culture that surrounds the whole area. As honourable members know, I have personally visited that area.

I take on board what the honourable member is saying in terms of using the latest clean technology to provide services and facilities and this certainly would be within our forward program. That is the kind of things we would like to provide. Where we can provide services and facilities in harmony with the environment and where they can be provided by using solar energy or ensuring that waste is able to be recycled and all those sorts of things, that is exactly what we would like to do. I presume that that is what the honourable member is asking.

Mr LEWIS: How much money is raised through the desert parks system? How much is spent on the maintenance of visitor facilities?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I answered that question. I think \$104 000 is raised from the desert parks system.

Mr LEWIS: How much is spent at present on the maintenance of visitor facilities in those parks?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: All of the money is spent on the maintenance of the desert parks and on the provision of facilities.

Mr LEWIS: Any on habitat preservation?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Your colleague asked those questions this morning in great detail so, rather than re-answering them, I suggest that the honourable member look at the detail.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I have three questions relating to page 277 of the Program Estimates. The first relates to the broad objectives, namely, to establish and support the National Resources Council. I notice that the Minister referred to it in her introductory remarks. Specifically I ask whether the Minister can explain the functions of that council and will she provide information on how the council will be funded?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I certainly can. In fact, the Natural Resources Council was established, as stated in my opening remarks this morning, as the result of an election commitment in 1989. The council is indeed an extension of the natural resources management standing committee, a committee of chief executive officers responsible for the Government's natural resources management agencies. The proposal to establish a Natural Resources Council has been publicly canvassed. In fact, it has been extensively canvassed through a green and a white paper and legislation to formalise the arrangements for the council will be introduced into the Parliament this session.

To quickly spell out the function for the council, it would be to regularly review and evaluate the management of natural resources, regularly report to the Minister on strategic directions and policies for identifying, allocating, using and managing the natural

resources of South Australia, to review and report to the Minister on legislation affecting natural resources, to review and report to the Minister on the allocation, use and management of public lands, and to convene meetings of the natural resources forum, which would bring together the many groups involved with or interested in natural resources management.

It is important to note that the Government has established the Natural Resources Council administratively on an interim basis. So, rather than simply sitting back and waiting for the legislation, we have established the council. It is chaired by Professor Lovering and he is doing an extremely good job in this role. I am sure that members are all aware that Professor John Lovering is Vice-Chancellor of the Flinders University. The other non-government members of the 13 member council include: Mr Neil Smith, presiding officer of the Soil Conservation Council and a farmer from Ardrossan; Mr Don Alexander, the presiding officer of the Water Resources Council; Mr Leon Broster, Vice-President of the Local Government Association; Ms Dianne Davidson, an agricultural consultant; and Ms Christine Trenorden, a solicitor.

It is important to acknowledge the work that these people are doing in working with the chief executives in Government responsible for the natural resources portfolio areas. I presume that the honourable member is interested in the final budget, which will be \$335 000, contributed to by the following departments: Environment and Planning, Engineering and Water Supply and Agriculture (which will contribute in excess of \$74 000 each); Lands (contributing \$55 000); Fisheries, Mines and Energy and Woods and Forests (which will be contributing in excess of \$18 000 each) towards the running of this council.

Mr HOLLOWAY: One of the broad objectives in the conservation policy and program development is to provide policy advice and support to major resource management initiatives at the State, national and international level. One of the most important questions we have at a national and international level is the reconciliation of environmental objectives and the need for economic development. Will the Minister advise what the Government is doing to ensure that the costs and benefits of environmental management are being properly evaluated?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member referred to the international arena—is he referring to this on an international basis?

Mr HOLLOWAY: What is the Government doing to ensure that the costs and benefits of environmental management are being properly evaluated? The line in the program talks about providing policy advice and support at both a State and international level. We may be locked into international developments.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I presume that the honourable member is talking about the environmental policy group which, within the department, has originated a study on this issue and developed an environmental initiatives program which sets out a number of things. It is important to recognise that we need to look at how we value (and I mean that in terms of valuing) the environmental costs and benefits of major projects in South Australia. Also, this policy group will look at

assessing the economic costs of environmental degradation, developing economic instruments which will complement and supplement environmental regulations in the management of the State's environmental and natural resources and, most importantly, will provide assistance in adoption of the concept of sustainable economic development by identifying and measuring the linkages between economic development and the environment. That links into the international concept, which now has been adopted on a global basis of sustainable development underpinning, and the concept of sustainable development underpinning, all development to be undertaken throughout the world.

The policy group also looked at such things as the fact that this initiative, while relatively new, is certainly a key element in the way in which the Government is managing environmental resources in South Australia. Environmental benefits and costs have traditionally not been related in economic markets, and I have for some time been suggesting, particularly at national conferences and certainly in any work that has been done within my own departments, that we must look at putting some economic value on economic benefits and costs. As a consequence, it has not been easy to strike a proper balance between economic development and environmental objectives, and I think it is important that I quickly outline to the honourable member what work we are proposing in the 1992-93 financial year.

We would like to move forward in terms of assessment of the economic benefits to South Australia of the Native Vegetation Management Program. I remind you that we have spent many, many millions of dollars on preserving our native vegetation in South Australia. No other State in the country has done anything like what we have achieved; in fact, they do not even have similar legislation. We are going to be looking at assisting the Australian Bureau of Statistics in developing a national natural resource accounting system, and also we are going to be looking at assessment of environmental economic values associated with a range of important environmental and resource issues, including the huge problem of dry land salinity in the upper South-East, and of course looking at this assessment of the environmental economic benefits as they relate to the River Murray.

It cannot be overstated that the traditional economic models really are totally outmoded in terms of the way in which they fail to address factoring in to an accounting model the benefits of first, preserving the environment and, secondly, developments that may cause considerable degradation to the environment. It is not sufficient, in my view, to adopt a traditional approach to this and then to talk about whether something will be economically sustainable. The whole question of sustainability must incorporate a concept of looking at environmental values.

Mr HOLLOWAY: My next question relates to national water quality guidelines, particularly for marine waters. I notice as part of this program the conservation policy and program development says, 'The achievements for the past year has been assisting the Marine Environment Committee in defining marine environmental standards and policies.' I also notice that there is a reference on page 281, under the Pollution Management Program, to this matter where policy advice is provided for the Marine Environment Protection

Committee. I understand that we have released water quality guidelines for marine waters. Will the Minister say how our measures relate to the rest of the country?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: South Australia has had a very prominent role in developing the national water quality strategy. This has been promoted and coordinated by the close communication between the Department of Environment and Planning and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This has been another benefit of having a natural resources grouping which includes both these major departments. There have been several major discussion papers on the national strategy which were released in Adelaide following the recent meeting at which Simon Crean and I actually jointly released these papers following the meeting of the Australian Water Resources Council on 28 August this year.

The national strategy, I am delighted to tell the Committee, is a joint initiative of the Australian Water Resources Council and the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Ministers Council. It is important that we recognise that, while commonsense should prevail in all cases, historically it has not done so, and it is quite an achievement to bring these two major national councils together to work together in terms of national standards for water quality.

I also inform the honourable member that South Australia expects to host a national conference to review the first round of public consultation on this strategy in December of this year. Indeed, the strategy suggests ways of achieving practical applications again of the concept of sustainable development. If members pick up during the day and the night that we are actually talking about sustainable development on a consistent basis, it is because sustainable development must underpin all the work that we are doing at every level within Government and, indeed, in the private sector.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to finance information paper No. 1, page 271 under 'Native Vegetation Management'. After more than a year's operation the Native Vegetation Council has yet to prepare guidelines for vegetation management and for applications for financial assistance. When will they be prepared and what funds are allocated to provide management assistance to owners of heritage agreements?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will answer the general policy part of that question and then I will ask Mr Nicholas Newland if he would respond to the detail of that. I think we have to be very clear when we talk about the establishment of the Native Vegetation Council that we are also talking about the Native Vegetation Management Authority, which has been running, in a sense, parallel with the council because when we brought the new Native Vegetation Bill to the Parliament we ensured that we gave landowners in South Australia the opportunity, up to a particular date, to apply for assistance and, indeed, for clearance approval or non-approval under the old Bill. That meant that we created quite a large backlog of applications, and we felt, in fairness to those landowners, that all those applications should be thoroughly assessed and objectively looked at in terms of the old legislation, and that they should be dealt with in a very equitable and fair manner. This has proceeded, and Mr Newland will be able to tell us when

we finished dealing with all of those applications that were made up until the closing date.

However, rather than wait until we had finished all the applications under the old legislation, we thought it appropriate to establish a Native Vegetation Council which would look at the ways in which we could implement the new legislation, and I will remind honourable members that that was to take the whole issue of native vegetation one step further. We have prohibited wholesale clearance of native vegetation in South Australia, and I say again, for the purpose of the record, that we are the only State in the country that has done this. We now have an emphasis on the better management of that vegetation, which is off-park, private vegetation that is now being preserved. The things that we have already started to look at with private landowners are the control of feral pests, such as rabbits, the fencing of areas that come under these heritage agreements, and also better bushfire protection. To the extent that the council has been able already to do quite an amount of work, I will ask Nicholas Newland if he would answer the specifics of the honourable member's question.

Mr Newland: So far, the Native Vegetation Council has been concentrating on, as it were, establishing itself as a strategy authority to take on this responsibility. In terms of the general management of the program the emphasis of the program, as the Minister has indicated, has been to concentrate on dealing with those clearance applications which were made under the 1985 Native Vegetation Management Act, and it is hoped that those clearance applications will be dealt with by the Native Vegetation Authority by December this year. With a program of this size (and, as the Minister has pointed out, it has been a very large program), it is always hard to be completely specific when that phase of the program will come to an end, but our predictions are that it will be in November/December this year.

The business about the establishment of the native vegetation management guidelines is something which the Native Vegetation Council has on its agenda, and there have been at least two occasions where a paper setting out the way in which those guidelines should be administered and their contents has been presented to the council by the Native Vegetation Management Branch. At this stage, the council has not been prepared to approve the form of those native vegetation management guidelines because it wants to make sure that those guidelines will be acceptable not only to the wide range of membership on the council but also to the farming community which will receive the benefit thereof.

Mr OSWALD: I ask a supplementary question, Mr Chairman. How many applications under the old Act are to be finalised and how many are actually bogged down because of disputes about valuations regarding the level of compensation due?

The CHAIRMAN: I will allow that as a supplementary question although it is very much on the borderline. Whilst this is dealing with applications, it is in no way relevant to the answer given by the Minister or the department.

Mr OSWALD: It picks up a point that the officer was making. He said everything bar telling us how many applications he had before his department.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We have that information, Mr Chairman, and I will ask Mr Newland to provide it.

Mr Newland: There are still 150 clearance applications under the 1985 Native Vegetation Management Act to be processed. There have also been 84 clearance applications received under the 1991 Native Vegetation Act, of which two have been granted, one has been partially granted, 12 have been granted conditionally, three have been part granted conditionally and three have been refused. The remainder are still to be processed.

Mr OSWALD: My next question relates to page 284 of the Program Estimates (Financial Information Paper No. 1) and is once again on native vegetation. Can the Minister provide details of all applications held by the department for applicants who wish to clear remnant vegetation? What will be the date of completion of processing those applications? What were the dates of the relevant inspections and assessments during each process?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We have general information, but not at that level of detail, so I indicate that we will provide that information later.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to page 272 of the Program Estimates and to the matter of pastoral management. What was the total cost of administering perpetual leases in 1991-92?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am sorry, but that is a Lands portfolio question, as perpetual leases do not come under the Department of Environment and Planning. Perhaps the honourable member can ask that question in relation to the Lands lines.

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr David Conlon, Manager, State Heritage Branch.

Mr OSWALD: On page 137 of the Estimates of Payments book it is noted that there will be no contribution to the State Heritage Fund under either native vegetation management or State heritage conservation programs, as compared with the budget last year of \$176 000. How will the trusteeship of State Heritage Branch fulfil its obligation under section 18 of the South Australian Heritage Act to make payments, grants or loans for the preservation or the enhancement of physical, cultural or social heritage of the State?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I shall ask David Conlon, Manager of the State Heritage Branch of the department, to respond.

Mr Conlon: There will be funding available to the State Heritage Fund during the coming year. That funding will come from Land and Business Agent Act inquiries, where a payment is made into that fund every time an inquiry is made, and there will also be repayments from a rolling fund of loans that have been put out to owners of heritage buildings and properties. Some of those loans will be repaid during the year, and also there is interest to come back on those repayments. So there will be money available in the fund to pay out to heritage owners.

Mr OSWALD: Does the Minister have an estimate of those figures?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes. For State Heritage Fund receipts for 1992-93 we are projecting that the interest on heritage loans repayments will total \$27 461, that the heritage loan repayments of principal will amount

to \$44 887 and that the Land and Business Agents' Act fees will total \$102 000. Estimated total receipts, after adding in heritage advices and publications, will be \$388 370, which is a quite considerable amount of money in terms of the tight budgetary situation we are in. Also, there is some One Nation money that is coming from the Federal Government, which amounts to \$580 000. So we have that \$580 000 on top of the \$388 370. So we are considerably up on what we had available last year. This might be an appropriate time to say that today I will be releasing for public discussion and comment the new Heritage Bill, which we certainly hope to be able to pass through both Houses of Parliament in this session. So that will be available for the community today and I will make sure the honourable member has a copy as soon as possible.

Mr FERGUSON: I know that the Minister would be disappointed if I did not ask a question on the Coast Protection Board and, accordingly, I refer to page 270 of the Program Estimates and information which refers to all the various elements of the coastal management area. Minister, I am particularly worried about the way the coastline has been left following the last storm that we had and the heavy seas. In this regard I would say without exaggeration that millions of dollars of infrastructure is now in danger, if we have another big storm and big seas. I know that you have been very generous in providing some money to the councils to handle things like rip-rap fencing and things like that in the coming season, but unless there is some sand to restore the situation all of that will be of no avail. So I am particularly concerned about the pause in the sand management program. Have your officers had an opportunity to look at the situation and when will the sand replenishment program recommence?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I shall get Mr Newland to answer that in detail. Certainly, I have made that very clear that money would be set aside in the budget and in fact we have set aside a minimum of \$200 000 for the very programs that the honourable member is talking about. Of course, we will not be able to redress all the damage, and I remind the honourable member that there are some situations where nature itself has determined that the sand dunes should never have been built on; but they were built on, and in some cases in defiance of advice given some years ago by, I believe the Planning Advisory Committee.

Mr LEWIS interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am just talking about the movement of the sand dunes, and it is fairly important that we look at the way in which coastlines around the world have responded to movement of sand. With respect to some of the areas where we can treat what we are calling the hot spots—in other words, areas that need a fairly quick sand replenishment program because of the sort of the thing we saw with the storm damage last week—one contract has already been let in one area. But I will ask Mr Newland to give details.

Mr Newland: Arrangements are being made for the letting of contracts by local government—and I make the point that the contracts are let not by the department but by local government. In the Henley and Grange council area, \$10 000 is being made available for work. Further work has been scheduled for the Woodville-Semaphore

Park area at \$15 000, which will provide 10 000 cubic metres of sand in that location. A further \$30 000 is being made available to the Glenelg council for 20 000 cubic metres of sand and 5 000 cubic metres are being made available to the West Beach Trust at a cost of \$6 000. Further, other works are being programmed in country council areas, particularly on Yorke Peninsula and in some locations in the South-East.

Mr FERGUSON: The sand dunes on the beach front at West Beach now seem very badly eroded and almost cut in half, and it seems to me that the sand replenishment program in itself will not rectify the situation. It appears that at the moment no effort is being made to look at what ought to be done in relation to saving those sandhills. Has this been given any consideration at all?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, it has been given consideration in terms of my releasing for discussion the coast protection/management green paper, which I released some weeks ago. The Act has now been in operation for 20 years, and the green paper canvasses a number of options. It seems to me that we need to look at options that have been tried around the world, and the Coastal Management Branch has done this. Some of those options are extremely expensive.

I had the opportunity to look at some of them myself in terms of what is happening off the coast of Miami, which, probably, has the most horrendous situation in terms of planning and development, since houses and other facilities have been built right up on the sand. However, I am told by my departmental officers that Miami also has the most expensive solutions. A whole range of options has been looked at by other countries and, with the release of this green paper, we are taking the opportunity to put all the options on the table.

I am told by the department that some of the things I have had raised with me by members of the community, such as looking at replanting the seagrasses and looking at a series of sharks tooth groynes in the United States, are very successful but also incredibly expensive. It is now a matter of the community's becoming involved in some of the research work that the department has carried out thus far. The Coastal Management Protection Authority has undertaken research in this area.

So, it is not correct to say that nothing has been looked at and no-one is looking at new technological solutions, because we are doing that. However, we must also look at who will actually pay for these solutions. It is important that there be some element of beneficiary pays and the extent to which we can identify classes of beneficiaries. Do we say that the whole community is a beneficiary, whether people live in the outback arid areas or whether they actually have real estate on the coast which, of course, is much more highly valued than if it is not on the coast? We need some sensible and rational public debate about the solutions and how we fund them.

We do not need to talk about putting barbed wire fences around beaches. I feel quite angry about that, because that is not a solution canvassed anywhere within the green paper, nor has it ever been suggested by anyone within the department or within the Government. We really need to get the discussion on a rational and reasonable footing and discuss these solutions. We need to look at what is happening in the rest of the world, in

the rest of South Australia and in the rest of Australia, and look at how we fund these solutions.

Mr FERGUSON: Another coast protection problem that is with us at the moment is the huge amount of debris that has been deposited on the beach at Henley Beach and Glenelg, having come down the Patawalonga and, although I have not been down to see the Onkaparinga, I imagine that it is in the same situation, where the floodwaters have deposited a huge amount of debris and materials such as prophylactics, syringes and other things.

It is unfortunate that a small municipality such as Henley and Grange must bear the cost of cleaning up the debris when it belongs to other councils along the River Torrens. What can the Coast Protection Board do to assist in this cleanup? It appears to me that some of the material, such as trees and parts of trees, is recyclable. Has the department ever looked at what might be useable in the debris that ends up on the beaches of South Australia?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: In the first instance, the honourable member has raised the philosophical question as to who should pay for the management and control of stormwater. I would refer members to the discussion paper that David Plumridge and I released in February last year, which canvassed a number of options that have now been widely put to the community through public meetings across the metropolitan area. I believe that we must have wide management and control of storm water, which means that coastal councils such as Glenelg, Henley Beach and the other councils up and down the coast are not carrying the full responsibility for the cleanup of storm water damage and the debris that is being deposited, and are not completely responsible for things such as the Patawalonga.

I have said that from, I guess, the time that I have been a Minister. Stormwater and its management has historically always been the responsibility of local government. I believed that it was time we looked at this from a more mature approach and that we looked at the State Government being involved in a working partnership with local government to maybe look at how we could have some form of an authority across the metropolitan area to be able to take the decisions about stormwater management and control, and how this might happen.

To date we have not yet had that resolved. I am waiting for local government to get back to me to give me some feedback about what local government believes is the most appropriate model of moving forward. In the interim we have to look at what I guess could be called a mini natural disaster, which is what the flooding and storms of the past fortnight have been. It may not be appropriate for the Coastal Management Board and the fund to provide the resources, but I am prepared to look within my portfolio to see whether some moneys can be made available.

However, I think there also has to be some responsibility borne by the upstream councils from where the debris has come. At the end of the day it is not just sufficient to say, 'Oh well, if that's all too hard we'll just get the State Government to pay.' I could just as easily say, 'Well look, it has been a small natural disaster in South Australia. Why shouldn't the Federal Government

contribute to this'? I do not think that that is the way we will solve the problems in the long term. It might be a short-term quick-fix solution, but in the long-term we have to find structures and we have to ensure that the community understands the need for funding for the better management and control of stormwater.

As all members know, it is one of the things that I felt quite passionately about in terms of looking at things such as the creation of wetlands and putting in things such as trash racks (where they are appropriate) and making sure that they are in the right place and that they will do the job. A number of programs are on the agenda, but I think that what we have to do is work much more positively and constructively with local government to share that responsibility so that it is not just put on one small Government department, which is what the Coastal Protection Branch is in terms of the size of government.

I will have a look at that and see if we can find some funds, but I think you would then have every council throughout the whole of South Australia saying, 'We don't need to accept our responsibility for cleaning up the beaches; it is someone else's responsibility.' I think we have to be a little cautious here.

Mr LEWIS: I refer to page 277 of the Program Estimates under the objectives for the department which included an assessment for the planting of trees in rural areas. Was the assessment ever completed? Can we have a copy of the report?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Would the honourable member refer me to the section on the page?

Mr LEWIS: On page 277 of the Program Estimates in the objectives for this last financial year there was included an assessment of the decline of trees in rural areas. I ask the Minister and her advisers to provide the Committee with information about whether the assessment has ever been completed and, if it has, can we have a copy of it.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Is this one of the five dot points?

Mr LEWIS: You've got it.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Which one is it?

Mr LEWIS: Assessment of the decline of trees in rural areas. It is for 1991-92.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Mr Chairman, it is certainly not on that page. I am not sure what program it would come under because I am not sure to what the honourable member is referring.

Mr LEWIS: I know that we were looking at this at the beginning of the 1991 financial year and that we looked at it again last year—well, I did, anyway. I wanted to know what has happened to it because I have not heard anything of it.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I cannot find the relevant section.

The CHAIRMAN: I must admit that I am having some trouble finding it.

Mr OSWALD: It was in the 1991-92 budget.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That is not the one we are looking at.

Mr LEWIS: We were told the money was going to be spent and that it was spent on that, although I do not know whether or not the assessment was ever completed.

The CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the Committee, is the member for Murray-Mallee referring to the

Program Estimates and Information for 1992-93 or 1991-92?

Mr LEWIS: 1991-92.

The CHAIRMAN: With all due respect, we are here to question the Minister on the 1992-93 year.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am not quite sure what the honourable member is referring to, but—

Mr LEWIS: I am referring to the decline of trees in rural areas and the specific objectives that were originally set for the assessment of that two years ago.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Let me explain to the honourable member that there are two programs, and I will get Mr Nicholas Newland to talk about them. I understand that one program is the assessment of the damage that mistletoe has done in the Mallee area and the other one is the lerp infestation in the Upper South-East. They are the only two programs I am aware of. However, the department may well have some other programs that it is currently undertaking, and I will ask Mr Newland to elaborate if there is anything else.

Mr Newland: The Native Vegetation Management Branch of the department has undertaken some work on the extent of mistletoe infestations in both the Murray-Mallee and the Lower Flinders Ranges and has been working with local government as to how to deal with those particular problems. So far that work has not really come up with any definitive findings, except to recognise the fact that the extent of the removal of vegetation or natural habitat has tended to increase that particular problem with mistletoe infestations.

The same can also be said for the infestation of particularly blue gums in the Upper South-East of the State with lerp, which is a sap sucking insect. Again, the work that has been done by the Native Vegetation Management Branch so far has identified that this is an increasing problem which is tending to reflect the extent of removal of native vegetation habitat in the Upper South-East and the increasing stress being placed on the remaining vegetation through other problems such as rising salinity. I also understand that the department has recently completed a report on red gum dieback in various parts of the Flinders Ranges. They are the only programs which come to mind.

Mr LEWIS: In a similar vein we had objectives that referred to the conducting of a major seminar or conference on environmental auditing and monitoring and there was an intention to publish guidelines for environmental auditing. I do not see any allocation for the publishing of those guidelines. There was not any last year. What has happened? Could we have a copy of them if they have been published? I do not know when this seminar or conference took place, but can we have a copy of the guidelines?

Mr Harris: We did a certain amount of work on environmental auditing and monitoring, but we have recently put it in abeyance pending the establishment of the EPA. We are currently reviewing our approach to it. We can provide the honourable member with further advice a little further down the track.

Mr LEWIS: Supplementary to that, did the seminar or conference take place? We appropriated funds for this purpose 12 months ago; what has happened to them?

Mr Newland: The conference was proposed for about the middle of this year, but it has been deferred because of the establishment of the EPA and the review.

Mr LEWIS: So, presumably those funds should have been carried over? If not, were they applied to some other purpose and, if so, what purpose was it?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am sure that they would have been applied to some other purpose; they would not have been wasted in any way. Obviously, when you are running a department with so many programs and facets, if one thing does not receive that money it is put into something else. That is fully audited and made available to the Auditor-General.

Mr LEWIS: That is an interesting observation. We appropriate funds for one purpose only to find that they have been spent on others for which no appropriation was sought. Referring to Program Estimates (page 270), we see that the primary role of national parks is said to be the protection of wildlife (the way some people behave in national parks I can understand that, but I thought it was more for other species than *homo sapiens*). For that to be improved and effective continuing research must be done into flora and fauna there, both native and feral.

At present it seems that very little State Government money is going into that research; most of the appropriation budget goes into kangaroo management, as far as I know. How many officers are employed in the National Parks and Wildlife Service directly in wildlife research? How much State Government finance goes into wildlife research outside the program of kangaroo management? Is any money spent through other agencies, such as the Adelaide University, Roseworthy campus? Finally, how much finance is being made available for wildlife research from the Federal Government through the State Government?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask Mr Newland to answer those questions and, if we do not have the detailed answer particularly of the exact amount from the Federal Government, we will provide it, but I think we may have it. Mr Newland will answer the first part of the question, and I will pick it up at the end.

Mr Newland: The honourable member asked about the number of officers employed on wildlife management within the Biological Conservation Branch of the department. Five full-time equivalents are employed on wildlife management, and they deal with a number of programs including, of course, the kangaroo management program to which the honourable member referred, but also other programs, such as undertaking a biological survey on wetlands, their work associated with the reintroduction of endangered species, and so on.

In terms of the amount of money coming from the Federal Government for wildlife-based programs, this year we have been fortunate to be the beneficiaries of over \$200 000, through at least two programs run by the Commonwealth—the endangered species program and the State's cooperative assistance program run through the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Mr LEWIS: Without parading any inside knowledge I might have of the formula, and so on: by how much could that money from the Commonwealth be increased by the employment of two extra scientific wildlife officers in the National Parks and Wildlife Service?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Before I ask Mr Newland to answer that, I will just answer the last part of the previous question, which related to how much money came to us from the Federal Government. I can identify two particular lines of funding: first, through the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service, for which funding of \$50 000 is estimated for this year; and, secondly, through the endangered species consultancy program, a further \$100 000. So, we are talking about \$150 000. Other funds are coming through from DASET, but they relate to other areas, not the specific area about which the honourable member has talked. I will ask Mr Newland to comment on the supplementary question.

Mr Newland: The appointment of an extra two scientific officers to work on matters associated with wildlife management within the department would not necessarily attract further funding from the Commonwealth. The way in which the Commonwealth tends to provide funding for various programs is, first, through their importance in terms of the objectives that may exist under the respective Commonwealth program and, secondly, through the type of support and assistance that comes from the particular State agency concerned.

South Australia is fortunate, in the biological survey work that it has done over the past 10 years, in effect to be at the forefront in Australia in establishing a database for biological resources. In effect, that has been the catalyst for us to be able to attract the level of funding that we have been able to attract from the Commonwealth so far. So, I do not think that employing an extra two scientific officers in the program would necessarily add to what we have been able to achieve.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Program Estimates (page 281), under the heading, 'Program Pollution Management' and also under the 1992-93 Specific Targets and Objectives refers to the establishment of the Environment Protection Authority. There has been some comment in the media recently that the Environment Protection Act may lead to substantial litigation for pollution offences. Will the Minister comment on that?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I note that there was an article recently, I think in the *Advertiser*, from a Miss Tricia Ross saying that the EPA would open the floodgates to litigation as specific industries were going to be facing fines up to \$1 million for pollution offences. I would like to point out a number of facts in terms of that particular allegation. First, it must be understood that we are talking about a \$1 million maximum penalty. It would certainly apply only when a company had intentionally or recklessly polluted the environment and thus caused serious environmental harm and when the court considered that the maximum fine should be imposed.

If I recall the debate in the Parliament in terms of the Marine Environment Protection Bill, everybody agreed that \$1 million was considered to be a fairly substantial fine but that it was seen as a maximum. Secondly, we must put this matter into perspective, because we must acknowledge that the penalty at the other end of the scale is an on-the-spot fine of \$100. So, we must look at the whole context of this system. It is also worth remembering that there are \$1 million maximum penalties under a number of current Acts, both here and in other States. There has been no evidence that having a penalty

of that size therefore elicits large numbers of legal actions.

The draft Environment Protection Bill provides safeguards against the misuse of the entitlements to take legal action for a breach of the Act. An individual wishing to take a company to court would need the prior approval of the EPA. This is designed as a means of preventing malicious or frivolous legal action, and I think it is important that we stand up and say that to the community so that they know that businesses which are going about their proper job in a responsible way will not be taken to court in a frivolous or malicious manner.

Similarly, to prevent the abuse of the right to seek an injunction where a breach of the Act is suspected, a person must obtain special leave of the court in most cases. In considering whether to allow the case to go ahead, the court must take into account the public interest. I would like to summarise by saying that important checks and balances are included within the draft Bill to guard against a flood of unjustified legal action.

I hope that in raising this matter, certainly for the purposes of the media present, we have been able to put clearly on the record that this is a balanced approach which will not cause an unprecedented rush of legal action but on the other hand will send very clear signals to all sections of the community that we do mean business.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer again to 281 of the Program Estimates and the program of pollution management under 1992-93 specific targets/objectives relating to contaminated land sites. What has the Government done to make funds available for the clean up of contaminated sites that pose a significant health threat or hazard to the environment?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We have done a number of things. Under the proposed budget financial provisions for 1992-93, with the establishment of an Environment Protection Authority we would look at applying some \$250 000 per annum to directly assist organisations to clean up contaminated sites. The EPA will advise the public of the procedure for applying for clean-up funds when the fund becomes operational. The funding will be applied in accordance with EPA guidelines and will be used where there is the greatest potential to achieve the most benefit.

The inner metropolitan area is one region where contaminated land clean up would allow opportunity for urban development and help alleviate some of the social problems that exist there. This initiative, I stress, is in addition to the moneys available through the Federal Government's Better Cities Program.

I would also like to refer to my role as the Environment Minister on the national ANZEC Ministers forum, where we have identified the need for there to be some form of national approach to the provision of funds for the clean up of contaminated land sites and indeed we will have to move nationally to the way in which we raise funds to put towards the cleaning up of contaminated land and to the way in which those funds would be disbursed. It is quite a nonsense to suggest that small States have the financial capacity to take on the clean up of some of these sites, because we are talking

about multi million dollar clean up; we are not just talking thousands of dollars.

The member for Murray-Mallee interjected that it depends what is on the site. He is quite correct: it depends on what substances form the contamination, how highly contaminated is the land, and on the way in which we move forward with technology. A number of suggestions have been made: first, that if the States develop certain technologies for particular sites, they share them with other States, thus being able to defray the costs of the initial establishment of those technologies, rather than having a border around our States and trying to do everything within our own boundaries. We must look at the solution to these problems on a much broader front, both from a financial and a technological viewpoint.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer to the same program of pollution management but with regard to the Marine Environment Protection Committee. This is probably a very topical point at the moment. This committee has recommended policies for licensing marine discharges, and a significant feature of that appears to be an environmental improvement program to be negotiated by the third year of licensing. What is the Minister's expectation that such programs will actually improve the environment?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have high expectations that these programs will improve the environment, in particular the marine environment. In discussions that officers of the department have had with the various companies, businesses and Government instrumentalities currently discharging into the marine environment, we have found an enormous amount of enthusiasm and goodwill to move forward and implement technologies that will reduce both the quantity and the content within discharges into the marine environment. Indeed, some companies have moved already to implement new programs and technologies that are multi-million dollar programs ahead of the legislation. So, I feel very optimistic.

In the honourable member's electorate, BHAS has moved to implement such technologies and programs. It is very important. I would like to give a couple of examples of this. Before the anticipation of the Act, Pasmenco Metals BHAS at Port Pirie submitted a waste water quality improvement strategy. To advise the Committee of the level of commitment, the projected cost of that strategy was in the order of \$8 million. The company is proceeding with this program well ahead of the requirements of the Act.

I also refer honourable members to the example of APCEL in the South-East where, even though it had the protection of an indenture that allowed them to do anything that one can imagine by way of discharge from their factory gate, they have worked constructively with the departments involved, the local community and local government to ensure that they will clean up Lake Bonney, and that program is well ahead of any kind of legislative requirement that they might have had. They do not have that because of their indenture.

I also indicate to the Committee that the new casting plant at BHP Whyalla includes a water treatment plant which reduces the demand for fresh water and helps reduce the pollutant load in the plant discharges. The

refinery at Port Stanvac is part way through developing an environmental improvement plan which will reduce risks of oil spills and improve the physical appearance and condition of the plant. It is consistent with a more efficient operation.

To summarise, we can feel optimistic. The fact that businesses and Government instrumentalities that discharge into the marine environment are much more environmentally conscious and aware and are accepting their responsibilities ahead of the legislation, I am delighted to say, does not mean that we will not ensure that we carry out the spirit and the letter of the legislation, because we will.

Mrs HUTCHISON: What sort of monitoring mechanisms are in place to monitor this?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The monitoring will come with the establishment of the Environment Protection Authority. We have already moved to a certain point. Mr Rob Thomas, who has been appointed the new Director of the Environment Protection Authority, takes up his position on the 28th of this month. As soon as he is in place and operational, we will look at establishing the rest of the positions within the EPA, and the monitoring of all requirements under the various Acts, which will be brought under the Environment Protection Act, will be monitored through the EPA. That may well be in some instances contracted out to other departments, but it will be overseen and managed.

Also involved will be the whole question of internal auditing and monitoring within organisations and companies where they will have to embark on auditing programs that will be overseen by the EPA.

Mr OSWALD: Is the Minister satisfied with the new management and management procedures in place at the Adelaide Gaol? It has been put to the Opposition that under the new management the wire fences which were part of the gaol exercise yards are being removed, and that holes have been knocked through walls for doorways, etc., despite objections from volunteers acting as guides down there.

As we have been advised that an officer of your department is aware of these activities and has been approving them, will he explain to the Committee the latitude that the new management of the old gaol is giving in making alterations into what we believe is a heritage listed building?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Before I ask my officer, Mr David Conlon, the Manager of the Heritage Branch, to speak, let me just say that the Government very firmly believes that it certainly is a heritage building and a heritage site in that we have moved to provide funds for its on-going protection and maintenance. So, it is not just an Opposition perception that this is something that is part of our history. Before we actually find somebody guilty I think it might be appropriate—notwithstanding the way we do business in this State—to actually hear the other side of the story and I would like to give my officer the opportunity to present that side. I would ask Mr David Conlon to do that.

Mr Conlon: The honourable member has raised two issues. One is the removal of wire fences, and perhaps we can comment on that one first. Around the outside of the Adelaide Gaol is cyclone fencing and that fencing is not a single fence that runs all the way around; the area

is divided into sections. One of the security measures on the gaol is guard dogs running in that area. We have been endeavouring to cut the costs of looking after and securing the gaol, and one of the steps we have taken is to remove some of that internal fencing to cut back the number of guard dogs that are required to run in that area. So, we have halved the cost of guard dog security around the gaol by doing that.

The other thing that will happen is that we are negotiating with the Adelaide City Council regarding the final shape of what will become a recreation park under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, and it is likely that external fence will also move sometime in the next 12 months or so, but the fences that have been moved to date were to improve the efficiency of security with the dogs.

As to knocking holes in walls for doors, that has not happened. It was raised with me last Sunday that that was a possibility, but nothing like that has happened and I do not believe it will be happening.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I hope the honourable member is happy with that answer because it is a good answer both on heritage grounds and also on grounds of good financial management.

Mr OSWALD: I am delighted to hear that. I will be interested to talk to the guides down there that tell me that holes are being knocked in walls. I will put them on their mettle.

My next question relates to pollution management, page 271. On 10 and 11 February this year a copper chrome arsenate spill occurred in the Brownhill and Keswick Creek system. Following the spill an officer from the E&WS went down and briefed the Glenelg council, and as a result of that briefing it became apparent to council that both the Department of Environment and Planning and the E&WS did not have a comprehensive testing procedure to indicate the level of pollution from any one spill or to indicate possible sources which would allow litigation for reparation of costs caused by spillage, and did not have a procedure to advise companies on being safety conscious regarding the spillage of toxic substances. I know that whilst it can be argued that down the track next year when the EPA is in operation perhaps it will pick up those areas of concern, the fact is that it appears these areas are not covered. What is the Minister's response to those three allegations raised by the Glenelg council, and what is the department doing to rectify them in the interim before the EPA comes into operation?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It will not be the middle of next year when the EPA comes into operation. I think I just said, in my last answer, that the Director of the EPA has already been appointed and takes up his duties on 28 September this year. The Bill may not be operational, but if you have the administrative arrangements correct and they are operational then surely that is the answer to the question. The answer is that with the EPA in full operation—in other words, bringing together the various arms of Government under the one management strategy—then the response times will be dealt with, as will the way in which we deal with these sorts of issues, and the way in which we are able to make sure that our officers are multi-skilled and not just going out and looking at one aspect of a particular environmental

problem. This is the whole rationale of establishing an EPA. So, I think that is not a long-term solution: it is an immediate solution. However, that is the last part of the question. There have been some other parts to the question and I would ask Mr Gary Stafford from the department if he would like to respond to the earlier parts of the honourable member's question.

Mr Stafford: Mr Chairman, I might not have caught all of the question, but I think the first part of the question related to a statement to the effect that the department does not have adequate testing facilities for material that may be spilt. In response to that I would like to say that the department does have access to a number of Government laboratories. So we certainly would not have any problems in identifying material that had been spilt in an incident such as that described. We did in fact have officers on site at the time of the spill, together with officers of the Department of Labour, the E&WS, Metropolitan Fire Service and various other people called out as part of the normal response under the Blue Book procedure, which I am sure the honourable member would be familiar with.

The question of prosecution and cost recovery rests, as I understand it, with the Department of Labour, and it would prosecute if necessary. I believe that legislation has recently been amended to enable cost recovery for those other parties involved in investigation of spills of that type. But more importantly the role that our officers played was one of attempting to ensure, by working in liaison with the company concerned, that spills of that nature do not occur again—in other words, if there were safety valves installed to ensure that storage tanks would not overflow in the future and run into the Sturt Creek.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That, of course, is one of the major underpinnings of the establishment of the EPA which is about prevention. It is not about things happening and then suddenly saying, 'Well, what are we going to do about it?' It is actually about prevention. This is why we are looking at licensing, monitoring and working with industries to get the best practice on the ground so that we will be able to prevent these kinds of things happening in the future; I think that is one of the strengths of the new EPA.

Mr OSWALD: I will convey that answer to the Glenelg council. My other question is: when can the Opposition expect a reply to our question in the House as to why the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and in particular the Resource Protection Branch at Norwood, does not advertise positions or carry out interviews before making appointments to staff positions? Will the Minister provide a list of all employees from the whole of the National Parks and Wildlife that have been approved and appointed in the past three years without advertising or interview? Will the Minister take it on notice?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I do not need to take it on notice. I have answered the question; it is in the system. Certainly I have answered the question and in fact, as I recall the answer, the honourable member did not correctly identify the branch. There is a branch at Norwood but it is not the branch to which the honourable member referred, so in fact the department went to extreme lengths to provide an answer, trying to second guess what the honourable member was asking, because we also identified who had been appointed recently, in

two sections of the department, because one section that the honourable member referred to was not located at Norwood and in fact it was not the correct title. We gave the information for another section which is located at Norwood. The answer to the question is in the system. I have certainly signed it and authorised it to go into the Parliament, so I am sure the honourable member should have it within a day or so, if he has not already received it.

Mr OSWALD: This is supplementary. We are playing with one word in a title here. I could have clarified it by a telephone call but I took the name of the branch off a chart that was given to me.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We have given you that information.

Mr OSWALD: If the Minister has a reply coming, I will be interested to see the reply. It is a question that revolves around what is the policy for appointing officers into the department without going through the normal advertising and interviews.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can say that the department does go through the requirements under the GME Act, as I understand it, and because I deal with so many issues I cannot recall the exact answer to the question, but I do recall that certainly any concerns the honourable member had were absolutely addressed in the answer that I provided in the system. So, I think the honourable member should be pleased with the answer he receives.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to the Estimates of Payments where, at page 137, it is noted that \$1.1 million has been allocated for pastoral management, whilst it is understood that \$1.4 million was previously available for this function through the Lands ministry. What previous activities will not be resumed or what specific cuts are proposed to meet the shortfall, and how will they be apportioned to different aspects of the program?

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

Mr Newland: When the program was first transferred from the Department of Lands, arrangements were made for the program to be deficit funded from Treasury, because the amount of money being received from pastoral rents did not meet the total cost of the program. Since that time negotiations with Treasury have established that that former funding would not be available and that it would be a requirement for the department to fund the program in its complete form.

As a result of that we have made some adjustments to the operational nature of the Pastoral Management Branch. We have had further negotiations with Treasury and have been successful in gaining a small amount of assistance to help us run that program in its original form. The reductions that the honourable member is referring to have been made across the program at large, particularly in the area associated with the Land Management Section of the branch. That does not mean that the major part of the program, which is the assessment of pastoral leases to establish land management conditions, will not continue as it was being undertaken before.

Mr OSWALD: It is also understood that within that \$1.1 million there is some national soil conservation

program funding. What proportion does this represent? Is it tied to specific projects and, if so, what are they?

Mr Newland: When the Department of Environment and Planning took over the operation of the pastoral management program we understood that the previous administration had not been availing itself of opportunities of Commonwealth funding for activities within that program. Since the Department of Environment and Planning has been involved with the program we have been actively seeking Commonwealth funding through a number of sources, including, as the honourable member has mentioned, the national soil conservation program. We have been successful in obtaining approximately \$75 000 through that particular program, and those funds will be made available to allow us to begin the process of assessing pastoral leases in the north-east pastoral zone.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I have some questions in relation to the other deposit and special deposit accounts under the Minister's control, referred to in the Auditor-General's Report on pages 74 and 75. Could the Minister indicate where the funds under the Dog Control Statutory Fund have been applied? I notice that in the past financial year payments of \$291 000 were made, as against receipts amounting to \$261 000.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask Mr Newland if he can answer that question.

Mr Newland: I do not have those details with me and I would prefer to take the question on notice and provide the honourable member with information later.

Mr HOLLOWAY: Perhaps similar information could be provided, on notice, in relation to the Wildlife Conservation Fund, in relation to which I understand that funds are provided from hunting permits. Also, I seek, on notice, some information in relation to the Native Vegetation Fund. Reference is made in the Auditor-General's Report to properties purchased under the 1985 Act, which are ultimately purchased by SAFA, and it refers here to properties to the value of \$1.7 million. Will the Minister provide details of the number of properties so purchased and the location of them?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, we will provide that information.

Mrs KOTZ: First, I must say, with due respect to you, Mr Chairman, and in relation to some of your previous discourse on pre-empting comment in questions to the Minister, I would like to point out, without seeking to breach any ruling by the Chair, that I am certainly not trying to justify to you, Sir, in particular; it is just that you are the direct access to the Minister. I preface the question that I am about to ask the Minister in that way, because I do not know the answer; it may in fact be substantial and, if it is, I am quite happy for the question to be taken on notice. I refer to page 268 of the Program Estimates. Will the Minister provide a list of all consultancies conducted by sources outside the Department of Environment and Planning? What were the subjects of each of the consultancies? Who were the consultants? Could I also have details of the individual fees that were paid to each of those consultants?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Mr Chairman, the information has already been provided to the Economic and Finance Committee; but I am aware that not all members are actually on that committee and may not—

Mr FERGUSON interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: In a spirit of goodwill, I am happy to provide that information again for the honourable member. I have it here in front of me. However, I do not intend to read every one of these and all that information into *Hansard*, because that would simply be wasting the time of the Committee and I do not think it would progress anything.

I have a document listing consultancies of less than \$10 000, those between \$10 000 and \$50 000 and those above \$50 000, giving the total cost, the actual consultant and the costs that were paid. I presume that is what the honourable member wants. The document lists what the consultancy is for and, without reading it out, I will have it inserted in *Hansard*.

1991-92
CONSULTANCIES

		\$
Less than \$10 000	total cost	99 720
23 Consultancies		
\$10 000-\$50 000		
Manage the IBIS Awards	Tumbull Fox Phillips	10 000
Manage the Bush Chronicle Newsletter	Tumbull Fox Phillips	15 048
Provide training and expertise to assist the Rangelands Assessment Group in the field of arid land management	Dr R. T. Lange	43 049
Survey of Environmental Management industry, as part of ongoing Economic Development Study	P.P.K. Consultants	15 000
Establish and promote a pastoral lands research and education institute in association with the Middleback Field Centre	Dr R. T. Lange	29 895
Development Control incentive Study—Mt Lofty Ranges	P.P.K. Consultants	30 000
Study of Flooding in the Upper South East of S.A.	Dr Derek Smith	11 260
Review of 130 items of legislation having environmental components. Preparation of a computerised data base to facilitate publication and periodic update of an Environmental Protection Legislation Reference Handbook	Kinhill Group	28 000
Preparation of a Green Paper: Contaminated Land—A South Australian Legislative Approach	David Coles and Associates	15 000
Marketing of Urban Consolidation	Leo Burnett Pty Ltd	26 000
Small Area Land Monitoring System	Uni Quest	13 000
Development of a Retailing Data Base	Hassell Planning & Jones Lang Wooton	23 000
Streetscope Research Project	B. Oswald	50 000
Economics of Medium Density Housing	CSIRO	25 000
Study of Supplementary Development Plan and Development Control Procedures	S. Rix	11 750
River Murray Houseboard Study	G. Gaston	15 000

Office Development Study— Data Base Development	Hassell Planning	\$ 30 000
Industrial Land and Employment Study	Planning Advisory Service	32 000
Hackney Depot Relocation	Cielens and Wark	37 205
Budget Expenditure Control System	P. Close	16 000
Botanic Park and Mt Lofty Botanic Gardens Car Parks	Maunsell Pty Ltd	33 715
Southern Metro Development Strategy—Urban Potential	Planning Advisory Service	25 000
Environmental Protection Authority Office—Proposal for Organisational Structure and Mapping	John Collins Consultants Pty Ltd	12 000
1991 Royal Adelaide Show Environment Trail and Exhibit, Public Relations and Coordination of Activities	Tumbull Fox Phillips	20 000
		566 922

Above \$50 000		
Dilapidation Survey—Palm House Botanic Gardens	Bruce Harry and Associates in Conjunction with SACON	110 000

Mrs KOTZ: My next question relates to Estimates paper No. 2 at page 134. Under Receipts, it is noted that regulatory licence fees and charges are projected to rise from \$199 428 to \$1.24 million. How will this very substantial rise be achieved?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: What we are looking at comes under the environment protection licensing fees and charges, and there would be such things as clean air licences, CFC regulation fees for ozone protection and the marine pollution fees, and we have talked at some length about marine. In drawing up the legislation we determined that every company or instrumentality that discharged into the marine environment would require a licence and, in terms of preparing the stipulations for that licence, people would be charged the appropriate fee. That is where the money is coming from.

Mr Stafford: The Minister is correct: the licence fees involved are clean air licences, which will account for \$211 000; ozone protection fees, \$180 000; and the anticipated fees from marine pollution licences, \$670 000, totalling \$1.061 million over the full financial year.

Mrs KOTZ: My last question relates to page 270 of the Program Estimates. I believe that the amount of finance for recurrent expenditure by the National Parks and Wildlife Service is currently at a stage where it is so low that it is considered that there is more or less nothing for vehicle maintenance. Will there be enough money in the budget to guarantee sufficient funds for the proper maintenance and running of all present National Parks and Wildlife Service vehicles?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am not quite sure to what the honourable member is referring when she says that it is considered that almost nothing is there. It is certainly not considered so by the department or by me. I understand that we have increased the amount of money for vehicle maintenance this year, but I will ask the Acting Director-General to answer the honourable member's question.

Mr Leaver: The total recurrent allocation for the operation of the National Parks and Wildlife Service is just over \$8.8 million, 54 per cent of which is spent operating vehicles, plant, our aircraft and boats, in

meeting our fixed charges and maintaining essential equipment. I noted in answer to an earlier question that the operating funds will go up by 8 per cent this year, so the field management part of the agency will, in fact, have that increase. It is not tied to any specific item, so it will be available to meet its operating charges.

If any area does have difficulties in maintaining its vehicles, therefore, that will be accommodated by the 8 per cent increase. Our vehicle fleet is operated to a very high standard, which makes good economic sense. It costs much more to operate junk. Our replacement program is on schedule with the budget, so the quality of plant is kept to a very high standard in order that our operating costs do not creep up.

Mrs KOTZ: As a supplementary question, in that answer you stated that 54 per cent was in the area of vehicle operation. Do you have a breakdown on the specifics of what portion of that 54 per cent is used specifically for the maintenance of vehicles?

Mr Leaver: No, I do not have that before me. The department operates under a plant hire fund whereby the allocation for the operation of vehicles is internalised. It would be fairly easy to pull out those figures for the honourable member, so I will take the question on notice.

Mr FERGUSON: I refer to page 282 of the Program Estimates for 1992-93 and the 1991-92 Specific Targets/Objectives concerning the Glenelg foreshore development. The original objectives in the prospectus for the Glenelg foreshore redevelopment project included proposals for improving water quality in the Patawalonga area and upgrading recreational boating and launching facilities. Can the Minister advise whether these objectives have been addressed in the planning strategy? I add that some people in the western area are very anxious to make sure that the golf course remains as is in that area. What will happen to the West Beach Trust with respect to this redevelopment?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will answer some of the honourable member's questions and then ask the Acting Director of Planning, Mr David Ellis, if he would like to add anything, because he is my representative on the steering committee and has a day-to-day working knowledge of some of these issues.

In terms of the question of water quality, the current proposal provides for the removal of trash and much of the silt in a gross pollutant trash rack. It is a trap; part of it is a rack and then there would also be some ponding and wetlands further upstream. The proposal also involves flushing the lake with seawater. The lake would be suitable for uses which have primary contact for summer except, of course, after rain storms of the magnitude that we have seen in the past couple of weeks.

A final evaluation cannot be undertaken until more detailed designs are submitted as part of the ongoing assessment of the project. It is also important to note that there are public cost implications associated with this aspect of the proposal. I am expecting a return on these implications, and I expect that the report will be presented to the Government for evaluation in the next few weeks. I guess it is probably more appropriate that this be answered when I am wearing my hat as Minister of Water Resources, but I am having some negotiations and discussions with the E&WS Department about the way in which we will move forward and look at

M

particularly cleaning up the gross pollutants in the Patawalonga.

I believe that it will be part of the final solution to clean up that area in terms of the water quality. As I said earlier, it will be part of the overall stormwater management strategy for metropolitan Adelaide. What we are seeing in a number of council areas is a whole range of practices that are happening upstream. I remind members that our forebears thought that the way in which one handled stormwater was to build concrete channels and move it as quickly as possible into the neighbouring council area and then into the sea. We are finding that not only do these things look aesthetically horrible but also that they are environmentally unsound.

For example, I know that the Marion council is very keen to work with the various Government departments—Environment and Planning and E&WS—to have a look at perhaps using some of its land to make wetlands and some more attractive ponding basins which will attract birdlife and other forms of life. I think that this is the way that future communities will go. I think we will see an integrated response to the way in which we manage, handle and clean up the stormwater.

Let us not forget that we have to move forward and look at policing more effectively the litter laws because it is what people throw down in the streets and on the kerbs and in the gutters that end up in places such as the Patawalonga. The litter does not get there by magic; it actually gets there because human behaviour determines that that is where it will end up. That is another major issue that the community will have to address and address very seriously.

Because I am very conscious that Mr Ellis is the expert within my portfolio grouping in relation to these issues, I will ask him whether he will address some of the broader issues that were raised by the honourable member.

Mr Ellis: I have very little to add because I think the Minister has said it all, except to say that West Beach Trust land is involved and the design details of the project are in the environmental impact statement that was prepared. The honourable member will recall that with this project the EIS process was used to facilitate the assessment review and selection of the preferred scheme. Although there are design details to be resolved, the proposal will be put to Government very soon, probably in the next week or two.

Mr FERGUSON: I refer to page 277 of the Program Estimates, in particular to the 'Broad Objective(s)/Goal(s)' concerning the program beginning with the establishment of the Natural Resources Council. Following the landmark United Nations conference in Rio on environment and development, what will the Government be doing to give effect to the findings of the earth summit?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I thank the honourable member for this question because it really does set the scene about where we are in terms of the rest of the world. I think that that is fairly important, particularly when one is looking at environmental issues. The Government was represented at the UNCED conference by me, and I represented the Ministers from the various States and Territories in Australia, and also by the Acting Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, Ms Cath Moore, who had been part of the preparation

conferences in the lead-up to the UNCED conference and had done an enormous amount of work in getting the papers and the agenda to the point that it was at when the final two weeks at UNCED were undertaken.

In addition, the Department of Environment and Planning contributed to representation by the National President of the Environment Institute of Australia. The State has had the benefit of ministerial, departmental and non-government organisational perspectives in adopting a strategy to support the international agreements and appropriate policy directions for this decade. I provided Cabinet with a report on the Monday after I returned from Rio de Janeiro, and I asked whether it would approve the Department of Environment and Planning coordinating Government responses. So, we will not just have a department by department response: we will have an across-the-board response. In fact, State Cabinet endorsed that suggestion of mine and the department is responsible now for coordinating the response to the conference outcomes.

The new Natural Resources Council has set up a group to undertake this work. So, we are actually putting to good use the Natural Resources Council, which I talked about in an earlier question. The group will progress the work through a series of workshops scheduled to be held through September and October, and a draft State response will be presented to the Natural Resources Council. It is also envisaged that the environment Ministers from each of the States will provide to ANZEC a response from their State not only about what are the implications in terms of responsibilities and meeting standards and requirements but also in terms of what are the opportunities.

Members of the Committee have heard me in the Parliament talking about the kind of environmental industry-type opportunities there are for South Australia, so I will not repeat myself because I think I have covered those areas in great detail.

It is important that we acknowledge the need to bring together ecologically sustainable development strategies, greenhouse response requirements and the UNCED outcomes along with the State economic strategy, the planning review outcomes and the national biodiversity strategy. None of these things can be looked at in isolation; they must be looked at as an integrated part of the total response because to look at them in isolation I think will lead us down the path of just not achieving the kind of goals that we believe are important to achieve if we are to survive on this planet and to have a sustainable future.

Additionally, the Commonwealth is developing an options paper on the means of bringing the UNCED outcomes and the ESD strategies together at the national level. This will be circulated to all the States and Territories for their consideration and input into finalisation. It certainly would be fair to say that this has been one world conference where people have not returned and just put things on the shelf and said, 'Well, that was interesting'; what we have done is come back and set the wheels in motion to ensure that the community fully understands the decisions that our Federal Government has taken and also to communicate and to work with the community to implement those decisions, because ultimately it will be the States that

have the legislative power to implement the decisions and generally at the end of the day that must pay for the implementation of those decisions.

Mr FERGUSON: I refer members to Program Estimates (page 282), under the planning program concerning the reference to Mount Lofty Ranges Management Plan under the 1991-92 Specific Target Objectives. In December 1991, the Government wrote to the firm KPMG Peat Marwick, representing the Mount Lofty Development Consortium, advising them that they had until 30 June 1992 to produce the project or lose the site. What is the present state of this development?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I believe that I indicated part of the answer to that in the Parliament recently. Just to give the honourable member an update, I have both verbally and in writing communicated to KPMG Peat Marwick and to one of the principals of the company stating that the Cabinet has extended the period in which it can get a viable proposal that can indicate financial support to the Government by the end of September. So, it has until the end of September to demonstrate to the Government that it can provide a realistically funded project.

This meant that we have extended from 30 June until the end of September the period of exclusivity that was given to this firm. We have done this because every fair-minded person in this State would recognise that we have had very serious recessionary forces at play, which have meant that in relation to many of these projects, while they are extremely important and worthwhile and need to proceed, there has been a reticence on behalf of investors to come forward with their investment funds.

The proposal that is currently being looked at is certainly smaller than the original proposal which was given Cabinet approval, and I believe that possibly has a much more realistic chance of succeeding. However, if the conditions that Cabinet has laid down are not adhered to, I believe (and Mr Ellis will pick up this matter) we would be opening up a call for register of interests for other forms of development. We are talking not about the actual summit but about the burnt out St Michael site, which of course is highly degraded now, and is an eyesore. We must proceed to provide proper visitor and tourist facilities. I believe we are now at that point where quite a deal of interest is being shown and, as we come out of the recession, we will see more interest in terms of the provision of backing and finance.

Mr Ellis: A large number of projects where developers are looking for finance have received planning approval over the years, and this is obviously one of them. It is the main reason for the extension of the period of exclusivity, so that the developers can look for funding, and obviously we hope that they find it. If they do not, it is reasonable to open up the possible redevelopment of the area to other developers.

Mr OSWALD: I refer members to the Program Estimates (page 272), under the heading 'State Heritage Conservation'. The 1991-92 budget listed \$100 000 for heritage interpretation and community awareness; for 1992-93 it lists it as \$15 000. What do these two figures represent, and what provision is there in the budget lines, either in this or any other line, for the promotion of cultural tourism?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Cultural tourism is an extremely broad concept which this Government fully supports. It really covers about three portfolios and three ministries. It covers, of course, the tourism portfolio; it covers the portfolio of the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage; and I guess to some extent, because I am the Minister for built European heritage, it covers my area.

However, the major area of promotion would come from tourism, because we are talking about cultural heritage as a form of tourism. A very substantial amount of cooperation has occurred across Government departments, and from my own department, particularly people such as David Conlon, who is the head of the Heritage Branch, working with his counterparts in terms of the people responsible for areas such as the Museum and other areas that come under my colleague, the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, and working with his counterpart in tourism.

It is important that we see this as an across-Government promotion of something which I think has been identified quite clearly in the Arthur D. Little report as one of the economic generators for South Australia in the future. It might well be—and this is just a mere speculation on my part—that the Premier may choose to bring together some of these areas in his reorganisation of his portfolios and ministries. I say that just as a comment; I have no inside information, and I am not aware whether that is in his mind.

It does pick up the point that the Arthur D. Little report has made about tourism, and the fact that the national parks system, for example, is one of the key and major areas in tourism development, promotion and generation. So, this grouping of portfolio departments has, in fact, worked very consistently and cooperatively with the Department of Tourism. We really do look at marketing. I work very closely with the National Trust. Of course, it is a great promoter of cultural tourism in South Australia in terms of visiting, national heritage properties and promoting our national heritage. I believe that we really do have a very positive and constructive relationship.

However, to the specifics of the question, I will ask one of my officers perhaps to see whether he could add anything further to my answer. I believe that the specifics of that question will need to be taken on notice. In terms of the general policy direction, I believe I have answered that. Will the honourable member say what specific information he is requiring?

Mr OSWALD: The basis of the question is that over 12 months the allocation has gone from \$100 000 back to \$15 000 and I want to know your promotional plans for cultural tourism for the forthcoming budget, based on the fact that the allocation has dropped so dramatically to almost zero.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Obviously specific programs required spending to get interpretive facilities at a particular location. That specific program, in terms of getting something organised, has obviously come to its conclusion and the programs identified for this coming year obviously have been identified in terms of that amount of money, but we will get a specific answer in case that is too general.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to coastal management, on page 278. The Minister would be aware, having an electorate in the Noarlunga area, that there has been publicity in the local papers concerning a proposed rock concert, fireworks display or some sort of bash planned on the estuary of the Onkaparinga. I believe that it is for new year's eve or one significant evening. It has been to a subcommittee of the Noarlunga Council and received some support. If it progresses we can visualise many thousands of people walking all over the reconstituted sand dunes in the vicinity of the Onkaparinga estuary. As there has been much expenditure in the past years and a considerable amount planned in the coming budget for the Onkaparinga estuary, what is the Government's attitude to this concert and fireworks display being conducted in the estuary to capture the amphitheatre effect, as it will obviously result in the public walking all over the sand dunes that have been resown?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am aware of the concert. It is not new year's eve but the Australia Day celebrations and concert in terms of celebrating Australia Day in 1993. I was present for the Noarlunga Australia Day committee launch which talked about the kind of celebrations being planned. I am happy to do some detailed work on this for the honourable member, but as I understand it the land is under the management, care and control of the council and certainly the Noarlunga council's record to date has been very environmentally sound. I remind the honourable member that the Noarlunga council was prepared to put \$300 000 on the table for the final solution of the creation of wetlands in the estuary, along with the \$300 000 from the State and Federal Governments. It is light years ahead of many other councils that do not want to put anything into anything and want the State Government to fund everything.

My 12 year working experience with the Noarlunga council is such that I would be amazed if it has not already addressed the issues, questions and problems of crowd management and control in terms of that natural amphitheatre. However, I would not wish in any way to mislead the Committee. I have not personally had discussions with the Mayor or paid officials of the council in terms of whether they have clearly identified potential problem areas. I do not know whether they have had any discussions with my department—I am told that they have not. Certainly I am prepared to take up the matter personally with the Mayor of Noarlunga just to ensure a solution as on the surface it seems a most exciting celebration.

A play has been written in the south and we will be having people from the southern area participating on the evening of the Australia Day celebrations. It has certainly been welcomed by the broad community and I would believe that the council would have addressed the environmental management problems of such large crowds. However, I will take up the matter personally with the Mayor.

Mr OSWALD: I will be assured if the Minister does that work and comes back and says that everything is all right. I have had a surprising number of letters from people living in the area expressing concern about the way people will roam through the sand dunes. If it is

checked out and the concert goes ahead, I will be happy if I know that the Minister has no difficulties with it.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am amazed, because not only am I the Minister for Environment and Planning but also the local member and I have had not one letter. I am not asking the honourable member to break any confidences, but perhaps he could raise with me privately from where the concerns are coming. The issue has not been raised with me and I believe that I have a fairly high profile in the southern community. I will check it out, but maybe I do not have the power to make a decision one way or the other. If it is on council owned and managed land and seen to be appropriate by the council, I would have to check my legal powers. Certainly I would hope that in the spirit of working with the community it would not get down to a situation of the Minister coming in and stopping something like this, but that we would work with the council on ways of managing crowds rather than having people trampling all over the sandhills. I would be amazed if the Noarlunga council had not thought of the problems and addressed them.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer to Aboriginal heritage conservation on page 276 of the Program Estimates, in particular the headings 1991-92 and 1992-93 specific targets/objectives. What stage have the objectives for 1991-92 reached; have they been completed? What start has been made on the 1992-93 objectives, including the western Lake Eyre Basin, and the Nullarbor Plains project, and Gawler Ranges site protection as mentioned in the 1991-92 objectives?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will speak briefly about the ones with which I am fully conversant and then will ask the Manager of the Aboriginal Heritage Unit, Mr Bob Ware, to add something. The question related to how well we have implemented the objectives of 1991-92 and what are the proposals for 1992-93. I express great delight at what has been looked at in terms of the Nullarbor Plain project for identifying all of these sites and areas but great disappointment, on the other hand (and people may have read of my disappointment in the *Advertiser* yesterday or this morning), that the Western Australian Government has not managed to see its way clear to support us in nominating the Nullarbor Plains for world heritage listing. I remind honourable members that we do not have one world listing or one nomination before the World Heritage Committee from South Australia. That is fairly sad because we have some areas of enormous significance and one of the exciting things about the Nullarbor Plain is its tremendous Aboriginal heritage and cultural significance.

I do not pretend to speak about that as it is not appropriate and I am sure that Mr Ware will speak about it. I preface what he will say by advising that I am disappointed that we have not been able to move forward for listing this year and I can only hope that Western Australia will be prepared to do that next year, as it is an area of great significance for a whole range of geological reasons, for arid areas and for Aboriginal history and culture. I ask Mr Ware to comment.

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr B Ware, Manager, Aboriginal Heritage Unit.

Mr Ware: The western Lake Eyre project is a community based project by the Dunjiba community at Oodnadatta. It is anticipated that the project will be finished this year. It is funded through the National Estate grants through the Australian Heritage Commission.

The Nullarbor Plains project has been going for some time. It is a project once again that is funded through the National Estates grants, and it started to move a lot swifter in line with world heritage nomination. You will notice that in our 1992-93 targets we had some thermoluminescence study of Koonalda and Allans Cave. Early indications from the thermoluminescence dating are that the dates are at 40 000 years, which effectively puts out the rest of the dates that the scientific field used in carbon dating on Lake Mungo, and Lake Mungo was done at 40 000, and it was thought that the dates for the Aboriginal people down south were a lot shorter; 40 000 certainly puts a lot out. Those dates have more or less been confirmed with the Stratigraphy in Allans and Koonalda. So, they are very pleasing, but it is disappointing, as the Minister has previously stated, that the Western Australian Government is not moving towards world heritage support for the Nullarbor Plains. I must say I am a little bit biased on the Nullarbor Plains, having been a previous resident in that area.

The Gawler Ranges project is a continuing project working with the Kokatha people, the Bangarla people and the Wironga people, all of whom have affiliations with the Gawler Ranges. Hopefully that will not finish, but will be an ongoing project for about two or three more years, because very little work is being done in the Gawler Ranges. Site protection is always an ongoing project where sites need physical protection, and that will appear every year on our objectives and targets. The Strehlow collection, you might have read, has been dealt with in a court of law. It has now been taken out of the hands of Government, so there is very little I can say in relation to that. The ownership matter will be determined in a court of law.

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

Minister for Environment and Planning,
Miscellaneous, \$1 407 000—
Examination declared completed.

Lands, \$3 309 000

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. Darley, Chief Executive Officer and Valuer-General

Mr M. Whinnen, Director, Corporate Services.

Mr B. Kidd, Registrar-General

Mr C. Backen, Director, Valuation Services

Ms A. Stimson, Director, Property Management

Ms B. Brooks, Director, Land Information

Mr P. Kentish, Acting Surveyor-General

Mr T. McNamara, Manager, Financial Services.
Mr D. Lancaster, Management Accountant.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open for examination. Minister, do you wish to make a statement?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have a very short statement. I think it is important to make this statement as I have been Minister of Lands—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, it might be the last time, so it will be five years and five Estimates Committees. So it is a fairly emotional occasion. On the last two occasions that I have addressed the committee on the Department of Lands estimates I have highlighted progress towards a commercial approach being adopted by the department. This process continues and has resulted in efficiencies and savings for the Department.

At the same time, the Department has aimed to achieve a balance between client demand and the net cost of operations, and I believe that this has been achieved. The department first adopted net funding in the financial year 1990-91 when the net budget provision was \$14.9 million.

For 1992-93 the net provision is reduced to \$3.3 million. This represents a turnaround of over \$11 million over two years, and I can assure the committee that the planning and cooperation necessary for such a result included support from staff and, indeed from the department's clients. Lands SA has reduced its costs by concentrating its efforts on its core business functions and identifying and pursuing business opportunities arising from clients seeking land information. A new Division of Land Information has been established together with more professional service divisions addressing valuation and survey services and the department will continue to offer the full range of services through its metropolitan and country regional office network.

The department has also used its extensive information data bases to develop new products and attract new clients. An example of this type of initiative is the development of the section 90 statement service. From a very humble beginning in 1989, this service has grown to currently supply at least 60 per cent of the market. By using the Lands SA products the community and industry is provided with a one stop shop facility which integrates all the necessary information from Government relating to a property, or business, required by purchasers of real estate at a most competitive price. The South Australian service is unequalled anywhere in Australia. Indeed, the service and the legislation are the envy of other States.

The department now also provides to all Government agencies a site inspection reporting service, which addresses the very real issue of contaminated land. The department continues to pursue international projects exploring opportunities to sell its land information overseas. To date, the department has operated in 11 different countries. At a recent meeting of State Lands Ministers in Darwin, agreement was reached on the national bidding arrangement for overseas land related development projects. In continuing to meet the needs of the public, the department will continue with its commercial approach, and this embraces quality and 'value for money' client service. Staff numbers in the

department have reduced over the past year. This reduction will continue in 1992-93, but only after full consultation with all involved, including management, staff associations and the staff themselves, and then only in accordance with the department's consolidated business plan.

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

Mr OSWALD: I refer to page 150 of Financial Paper No. 2. The department has recently conducted a rolling audit on what is considered surplus Government land, including Crown land. Will the Minister provide the Committee with a current list of the properties considered surplus to requirements, and also, now or on notice, advise the Committee on the current valuations of each of those properties and provide details of which ones are already earmarked to be sold?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have a list here, which is quite extensive, and I am happy to have that inserted in *Hansard*. However, my officers tell me that it is not an exhaustive list. I am not sure what the honourable member is seeking. I am a little reticent in relation to that question in the sense that I do not want to end up with the department ending up spending hours and weeks collating the information. If the information is readily available I am happy to provide it to the honourable member. However, as I indicated in my opening statement, we are running a very efficient and effective organisation and I really do not want to be creating a huge amount of ancillary work. Is the honourable member happy with this list of 60 properties, which I think does have the information that the honourable member requires. It refers to the property, the agency, the description, the area, the current value, the status, the market value and the Valuer-General's value and whether there is a difference between the market value and the Valuer-General's value. Does the honourable member have a specific property that he would like us to refer to? What is the honourable member wanting from this question?

Mr OSWALD: What the honourable member is wanting is a list of properties that the Government has identified as a result of a rolling audit, properties that are now surplus to Government requirement because, no doubt, the Government is going through that list and deciding what it is going to dispose of in order to reduce its debt and for other purposes. I believe that, as the community has paid for these properties, it is right and proper for the community and indeed members of Parliament, to know which of the properties have been identified for disposal.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can provide a current list, which is out to other Ministers for comment from them. As I said, it is not an exhaustive list. It is obviously something that is going to be ongoing; it is not some static thing in terms of having a list and that being the end of it. I imagine that it would keep going and would be continually reassessed.

Mr OSWALD: I accept that it is a rolling audit but there must be some cut-off point up to which information can be collated.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am happy to provide the list I have in front of me for the honourable member

which says '17 September 1992 Strategic Surplus Government Property'.

31 AUGUST 1992 STRATEGIC SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY 92/93

Property	Agency	Description	Area	Current Value	Status	Market	V-G's	Diff.
						Value	Value	
				\$		\$	\$	\$
1 Ingle Heights P.S.	Education	Land	3.80	750 000	Sold & settled June 92	750 000	700 000	50 000
2 Awoonga Road Land	E&WS	Land	4.50	1 250 000	Sold & settled June 92	1 250 000	1 140 000	110 000
3 Hillcrest 1	SAHC	Land	10.25	1 543 000	Sold under contract	1 643 000	1 543 000	0
4 TAFE Beulah Park	DTAFE	Land	0.06	150 000	Sold under contract	150 000	150 000	0
5 Glengowrie H.S.	Education	Land	7.80	4 500 000	Sold under contract	4 500 000	4 600 000	(100 000)
6 Kensington Park TAFE parcel 2	DTAFE	Land	0.35	450 000	Sold under contract	541 000	400 000	141 000
7 Kensington Park TAFE parcel 1	DTAFE	Land & school	2.35	2 305 000	Sold under contract	2 305 000	2 400 000	(95 000)
8 Campbelltown H.S. Oval	Education	Land	4.40	1 780 000	Sold under contract	1 780 000	1 800 000	(20 000)
9 Glenside Hospital 2	SAHC	Land	2.30	2 500 000	Sold under contract	2 500 000	2 700 000	(200 000)
10 Hindmarsh P.S. 1	Education	School		914 000	Sold under contract	914 000	914 000	0
11 Ingle Farm P.S.	Education	Land	4.00	620 000	Sold under contract	595 000	620 000	(25 000)
12 Findon H.S.	Education	Land	2.10	955 000	Sold under contract	955 000	1 000 000	(45 000)
13 Goodwood H.S. parcel 1	Education	Land	1.57	1 650 000	Sold to SAHT 12 Aug. 92	1 650 000	1 600 000	50 000
14 Bresle House	SAHC	Land	0.14	400 000	Sold settle 1 Sept 92	400 000	420 000	(20 000)
15 Tea Tree Gully TAFE old site	DTAFE	Land		930 000	Offer pending	930 000		
16 Strathmont H.S. parcel 2	Education	Land	2.50	1 075 000	Offer pending	1 075 000		
17 Hillcrest 2	SAHC	Land	44.50	5 500 000	Offer pending	5 500 000		
18 818 Marion Road Marion	SACON	Depot	0.06	650 000	Offer pending	650 000		
19 Wandana J.P.S. School	Education	Buildings	0.25	130 000	Offer pending	130 000		
20 Klemzig J.P.S. School	Education	School buildings	0.90	600 000	Offer pending	600 000		
21 Charlston P.S.	Education	School & land		175 000	Offer pending	150 000		
22 Glenside Hospital 1 (108 109)	SAHC	Land	0.08	1 300 000	Offer pending	1 300 000		
23 St Morris P.S.	Education	Land	4.50	2 500 000	Offer pending	2 500 000		
24 Eden Parkland	SAHC	Land		325 000	Offer pending	325 000		
25 Kidman Park Land parcel 1	Education	Land	2.70	1 750 000	Offer pending	1 750 000		
26 Playford High School parcel 1	Education	Buildings	2.00	700 000	Lease back			
27 St Corantyn/Morcroft House	SAHC	House & land		3 500 000	For sale			
28 SACON Kensington Park	SACON	Office warehouse		750 000	For sale			
29 Ingle Farm Community Health Centre	SAHC	Office		700 000	For sale			
30 Kidman Park Land parcel 2	Education	Land	2.70	2 255 000	Development	2 255 000		
31 West Lakes High School	Education	Land	9.00	2 750 000	Cabinet sub.			
32 Ingle Central P.S.	Education	Land	4.00	650 000	Auction Sept 92			
33 Playford High School parcel 2	Education	Land	3.50	1 500 000	Auction Oct 92			
34 Eden Park	SAHC	House		1 050 000	Auction Oct 92			
35 Wandana J.P.S. Land	Education	Land	0.50	265 000	Auction Oct 92			
36 Goodwood H.S. parcel 2	Education	Land	0.12	200 000	Auction Oct 92			
37 NASAC	DFACS	Land	0.34	400 000	Auction Oct 92			
38 Glenside Hospital 3	SAHC	Land	3.00	3 000 000	Auction Jan 93			
39 Klemzig J.P.S.	Education	Land	0.40	400 000	Auction Dec 92			
40 Hindmarsh P.S. 2	Education	Land		600 000	Auction Aug 92			
41 Strathmont H.S. parcel 1	Education	Land	4.70					
42 Strathmont H.S. parcel 3	Education	Land	1.80					
43 Hendon Primary School	Education	Land	0.55					
44 Elizabeth Vale Primary School	Education	Land	0.45					
45 Kilburn Work Centre	Education	Land						
46 Blackwood Forest	Lands	Lands plus forest						
47 Adelaide Girls H.S.	Education	School & land						
48 Camden Park TAFE	TAFE	land	0.33					
49 Osmond Tee Land and Buildings	Education	School & land						
50 Queen Victoria Hospital	SAHC	Hospital						
51 Morris Hospital	SAHC	Land	12.45					
TOTAL			132			36 898 000	19 987 000	(154 000)

-0.771%

Mr OSWALD: What is the total rental income per annum from pastoral leases? Is the figure of \$2.116 million (actual), which appears under Crown land rents (page 150 of Financial Paper No. 2), referring to that amount? If not, what does that figure relate to?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: There is a difference between pastoral leases and Crown land rents, etc. While the actual amount that is paid in terms of pastoral leases is set by the Valuer-General, funding is put across to the Department of Environment and Planning to run the branch, which we have just dealt with under the environment and planning estimates. So this has nothing to do with pastoral leases. In fact, this is Crown land rents, interest on agreements and sundries. So pastoral leases do not come under this heading. They are in a category separate from pastoral leases.

Mr OSWALD: How much money has been spent on valuation consultants since the commencement of the Pastoral Lands Management and Conservation Act, and how much is budgeted to finance the pending court challenge by the South Australian Farmers' Federation?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This has been dealt with through a question on notice, the answer to which has been forwarded from my department, although it may not be in the system yet.

Mr OSWALD: Do you have a copy of it here?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I do not have a copy but certainly it is on its way to the honourable member. I recall that it was a very small amount in terms of what the consultancy was for the valuation. We think it was about \$48 000, but I would not want to be tied to that absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the member for Morphett well knows that Questions on Notice go through the Minister's office, the Minister submits them to Cabinet and they then go to the Parliament. I do not think that we should circumvent that procedure.

Mr FERGUSON: The District Council of Beachport has expressed concern about the future management of Lake George and the surrounding public land, and has sought the establishment of a management committee for the area. What action is to be taken on the future of this site?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have approved the preparation of a land allocation and management plan that will assess the current status of the lake and the surrounding public land for conservation, recreation, drainage and grazing. I do not think one needs to be an expert to realise that there are potentially conflicting uses for that area, hence the importance my department and I place upon putting a proper management plan in place. The plan will also recommend tenure and administrative structures that will allow a coordinated, long-term planning protection approach for the resources and management of the area and its multiple uses. It will also put forward recommendations that solve problems associated with competing uses, including access, the area to be protected and minimum water levels.

The plan will be prepared under the guidance of a steering committee comprising members of the community, local government and State Government representatives. Lake George and its environs have high conservation significance as a wetland. The location is also used for numerous recreational activities and other

competing uses, and is the outlet for a major surface water drain, so it is a very important area from a number of perspectives. I am delighted that we have put money in the budget this year to be able to put this management plan in place.

Mr FERGUSON: Last year the Minister indicated that the South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing may be closed, as it was unlikely to cover its costs. What has happened regarding that proposed closure?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The performance of the South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing has been closely monitored since its transferral from State Services to Lands SA in 1989. However, despite its success in increasing revenue by almost threefold since 1989, the centre has not been able to meet its financial revenue targets. One of the original reasons for establishing the centre was to provide efficiencies of scale for remote sensing activities. At the time, the technology was expensive and consolidation was seen as the most appropriate way of achieving efficiencies across Government.

The technology in this field has advanced, and individual systems are now somewhat less expensive. The Department of Mines and Energy has established its own remote sensing facility, and it is anticipated that other Government agencies will follow. These developments have led to an impact on the revenue that has been historically generated by the centre and, as a result, Lands SA's commitment to becoming a commercial agency means that we have reorganised its functions and activities, and the centre has now moved under the Land Information Division.

I am delighted that, rather than closing down the centre, thus denying the community access to those facilities and services, we have brought it under the Land Information Division. If the centre were to close, there would still be a need to provide a remote sensing service to Lands SA, so this seemed a very sensible move. The level of service has been determined as an integral part of Lands SA's business planning process. It is expected that the department's usage will grow over the next few years as the value of image data is reorganised, particularly when combined with other land information data.

Any other Government agency that has a need to establish its own in-house remote sensing operation can share with another agency or can buy these services from interstate. The closure of the South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing will therefore be recommended to the Government by Lands SA pending a review of all Government costs brought about by other departments setting up their own facilities. By bringing it under the Land Information Division we will still be able to provide the service.

Mr FERGUSON: The computerised title system, TATS, has now been in existence for two years. What efficiencies have been achieved?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This has been one of our success stories. We are about one-third of the way through the commercial program, which will eventually lead to a fully automated register. I am a little disappointed that the member for Murray-Mallee is not here to hear this, as he was the shadow Minister when I took the Bill through Parliament, and I recall the very detailed questions he put to me at the time. I am sure that

he would be delighted to hear that this has been a great success, and that we now have almost 60 per cent of all transactions lodged for registration processed through the automated system. TATS enables a number of things to happen. It enables faster responses in registration and in the issue of new titles. Responses to requests for other products and services such as register searches are also speeded up.

This is very important if we are to offer the business community and the community generally the latest in terms of efficiencies of service. The benefits will become generally more apparent as conversion proceeds, but some indication of potential can be seen from the fact that TATS has enabled about 12 people on the conversion team to be drawn from other areas of the Lands Titles Division. Response times are improving despite this diversion of resources. This is a very important move forward.

Mr OSWALD: What were the total costs of the administration of perpetual leases for 1991-92? What form of income is derived from the forced freeholding of perpetual leases upon subdivision and people voluntarily seeking to freehold their entire lease?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I do not have the total cost, but I understand that the cost of printing and sending accounts, etc., is about \$15 per account. In terms of policy position, the costs associated with administering the transfer of leases and the subdivision of leases come under the departmental and ministerial policy of full cost recovery, and that is very important. In November this year we are looking at introducing into the Parliament a simplification of procedures that will require some new legislation, and hopefully that will occur at that time. It is intended that similar procedures as apply under the Real Property Act will also apply. I wonder whether Anne Stimson might have the information the honourable member is seeking. I would ask the honourable member to repeat the question.

Mr OSWALD: What were the total costs of administering perpetual leases? That having been established, what level of income is derived from, first, the forced freeholding of perpetual leases upon subdivision and, secondly, when people voluntarily seek to freehold their entire lease?

Ms Stimson: We will have to take on notice some of the details in relation to these questions. We do not keep separate statistics on what the honourable member is referring to as forced freeholding, which is freeholding that occurs when a perpetual lease is subdivided. Under Government policy there is no further issue of additional perpetual leases. Therefore, somebody who wishes to divide a perpetual lease, for example, to provide a residence (such as in the case of children buying a property from the parents and wanting to provide a residence for the parents) would have that area of the land held under freehold title because we do not issue an additional perpetual lease for that area. I take it that that is what the honourable member is referring to. As I said, we do not keep separate statistics on that; we merely keep statistics on the total income received from freeholding, which we could take on notice.

Mr OSWALD: We are after a copy of a report entitled 'The Review of the Environmental Sustainability of Unacceptable Coastal Shack Sites'. This was in the

1991-92 Target Objectives, and I would be interested in reading it, as I am sure would other members. The Minister may not have enough copies to circulate but may be able to print it. I am trying to avoid the cost of putting it in *Hansard*. Can this report be supplied individually to members of the Committee?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It was made available to the Parliamentary Library last year, so it would be in the Parliamentary Library. Would that not be the most efficient way of accessing it rather than having to reprint it? I am told that it is in the Parliamentary Library, and we will have that checked.

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister provide a breakdown of the 15 full-time equivalents who appear on page 305 of the Program Estimates and Information under 'Intra-Agency Support Services, Minister and Minister's Office' with a brief description of their various duties, together with a statement as to those who are permanent Government employees as against ministerial appointments by the Premier?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: At the end of June last year there were 14.6 staff and currently there are 14.6 staff, so there has been no increase in staff numbers. If I count myself, it would be 15.6, and I can assure the honourable member that I certainly count myself as a member of the team. That is for the three portfolios plus the Auditor-General. Does the honourable member wish to have the names of the people or the positions?

Mr OSWALD: I want a comprehensive list of names and positions, and what everybody does in the office. It does not have to be read into *Hansard* now; it can be provided later.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: All this information was provided at last year's Estimates, so it is all there. There might be some changes in names but there has been no change—

Mr OSWALD: I would like to know what is in the office and what is in the department, and this is part of the process. The Minister can provide it on notice or, if she wants, she can read it into *Hansard*, but I urge her not to and just to provide it as a document to the Committee.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We will provide that on notice. I have the names and the positions, but do not have the duty statements in front of me. I take this opportunity of saying that Ms Trixie Mead today was awarded, by the Government Management Board, an Achiever's Award. She is the secretary of my ministerial office. It is a great honour within the Public Service to receive such an award. My colleagues might wonder where I was at lunch time, and I can tell them that I was present when she received the award. I have to say that I felt great pride because of the enormous amount of work done not only by Trixie Mead in my office but by every other member, as they work incredibly hard and tirelessly. I put on the public record how much I appreciate the work they do and how valued it is by me.

Mrs HUTCHISON: My question relates to page 151 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts, Program 5, Valuation Services. I think that we are all aware of the downturn that there has been in the pastoral industry. Did the Valuer-General have regard to that downturn in setting the current rentals for 1991-92?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The short answer to that is 'Yes', the Valuer-General did take that into account. However, I think it is important that the Valuer-General answers because he reports directly to the Parliament.

Mr Darley: We certainly did take into account the downturn in the pastoral industry. In fact, rents were significantly reduced last year and the latest advice I have at the moment is that rentals will not increase this year.

Mrs HUTCHISON: The second question I have relates to page 150 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts, Program 2, Government Land Management. Aquaculture, particularly with regard to oyster leases, has the potential, as I am sure everybody would realise, to provide a viable industry alternative for farmers and others on the West Coast, and I refer particularly to Ceduna, of which I am very much aware. What steps are being taken to encourage this developing industry because I feel that it can have a very real impact in that area?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The Government is very supportive of any new and developing industry, and aquaculture is one of these. Every effort is being made to ensure a balance between economic development and the environment takes place. I am sure that the honourable member is aware of the lengths to which the department has gone to ensure that we achieve that balance. Maintaining the balance necessarily involves some costs, but these are essential to ensure that as the industry develops it is capable of being self-sustaining and not dependent on concessions; in other words, it has to be able to stand up commercially on its own two feet.

The costs for aquaculture from the perspective of the lands ministry relate to the lease rental for the site and the costs for insurance. In the case of the latter costs, I am very pleased to announce that the requirement for indemnity insurance has been reduced from \$10 million per site to \$5 million. If members are not aware of the financial significance of this change I would like to very quickly and briefly point out that this will effectively halve the premiums that lessees will have to pay. I am sure that lessees will welcome that decision, and I would like to think that my colleague, the member for Stuart, would pass on this information to her constituents because she has been representing them for some time in this matter.

In line with the Government policy of determining Crown rents as market rents, extensive work has been undertaken in setting the rental base for oyster leases. Consultation has occurred with the industry and this has ensured that rents will be reflective of market conditions. The rents will also take account of ability to pay, as indicated by the productive development of the leased area rather than be based solely on the total area which is leased, some of which may not be brought into production for several years. In other words, I think it would be fair to say the department has gone to every length to ensure that what is being charged for these leases is fair, equitable and reflects the ability of the lessee to pay.

The initial estimates for rentals were discussed with the industry, and this provided a valuable means of reviewing the practicality of the production estimates and pricing indicators. As a result of this consultation, the Valuer-General revised the rental estimates, and they are currently 50 per cent down on earlier forecasts. So, again,

there is a very big recognition of the industry in helping it to become established.

I am aware that the industry does not wish to pay anything other than a concessional rent. However, it would be irresponsible of me as Minister of Lands to have concessional rentals determined for a developing industry which is also gaining a commercial advantage through its ability to use and develop Crown land. Of course, that would be counter to the general policy right across Government in terms of any Crown-owned assets, particularly land, where we do have a policy of charging a market rent, whether it be shack sites, or pastoral, Crown or aquaculture leases. However, it is fair to say that we have treated the industry very equitably, and I am sure people will be very pleased with this information.

Mrs HUTCHISON: As a question on notice, in the Minister's opening statement, she mentioned the \$11 million turnaround within two years and the net funding arrangement. Could she let the Committee have some details on the major areas responsible for that turnaround?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We will provide that information on notice, because we will be able to provide specific amounts; I can talk about areas, but I would not be able to give the amounts off the top of my head.

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

Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous, \$143 000—
Examination declared completed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$1 260 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings

Members:

Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr P. Holloway
Mrs C.F. Hutchison
Mrs D.C. Kotz
Mr I.P. Lewis.
Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr E.J. Phipps, Chief Executive.
Mr A. Killmier, Deputy Chief Executive.
Mr P.A. Norman, General Manager, Services.
Mr P.G. Cooper, General Manager, Headworks and Country.
Mr J.C. Killick, Director, Planning and Strategy.
Mr P. Manoel, General Manger, Metropolitan.
Mr E.G. Haberfeld, Director, Corporate Finance.
Ms C. Bossley, Director, Human Resources.
Mr R.E. Mander, Capital Accountant.
Mr G.W. Drilling, Operating Accountant.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you care to make a statement?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes. This may be my last opening statement as Minister of Water Resources, and it is my fifth one.

I would like to take this opportunity to advise the Committee of some aspects of the 1992-93 budget of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The E&WS Department achieved in 1991-92 a zero draw on the Consolidated Account, representing a turnaround of \$24.1 million for the financial year and some \$41.6 million over the past two financial years. This favourable result relates to the combined effects of interest rate reductions, changed priorities in the capital expenditure program and through internal restructuring along commercial principles. It is expected that the E&WS Department and Treasury will agree to a business charter, which will progress significantly the commercialisation process of the department.

The budget for 1992-93 provides for an operating surplus of \$4.5 million and a contribution of \$17.9 million by the E&WS Department to the consolidated account for debt repayment. This is after allowing for a commercial loan from SAFA of \$30.5 million associated with the cost of further work force reductions through the offer of voluntary separation packages.

Within the Government's overall reform program, the department is undergoing a program of major change and renewal. It will further lower its cost base by reducing its work force. The target is a reduction of 800 by December 1992, measured from July 1991. Whilst the proposed expenditure reductions are significant, I am confident that they will contribute to increased efficiency.

It is vital that the department strengthen its performance to achieve international best practice in its operations. The E&WS Department has therefore embarked on one of the most ambitious change programs ever undertaken in Australia. The key characteristics of this program are its speed and comprehensiveness, its focus on improved customer service and bottom line performance and its emphasis on the full participation of employees and customers. The major tasks underpinning this change program are reform of the workplace and the redesign of work and jobs at all levels throughout the organisation. Workplace reform and work and job design will be fundamental to the department's achieving high levels of service with a reduced workforce.

The total capital works program for 1992-93 is \$93.5 million; which includes an \$11.8 million program for environmental enhancement projects. The E&WS Department will continue, therefore, to accelerate protection of inland water resources and the marine environment through the environmental enhancement program funded by the levy on sewerage rates. The highlights for 1992-93 include \$6 million for the near completion of a scheme for land based disposal of sludge from the Glenelg and Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works; \$1.2 million for the Hahndorf Sewage Treatment Works upgrade to increase capacity and to reduce nitrogen and phosphorus levels; and \$1.7 million for the Murray Bridge Sewage Treatment works effluent disposal to land.

Other significant features of the capital works program include \$6.5 million for the continuation of the Myponga

water filtration plant construction; \$11.2 million for the continuation of the program to rehabilitate metropolitan sewage treatment works; \$3.5 million for the ongoing construction of water and sewerage infrastructure in the Seaford development south of Adelaide; continuation of infrastructure rehabilitation works in the Riverland irrigation areas, namely, \$2.5 million for Moorook and \$2 million for Cobdogla-Nookamka area; and \$1.6 million on River Torrens works for the linear park in the Athelstone/Highbury sector, which I remind members will complete the River Torrens linear park, which is the longest river linear park in the country.

This gives a very brief outline of the major activities of the E&WS Department for this financial year the details of which are provided in the budget papers. I believe that the E&WS Department is a very responsible one and will provide for effective management of the State's water resources and improvement of public water supply. Also, sewerage and irrigation services will be enhanced and, at the same time, will provide a continuing high level of service to all its customers. I now have pleasure in presenting to the Committee the estimates of payments and receipts for the E&WS Department.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have a couple of household questions. The white book of estimates, page 292, deals with Minister and Minister's office. Will the Minister explain the fourfold increase from \$185 000 proposed 1991-92 to \$1 230 000 proposed 1992-93?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think there is a bit of a misunderstanding. This is not the Minister's office. I would hate the media to think that the Minister's office is getting an increase from \$301 000 to \$1.23 million. I would certainly be interested to know where it was going. It has nothing to do with the Minister's office at all. I understand this is to do with the 2 per cent guaranteed superannuation levy. Money has been set aside for that, I will ask Mr Killmier if he has anything to add to that answer.

Mr Killmier: I do not think so, Mr Chairman. As you know, the Commonwealth has placed requirements upon all employers for the superannuation levy and it is presented in that place in the Estimates. We can get additional information if the honourable member requires it. It is a new event and hence the sharp rise.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Committee would be aware that a sum of \$20 000 was paid to Mr Hudson in the preparation of a report relating to water rates. Will the Minister indicate if any further payment is being made to Mr Hudson in regard to the review of that original policy?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am not sure which line the honourable member is referring to. I think perhaps it might be useful to clarify the way in which the Committee has operated during the day. I ask the honourable member to indicate which program. It makes it easier for us to be able to get that information readily. While my officers are looking for that specific amount I can say that it was made very clear from day one that after 12 months operation we would review the way in which the system was operating, because it was the first major change ever undertaken to the water rating system, certainly in almost living memory. I have to say that we

made clear there would be a review at the end of 12 months. It seems sensible and appropriate to get Mr Hudson to have a review of the system and the way in which it had operated, getting towards the end of the 12 month period.

I am not sure what the honourable member is suggesting, but if he is suggesting that we should not be paying Mr Hudson for undertaking a review, I would find that a little strange. Of course we will be paying the man. I might remind the honourable member that his consultancy fees are extremely reasonable, particularly in respect to other consultants who operate in this town. So, yes, we will be paying him for his services. I think it would be highly immoral to suggest that we were not and I am sure the honourable member would not be suggesting that. I was hoping we might be able to give the honourable member the exact amount. We do not appear to have it here at our fingertips. Has the honourable member indicated somewhere within the budget papers that this has been referred to?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to Financial Paper No 2—'Recurrent Expenditure, Program 1—Metropolitan Water Supply'. I would presume that the Minister would know what consultancy rate she was paying Mr Hudson, and that is the question I would like to have answered.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes, I am aware of that. The reason I do not have the final figure is that Mr Hudson has not put in his final list of accounts. That is the reason.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Minister able to tell me the rate she will be paying Mr Hudson to review the water rating policy?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Mr Hudson will be paid by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, not by myself personally, and indeed the rate I believe is in the vicinity of \$600 a day. He is having approximately a 20 day consultancy. We would be looking at a total of between \$12 000 and \$15 000. Recognising that we are talking about a water rating system which in fact provides something in the vicinity of \$207 million of revenue per year, then I think we might well look at that as extremely good value in terms of perhaps the outcomes of his report.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Chairman, I ask a question supplementary to that. Why was it necessary to seek a consultancy on this matter, when I would have thought that the expertise that the Minister has in her own department would have been able to provide the advice required to establish such a policy?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The reason was that we determined, as I said, quite some time ago that we would have an assessment, getting towards the end of the 12-month period, and we felt that it would be more appropriate to have some outside consultancy and assessment working with the department, rather than have the department assessing its own water rating system.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The reason we thought it was appropriate to involve Mr Hudson in terms of working cooperatively with the department, to assess the incidence effects of the first 12 months—or almost the first 12 months, because we do not have the final absolute water figure in for consumption for the 12-month period—was that we thought it was important to

provide additional, high level, economic, independent input into that assessment process. I think that is really important. I think the outcome of his report, and indeed the final decisions that will be taken by Cabinet and by the Government, will reflect that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Supplementary to that, I believe that is an insult as far as the department is concerned. Can I ask the Minister—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Mr Chairman, I would like to respond to that supplementary question. I certainly do not believe that the department or any member of the department sees that as an insult, and I think that is making a gratuitous comment about the professionalism of the department. The departmental officers have worked very closely with Mr Hudson in reviewing the incidence effects of the first year of the water rating system, and I cannot understand the line of questioning, to try to somehow set up a confrontation between Mr Hudson and the professional officers of the department, when no such conflict exists and where there has been cooperation and a working together by both parties.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I intend coming back to that matter later, but it does seem incredible that, having paid Mr Hudson \$20 000 already for a disastrous policy—and it is reflected in the community that it is a disastrous policy—here we are looking to pay him \$600 a day to try to fix it.

The CHAIRMAN: In relation to how the Committee proceedings will be undertaken, I must make it clear that Committee members are here to question the Ministers and not to make statements. I have already made this point earlier on. Any statements can be made in other forums, such as during the 10 minute grievance debate in the House which occurs following the Estimates Committee hearings. I urge the member for Heysen and any other member of the Committee to bide their time and make any such statements during that part of the process.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: in the Standing Orders relating to Estimates Committees, where does it say that members may make no comment? In fact, this is an extension of the system of the Committees of the House of Assembly, and each member may speak for 15 minutes on each occasion if they so desire. In no place in the Standing Orders relating to the Estimates Committees is there anything to prevent that—unless I am very much mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer to Standing Order 268—Consideration in Estimates Committee—which states:

3. a Committee may ask for explanations from a Minister relating to the items of the proposed payment.
4. the Minister who is asked for explanations may be assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information.

I interpret that as asking for explanations; an explanation does not have to be preceded by a statement. That has been common practice in all the years that we have had Estimates Committees and that is the way it will continue for the remainder of these Estimates Committees hearings. The member for Murray-Mallee may wish to consult with other members of the Committee or with other colleagues as to whether my interpretation is correct or otherwise and then he may wish to invoke Standing Order 274. But in the meantime that is the situation.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On page 60 under 'Funding', the Auditor-General's Report states that during 1991-92 a change in accounting practices by the Treasury Department resulted in a reduction in the funds available to the department. Was it just a change in accountancy practices that required the reduction of funds of some \$33.3 million to the department, or was it a Cabinet decision that that should be the case?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The department is becoming self-funding and starting to stand on its own two feet, which is why there has been a reduction in the funds made available to it. For some years, the department has been looking at becoming self-funding, and we have now arrived at a zero draw in terms of last year. As I think I said in my opening statement, we are looking at a contribution this year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Supplementary to that, was it as a result of a Cabinet decision?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, the way the system operates is that Treasury negotiates with the departments. Those budgets are negotiated at that level and then come to Cabinet for approval, but the initiative would have come from Treasury.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister provide details of the items covered by the \$26.6 million that is referred to on page 60 of the Auditor-General's Report as the net cost of undertakings during 1991-92, and will she provide the details of the subsidies in the \$11.26 million referred to in note 4 on page 64 of that report?

Mr Killmier: The Committee may be aware that the E&WS Department has moved to the point where it is self-sufficient. In other words, the income that we receive from water and sewerage rating is used to meet all our operating costs as well as a number of other requirements. As can be seen from item 4, the income of the department meets not only the operating and maintenance costs of metropolitan and country water supplies but also the irrigation deficits and, on top of that, a number of other social justice components such as water resources management and items that are not income producing to any great extent.

Flood mitigation is mentioned there, as is apprentice training. At Ottoway the department maintains one of the best apprentice training organisations in the State which, of course, is not self-funding, so there are costs to the department. We also pay one-third of the operating costs of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. Those costs have to be met, but they are a necessary part of the department's operation. We have other minor items, such as Brukung and, of course, we also provide for a number of subsidies.

We do not rate all people at normal levels. Charities, exempt properties and the State and Commonwealth Governments receive concessions, which have been costed out in those items. The Adelaide City Council receives free water under the provisions of the Waterworks Act, going right back to the very early days. Notwithstanding all those concessions, the department has managed virtually to achieve a zero draw on Treasury, and we are very proud of that.

One other item of which we are very proud is the provision of money for Aborigines in the far north of the

State. We provide what is termed a social justice component of something like \$1.5 million, which is just another cost, although it is one we are very happy to wear because we recognise that the E&WS Department is one of only two water authorities within Australia that is responsible for virtually all the water and sewerage within the State, Western Australia being the other. We like to think that we perform that duty in a fairly efficient manner.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can give the figures for 1991-92, fleshing out what Mr Killmier said. With respect to the free water to the City of Adelaide and Port Adelaide, in 1991-92 the figure is \$865 000, with the exemption subsidy being \$9.298 million. We also provide water to the Festival Centre at a cost of \$259 000. For swimming pools, the Soldiers Memorial Gardens and playgrounds, the cost is \$241 000, and to the Adelaide Station Environs development it is \$453 000.

Then there is the Adelaide Submarine Corporation at \$185 000 and, as Mr Killmier said, contributions towards essential services to Aboriginal communities at \$1.337 million. I do not have the figures for this year, but we spent approximately \$12.638 million.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister provide all those details? She has referred to some of them, but I would like a complete list.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I understand that that is the complete list.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Auditor-General's Report talks about exempt properties and the State and Commonwealth Governments. I would be happy to receive that list at a later stage.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can I be provided at a later stage with the items that are covered in the \$26.6 million? I am talking about the undertakings during 1991-92 amounting to \$26.6 million.

Mr Killmier: From 1990-91 community service undertakings were costed out at \$15.8 million. For 1991-92 this was estimated at \$26.6 million. As the honourable member has asked, it is quite possible for that to be itemised with all the specific items. They are things that we have been required to cover within our overall 'no cost to the Government' arrangement, and if that is the way Government requires it to be done that is the way we do it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Could I have a list of that?

Mr Killmier: Certainly.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Many of these are historical things that we have done over a long period of time. As Mr Killmier said, we have provided the service of water and sewerage throughout the whole of the State.

Mr FERGUSON: My question relates to page 301 of the Program Estimates. Can the Minister advise of the program for the completion of the River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I can provide that information. I think I might have provided inadvertently a wrong fact earlier, so I hasten to provide the correct information because it is important. As members would know, the River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme has been undertaken over a number of years. In fact, I think it was started by Mr Peter Arnold,

and I have always acknowledged that and that it was an excellent program.

As the old cliché goes, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The fact that we have had this enormously heavy amount of rain from storms and a protracted deluge into the Adelaide metropolitan area and we have not seen any flooding, or any flooding of any significance, in the River Torrens would indicate that the flood mitigation scheme has certainly been a success.

The fact that we are going to move forward and complete this program in terms of the linear park is also an environmental success. So, I think it is a success on both counts. The completed scheme will provide protection for urban areas of Adelaide in terms of flooding for up to one in 200 years, as well as linking the coast to the foothills, which is a distance of some 30 kms. I am told that when it is completed this will be the longest river linear park of any capital city in the country.

To remind the honourable member, construction work began in January 1982 and hopefully will be completed in the financial year 1994-95. I believe we now have, following the announcement that we are looking at funds being made available for the Athelstone-Highbury area, one small section that is not completed between that area and the rest of the completed linear park. I would hate to mislead the Committee and would like to make sure that members understand that one small section is left to be completed. However, I understand the department is very keen to ensure that that section is completed as soon as possible. As I said, the current approval is for \$28.2 million and expenditure to 30 June has already amounted to \$23.53 million.

Mr FERGUSON: My question relates to the Program Estimates at page 294. Can the Minister provide up-to-date information of when the South Coast E&WS customers will be receiving filtered water from the Myponga WFP, and which areas the plant will serve?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Construction of the siteworks commenced in October 1991 and a contract for design and construction of the main process plant was let in March 1992. The current contracted commissioning date is August of next year (1993), allowing time to eliminate any possible teething problems. These filtration plants are really one-off projects because of the particular site-specific requirements in terms of the technology. Allowing for any possible teething problems, we believe that uninterrupted supply of filtered water from the plant should occur before the summer of 1993-94. I think it is important, in terms of talking about when the South Coast will receive this water, to put this into context.

In the past 15 years the Government has spent approximately \$200 million in the provision of filtered water to the people of South Australia. I think that that is a quite considerable commitment to providing clean, safe water.

Mr LEWIS interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: No, the Lower Murray has not been provided, as the honourable member interjects. But, we are moving to provide water to the greatest number of people in terms of the size of the filtration plants. It has always been my intention to move on to the River Murray. Once we have done Myponga, I have always made it very clear (and I am sure that the honourable member's colleague, the member for Light, if

he were here, would attest to this) that the next one would be the Swan Reach plant, and then we would move to look at perhaps package plants for the River Murray towns, and that would include the Upper and Lower River Murray.

I think we have to be sensible about this. One can only provide the level of filtered water to communities on a cost-effective basis. I think the record in South Australia is second to none, given that we start with the poorest quality water of any State in the country, and we have managed to move forward with five metropolitan plants—Happy Valley, Hope Valley, Barossa, Anstey Hill and Little Para. Of course, Morgan serves the Iron Triangle and the constituents of the member for Stuart, as well as the constituents of other members.

The Myponga plant will serve an area to the south of Adelaide between Moana and Sellicks Beach and will include parts of the Yankalilla district while a mix of predominantly filtered and untreated water will be provided to the Victor Harbor-Goolwa area. In fact, the very lower Murray area in terms of Goolwa will be provided with a much upgraded quality of water. It will be a mixture but it certainly will be a much higher quality than currently. The quality of treated water from the plant will be of the same high standard as that currently provided by other E&WS plants in operation.

Mr FERGUSON: My question refers to pages 294 and 296 of the Program Estimates. Can the Minister advise the progress of the construction of water supply and sewerage headworks for the rapidly expanding Seaford residential area?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is important that if we are to have these developments and we are to provide people with a quality of life that those of us in the more settled areas, particularly in the metropolitan area and in some of the country and rural areas, already enjoy, we have to be prepared to put resources into these areas.

In accordance with the Seaford Development Physical Infrastructure and Human Services Indenture Agreement, which was signed on 21 June 1990, the State is providing at no cost to the joint venturers adequate water supply and sewerage services. The Seaford development is staged over a 10-year period from July 1990 and, when fully developed, will have a population of about 20 000 people. Provision of the water supply and sewerage headworks was approved by Cabinet on 8 July 1991 and the overall budget estimated cost is \$9.7 million.

The construction works commenced during the period of 1991-92 and began with upgrading of the three existing sewage pumping stations. Construction of the major sewerage infrastructure is proceeding during 1992-93 with the laying of the gravity trunk sewer, which will serve the majority of the development. It is important to note that, while we have current approval of \$9.7 million, the expenditure to 30 June of this financial year just gone has been \$1.27 million.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to pages 63 to 64 of the Auditor-General's Report. In relation to the accounting practices now adopted by the Treasury as far as the E&WS is concerned, is it not a fact that, if this change in Treasury accounting practices had not taken place, it would have resulted in a reduction in the cost of both water and sewerage rates, if in fact the E&WS had not been forced, asked, requested or whatever, to pay that

money into general revenue and to pay also for other services which would under normal circumstances have come from Treasury funding?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I do not believe the answer to that question is that it would have resulted in lower water and sewerage costs, for the simple reason that a number of very important areas are and will continue to be funded and will require financing to fund them, for example, our capital works program. In my introductory statement I indicated that our capital works program was in the vicinity of \$93.5 million in total. So, the argument could be that if instrumentalities such as the E&WS did not contribute to the budget then maybe they could have reduced the costs to the consumer. They could also have reduced the amount of capital works that are carried on or they could also have not repaid some of the debt. Surely it is a responsible approach to take to actually repay debt in terms of the amount that the department owes, if you like, to the general Government coffers.

So, that is just a fallacious argument to say that if an instrumentality contributes to the repayment of debt, therefore that means that if it did not have to do that you could reduce the cost of water and sewerage. Not at all. You could also say that you reduced your capital works program or, if you did not wish to show that amount of money somewhere, you could not fund things such as the cross subsidy from the city to the country for sewerage and water, which is in the vicinity of \$47 million and \$48 million. You cannot take those kinds of issues in isolation and therefore make a definitive claim.

Mr Killmier: The Financial Statement of the Treasurer, at page 107, refers to what is called there an equal footing. It implies that public trading enterprises pay dividends or whatever to their respective Governments in recognition of the community equity of those public trading enterprises. The document states:

This is now commonplace for Australian public enterprises, including those in South Australia.

Of course, it would be nice if we were able to be treated uniquely, but it does not quite work like that. In relation to bodies such as the Grants Commission and other agents, if you do not stand up as well as and look as efficient as any other public trading enterprise, that counts against you. Whilst on the one hand it would be nice perhaps to be treated more favourably by Treasury, it would have a negative effect in that we would then be penalised for our inefficiency.

You win on one hand, and you lose on the other. In the end, if we want to stand up and be counted in the public arena, we must demonstrate that we can operate as efficiently as any other public trading enterprise throughout Australia, make our contribution in the normal way and not be seen as a drain on the public resources.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Was that change in accounting practice intended to soak up the retained profit of \$22.2 million, which is referred to in the departmental operations, profit and loss statements for the year ended 30 June 1992 (page 60 of the Auditor-General's report)?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like a clearer explanation of the question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What has happened to the profit?

Mr Killmier: It has been offset by the current year's results. In this instance we had what is referred to in item

two of the Auditor-General's Report as an abnormal item (page 64 refers to voluntary separation packages, provision for workmen's compensation and the Murray-Darling Basin Commission). A slight change has occurred in the methodology, if you like, of handling some of these community service obligations and the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, whilst it is a capital work, has been brought into our accounts as an expense in the current year.

I am a retired accountant, and I wonder at the writing off. On the one hand, that is nice if you can do it. Many companies attempt to write off expenses in the current year, and it has been done in this instance. But writing off the Linear Park, as it is incurred, is also a nice thing to do. So, that is the explanation for the abnormal items, which of course counts against your retained profits.

Mrs KOTZ: I refer to Program Estimates (page 291), in relation to water quality. We are all aware that one of the major disasters to strike at South Australia's resources has been the generation of the blue-green algae. Will the Minister say what monitoring programs are in place for the coming summer for blue-green algae in rivers and water supplies, and what precautionary measures are available for the Adelaide water supply if blue-green algae occur in the water storages or in the Murray River?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I thank the honourable member for that question, because it is something that has concerned me for a long period. It was I as Minister and this department that first put the whole question and importance of blue-green algae and the effects of nutrients in terms of the stimulation of blue-green algae in the Murray-Darling basin on the national agenda. It was quite an interesting experience where some of the other Ministers from the other States I think pooh-pooled the whole idea and could not understand why I was suggesting that this was a problem of equal magnitude and proportion to the salinity problem, that historically everyone has seen as a huge problem, and thought, 'Let's do something about it.'

About 12 to 18 months afterwards, I presented a paper to the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council on this question and proposed a whole range of options that we could look at to try to address the issue, because, unfortunately, there are no short-term solutions. I wish there were. As a result of my presentation to the ministerial council, a nutrient strategy was drawn up and a committee to investigate the matter was brought about under the auspices of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission.

When we have discovered blue-green algae in the system, we have taken specific action every year in South Australia to separate out those bodies of water from the main water supply areas. We have tried a whole range of things in Lake Alexandrina such as agitating the water because, as the honourable member probably knows, certain conditions must prevail before the algae will flourish. Unfortunately, for the past few years those conditions have prevailed. It is a case of Murphy's Law. We have some serious contingency plans with respect to our reservoirs and should blue-green algae get into the main body of the Murray River rather than just its anabranches. I ask Mr Peter Norman to delineate those programs for the honourable member.

Mr Norman: We have been monitoring the situation with respect to blue-green algae or cyanobacteria for some years. In South Australia we have a very professional effort, which is centred on the State Water Laboratory, with a network which runs internationally with other researchers in the field. A program of research is being conducted at the Bolivar State Water Laboratory with input from international researchers and those within Australia. The understanding of the issue is far from complete and that has generated a need for a series of research programs, in which we are participating, to fill in the gaps understanding.

As the Minister indicated, the Australian Water Resources Council of Ministers has picked up the issue, at her instigation, I might say, and has formed an algal research board for administering the funding of research into the whole issue of blue-green algae. A national blue-green algal research coordinator has been appointed on a three-year contract, which began earlier this year, to coordinate the national effort in plugging the gaps in the understanding of this very important issue. However, the understanding of the subject is such that we have increased the level of monitoring of our water resources in South Australia in order to alert us to the possibility of threat to our public water supplies. We have put in place contingency arrangements for each of our water supplies along the Murray River and elsewhere in order that, if we detect toxic blue-green algal species, particularly in the Murray River, which is our main area of concern, and in other sources, we have operational measures that we can swing into play to counteract such a possibility.

An effort has been made via the Murray-Darling Basin Commission with our interstate counterparts to attack the issue in the longer term through a catchment management approach to reduce the incidence of these dangerous blooms. I suggest that the situation in South Australia is such that, whilst we acknowledge that there is a very real public health risk associated with the subject, we have put in place measures that will enable the very satisfactory control of the health of the community supplied with public water supplies in South Australia.

Mrs KOTZ: As a supplementary question, I ask whether Mr Norman will identify the contingency plans that are in place in case of outbreak.

Mr Norman: The features of these contingency plans include considering measures that can be taken to mitigate the blue-green algae that might be blooming in the water source; in other words, there is the possibility of being able to attack the problem in the water body that is being used for the provision of public water supply. If that is not successful, the plans consider measures that might be taken to alert the community to the kind of use to which the public water supply can be put. That might include advice to the community being supplied not to use that water for drinking purposes. The contingency plans also include measures that can be taken to treat the water supply through the use of activated carbon to remove the toxin that is associated with the outbreak of such algal blooms.

Mr Killmier: We took particular care to conduct seminars in the Riverland and Lower Murray with local government and with the community to thoroughly inform people of what our plans were and to give those communities the opportunity to contribute to developing

the plans and making sure that they were happy with them. Those seminars were very successful and we feel very confident that people understand the plan.

I am a member of the planning committee of the Australian Water Resources Council. We tabled our plans there and the other States which, at that stage, had not reached the point that we had, because we were the first cab off the rank with our problems at Lake Alexandrina, took advantage of the work that we had done and, in many respects, they have copied a lot of the work that we have put in place. We feel happy with the work because they have analysed it and what we are working towards is a common approach to the handling of blue-green algae throughout Australia. It is naturally an emotional subject and, if there is no consistent approach between authorities, it is easy for the media or the public to point out that there is a different approach in another State and to question why levels are set differently from elsewhere.

We have attempted to work very closely with all the water authorities so that we have a common strategy and a common level of alert. We have developed alert levels depending on the readings in the water and, overall, the water industry in Australia is to be congratulated on its coordinated approach to what is a problem worldwide and which has not been solved anywhere in the world.

Mrs KOTZ: My next question also relates to the same page and the same line and to water quality. The recent heavy rains caused much damage due to flooding which also had an extremely detrimental effect on the quality of water which was fed through into residential premises, particularly in those areas which are still awaiting filtered water supplies. I know the Minister has given a very comprehensive rundown on the area of rural and country, but will the Minister indicate when the remaining unfiltered water supplies in the metropolitan area will be provided with filtration plants? I am specifically referring to the Aldgate and Clarendon weir area, Willunga, McLaren Vale and, of course, an area that is of importance to me and the impact it has on my own electorate, that is, upstream of Anstey Hill.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like to answer this and then refer it to one of the officers. As I understand it, the areas that the honourable member has talked about receive their water not from the catchment in the Hills but from the pipeline from the Murray River. Therefore, the heavy rains would have had absolutely no effect. The areas that are mentioned do receive their water supply from the Murray River. The downpour of rainfall was actually felt within the Adelaide metropolitan region and, if there was an appreciable notice of change of water quality, it must have been for some other reason, because it does not come from the catchment in the Hills.

Mrs KOTZ: I may have misled the Minister because the specific experiences I am talking about related to my own electorate, which is affected by Anstey Hill.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: When you talked about Clarendon, I certainly know Clarendon is not in the honourable member's electorate. Could the honourable member tell us the suburbs?

Mrs KOTZ: I gave you a background in talking about the fact that there were still some very disturbing water quality effects, when the recent rains occurred that affected my particular residential area; I can assure you they did.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Where is that residential area?

Mrs KOTZ: The Tea Tree Gully area.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It may have been a coincidence, that there was some sort of back-flushing needed in the pipes for some other reason. I do not know that you can attribute a diminution of water quality to the heavy rains. If the water is coming from the Murray River or indeed if it is just coming through as normal filtered water, there may be some other reason for that. I will ask one of the technical engineers who are experts on this to answer.

Mr Cooper: There are no water supplies in the Tea Tree Gully area which are untreated, and which would be affected by the storms in the Hills. It is either treated water from the Anstey Hill or Hope Valley water filtration plants or the Barossa Valley, depending on the area you are in, or they are supplied from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. Some areas in the Hills are still supplied with water from the Murray River that is not treated, but that would not be affected by the storms in the Hills. It would be pumped from the Murray River, and that was not affected by the rains. So, if there is an area I would be pleased to chase that out. It might have been a disturbance in the main that might have lifted sediments. We still have occasional sediments lifted, even in an area that has been having clear water for dozens of years. A reversal of flow or a very high flow can sometimes stir sediments.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I would like to add that the McLaren Vale area was also mentioned in the honourable member's question. The Myponga water filtration plant, which I have indicated should come on stream in 1993, would address that problem, but we would be very happy to follow through any particular cases that the honourable member might like to provide me with.

Mrs KOTZ: Just as a supplementary question, I do not want to divert the Minister and the departmental heads on a specific instance within my own electorate, but the major part of the question was whether, if the Minister has a program at this stage, she would identify when those specific areas would be put on filtration plants?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: First, the areas that the honourable member talked about are already on that. There are some in the Hills. Some of these will be picked up when we complete the final stage. Myponga and Swan Reach will be two of them which will pick up some of those areas, but for a more specific answer I ask Mr Cooper to answer.

Mr Cooper: There are two areas of Murray River water supplies that we are looking at in the future and they are the river towns, starting at Renmark and coming down the river—the major towns—and also the Eastern Adelaide Hills area, namely, Stirling, and going right back to Mount Barker and Littlehampton. I have already given a presentation to David Wotton and constituents from the Hills councils on our progress on the Hills towns. We are analysing that whole system, and we are at the stage of coming up with a process that is the most economic way of supplying them with filtered water. That is yet to be fully costed, and it will then have to be examined by Government to see when and how it could

be integrated into the program. We have a very heavy capital works program.

On the river towns we are running experiments. We have something like five different, fairly innovative water filtration pilot plants that we have sitting on the banks of the Murray River at Murray Bridge, and we are running experiments with those to see if one of those could be a breakthrough in giving us a robust, easy to operate and very cheap way of treating the river towns. We are still doing that. That is using some of the latest technology, including membrane filtration and that sort of thing. That is in the early stages, and again that would have to be costed through, developed and presented to Government, seeing how it could be integrated into the overall capital works program.

Mrs HUTCHISON: My question relates to page 295 of the Program Estimates, and the country water supplies. I think you have touched on part of this already, Minister. Will you provide us with some up-to-date information with regard to the filtration of water for the Barossa Valley and the Mid-North area? I am conscious that you have already spoken partly on this.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Perhaps I will just flesh out the answer that I gave earlier. The construction of the water filtration plant serving the Barossa Valley, the Mid-North towns and the Yorke Peninsula is scheduled to start in 1993-94, after the completion of the Myponga water filtration plant. The Mid-North towns and the Yorke Peninsula will receive a mix of filtered water together with local unfiltered catchment water, and the plant will be located at Swan Reach to filter Murray River water delivered via the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline and the Warren trunk main.

The proposed location was decided. However, we have moved it from the original location because it was decided to do so, after indication of support from the local members of Parliament (indeed they are Opposition members of Parliament, and they were fully consulted about the new location of this particular plant). Indeed, there was very extensive consultation with the councils affected by the change from the originally proposed site at Stockwell. The pilot plant studies to determine processing requirements were started early in 1992. It is aimed to incorporate taste and odour removal (in other words, any untoward odours and tastes will be removed) and to include algal toxin removals—I am sure honourable members will be pleased to hear that—should a proven system become available at an acceptable cost.

I think it is important to acknowledge that we must move ahead with this plant because we are talking about providing filtered water to one of South Australia's premier tourist attractions, that is, the Barossa Valley. It is, of course, the premier wine growing and wine producing area in Australia. As I have always said, we really do need to provide a high quality of filtered water, so I am pleased to inform the honourable member that we will be looking at starting in the 1993-94 financial year.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Again, my question relates to page 297 of the Program Estimates and the country sewerage program. Can the Minister advise what progress is likely in 1992-93 on the Port Lincoln sewerage works? When is construction likely to commence on that project?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes I can. This is something which of course is of great interest to country members, particularly the member for Flinders. I must say that I have always paid a tribute to him, as he has worked tirelessly over the years, and has dealt with successive governments, in seeking the provision of a sewerage plant. I am delighted to say that I am the Minister who acceded to his requests. I remind the member for Stuart that on 11 May 1992 Cabinet approved the construction of a sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln, at an estimated total cost of \$6.1 million. The design of the works has been done and is similar to the Finger Point treatment works in the South-East. It will have the capacity to accept waste water from the expected population growth over the next 30 years. So we are really looking at providing a plant that is capable of being functional for the expanding population as projected for that area.

The new plant will provide secondary treatment for sewage plus removal of most of the nitrogen and indeed half of the phosphorous, before the effluent is discharged into the sea something like 500 metres offshore, through the existing outfall. So what we have attempted to do is to remove the most harmful of the nutrients, to minimise any impact on the seagrasses in the Port Lincoln area. The design will enable recycling of the treated effluent by organisations that are interested in using some of the reclaimed water on land. Obviously, it is a mixture of disposal to land as well as disposal to the marine environment. Initially we would have liked to be able to remove all the nutrients into a land-based disposal option, but of course with the seasonal situation with the winter rains that is not possible. I think we will have a very good mix of land-based disposal to organisations that require the treated effluent and removal of the most harmful of the nutrients so that we know we are not causing any further destruction of the seagrasses.

The major contracts will be let for the construction of the works. There are two of those major contracts, and specifications have been prepared and public tenders will be called during September. Construction is programmed to be completed by the end of 1994, with commissioning of the works in early 1995. Several industries in Port Lincoln discharge effluent directly to the marine environment at the moment. They will be covered, firstly, by the new Marine Protection Environment Act. This is very positive news for the citizens of Port Lincoln. Options have been discussed with these industries, including the possible option of connecting to the sewerage system, which will involve significant pre-treatment by the industries, to ensure that discharges comply with the trade waste standards.

To further elaborate, we are working with industry, so that it does as much treatment on site as possible before it discharges into our system. As the honourable member knows, we will be moving to trade waste charges and licensing. I think we are the only State in Australia that is not already at that point. We are working with industry to ensure that we do not move too quickly and disadvantage industry financially and economically. But it is obviously the way in which all Governments throughout the world are going to have to move in the future, so that we have proper treatment both on site and through our sewage treatment works, and where discharge to the marine

environment occurs companies must be moving continuously to remove the most harmful of the substances that are present and to reduce the volumes. I am informed by one of my very reliable officers that we are looking at perhaps letting the contract at the Port Lincoln sewage treatment plant in the next two weeks, and we hope that work will begin in late February 1993 or early March. So that is the latest information from the department.

Mrs HUTCHISON: My last question is on a slightly different tack, and could refer to page 288 of the Program Estimates and the resources summary. Can the Minister advise the Committee to what extent equal opportunity has been implemented in the department? I am very conscious that the Minister did advise at the outset of the Committee proceedings that Ms Claire Bossley has been appointed to one of those senior positions.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I must say that I am delighted with the appointment of Ms Claire Bossley to the position. I can think of no-one better to fulfil that role. I have had the honour and privilege to open a seminar in respect of equal opportunity that Ms Bossley organised within the department. Certainly, I was unable to stay for the whole program, but from my knowledge of the program and my briefing following the seminar I believe it was extremely successful and provided to the women within the department the ability and the opportunity to feel that they have a very vital role and also that they have access to in-service training programs and promotion programs. However, I think it is important to acknowledge that equal opportunity is not just about women.

For most of its history, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has had a very substantial part of its work force occupied by people from non-English speaking backgrounds. In recent years the department has certainly undertaken a number of very commendable efforts to provide courses such as the Skilled English in the Workplace classes conducted by the Adult Migration Education Centre of TAFE. All the employees who attend these classes do so on full pay. The classes are conducted at the workplace, so that employees do not have to travel in order to attend. The department has gone to great lengths to make sure that the courses are accessible and that people feel comfortable about attending them. They do not have to travel long distances or attend colleges with which they are not familiar. I think those are important points in ensuring that employees do feel that they do have access to those new skills that they need to develop.

At this stage there is only demand for one class of 14 employees at the Marden depot. I guess one could say that that is because many employees have already undertaken a number of these courses. The courses ensure that non-English speaking employees understand occupational health and safety matters. Again, that is critical. If we are going to talk about equal employment opportunities, we have got to talk about equal access to occupational health and safety. If people do not understand some of the directions or do not feel totally conversant with the provisions then we really do not have equality in those areas. So the classes are very relevant to the employees and indeed to their managers.

I also want to further elaborate on what is being done for women within the E&WS Department. A women's staff development program has commenced to assist women in gaining the skills and the confidence that they will need for career progression. I guess it is not terribly easy for women in a department which, historically, has been identified as a department of engineers and the fact that one really needed to be an engineer to achieve any kind of promotion. I have to say that that is not for a moment taking away from the managerial skills of the engineers within the department. But I think that it does send signals to those members of the department—with the exception, of course, of the Deputy CEO, who is not an engineer. But I think it does send clear signals out to the employees, particularly the young employees and to women, that there are career paths within the department, and it gives them the confidence and skills to embark upon those.

I think the program is very necessary because, traditionally, women have been employed in only a very small number of work areas within the department. The Chief Executive is determined to ensure that women will provide an enhanced and expanded role in the future, and there are a number of areas where we have looked at putting these very worthwhile words into practice. Encouragement is currently being extended to women to apply for positions as facilitators within the department's change program. Some 50 of the total number are women and that is about 25 per cent; and, of course, we have a much lower percentage of women employed within the department, I think some 8 per cent of employees are women.

So, this is a genuine attempt. It is not about tokenism: it is about genuine equality of opportunity for all people within the department. The other area that the department is particularly concentrating on is to encourage women to assist as consultants in the work and job design process. In each case, because of the direct encouragement of the Chief Executive, women have applied in very large numbers, and now 50 per cent of the internal consultants for work and job designs are women. We have moved from that 25 per cent up to 50 per cent, which is an excellent result when one considers that women make up of the order of 8 per cent of the whole work force.

However, I do not want it to appear that we are talking only about women: there are considerable programs and similar encouragement is given to all employees, particularly those from non-English speaking backgrounds who historically have encountered, to use the vernacular, the glass ceiling. We are conscious of that, and the department is making very serious attempts to redress those issues.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Page 64 of the Auditor-General's Report refers to voluntary separation packages and indicates that, during the year, 252 employees accepted a package. The figure referred to is \$8.3 million, and we are told that \$30.5 million is to be borrowed to cover the cost of voluntary separation packages over the next 12 months. Am I to understand that the \$8.3 million covered the costs of the 252 employees and, if so, how many are expected to be taken off the payroll if some \$30.5 million is being provided for that purpose?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I understand that the figure of \$8.3 million (which did apply to the 252) is actually

more like \$10.9 million, because that money was needed to cover long service leave and other provisions. The money we are talking about which is in the coming budget and which is talked about in the Estimates is to cover the voluntary separation packages of the people who are leaving this coming financial year. In my introductory statement I talked about having a reduction of approximately 800 people—not from now until the end of the year but the total number over the period. That is a considerable number of people, and that is what the money will be used for.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If the \$30.5 million is being provided for that purpose, that suggests to me that we are looking at more than 800 people leaving the payroll.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That includes long service leave, so it is not just for the voluntary separation packages.

Mr Phipps: The reduction proposed for 1992-93 is 499 people. The budget estimate for that amount covers voluntary separation packages for those people and payments such as long service leave which will be outstanding.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister provide details as to the exact amount, because page 142 of the Auditor-General's Report refers specifically to this \$30.5 million being made available for voluntary separation packages? If it means more than that, we should be told.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: In terms of the \$30.5 million, estimates for the 1992-93 year are that the voluntary separation packages would take up about \$21.6 million and the long service leave provisions approximately \$8.9 million, making a total of \$30.5 million.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Further to that, how many of the 252 people induced to take separation packages have been re-employed in a part-time capacity or as a consultant?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: My officers inform me that no-one has been re-employed as a consultant. If the honourable member has any information to the contrary, I should be delighted to receive it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It seems crazy to me that we are looking at paying \$17.9 million to General Revenue and borrowing \$30.5 million for a specific purpose. Is there any variation in the rate of interest paid for that money?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is not paid to General Revenue; it is paid to the Consolidated Account for debt repayment. When we are talking about looking at ourselves in terms of a commercially viable enterprise, we must produce these in terms of the statements. That is the situation. It is paid to retire debt.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In relation to water quality, the Minister and members of her staff indicated that they had been able to put in place what seemed to be satisfactory controls regarding a possible outbreak of algae. Can the Minister reconcile claims by the Public Service Association that the decision to wind down the E&WS Department's marine biology and other areas poses a threat to public safety with a statement by the department's Chief Executive that the proposed cuts in departmental staff would provide the State with improved water quality?

The quote stated that the cut was needed for the E&WS Department to make the quantum leap in productivity that would provide the State with improved water quality, extend services to remote areas and streamline environmental management. Will the Minister provide a response to the very serious accusations that are made in this month's *Public Service Review* by the General Secretary of that union, as follows:

Planned cuts would compromise household plumbing and the State's water quality and sewerage infrastructure... The cutbacks would leave the E&WS without the resources to monitor water quality and pollution in the Murray and coastal waters. The department no longer has the capacity to monitor and investigate quickly a toxic algae outbreak or monitor discharges into the Gulf... It is a classic case of how the reduction of seemingly minor Government functions could have substantial effects on our long-term standard of living.

The General Secretary goes on to refer to the fact that the plumbing and drainage inspectorate within the E&WS Department faced the largest cut of up to 40 per cent in the metropolitan area. Industrial Officer Nina Walsh said:

There may also be instances where new plumbing work is not inspected and unwary home owners may find their new plumbing is substandard.

It is not my intention to refer to all the claims that are made, but they are substantial and damning claims made in the *Public Service Review*. I should like the Minister to respond to those statements by the General Secretary and the President (Lindsay Oxlad) of the Public Service Association.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We will answer those questions. The accusations are serious and it is important to ensure that we answer them. I reject the claim that we will be reducing the health and safety of the citizens of South Australia through the restructuring of the department to make the department more effective in terms of the services it provides and with respect to doing things in a way that is more effective and more accountable to the community.

I want to talk about one of these areas but then I will ask the various people from the department to speak about the others, because we have covered everything from the inspections of plumbing right through to toxic algal blooms in the River Murray.

The first matter is with respect to the marine biologist, and I think that has been raised. Indeed, I have had discussions with the department about this. Instead of keeping staff on full-time pay and on the payroll in the off-chance that they may need to be used in a number of areas at a critical time, it certainly seems more appropriate to be able to get those skills, which we can get at short notice, in a much more cost-effective way. I think the honourable member would agree with that. It is not a matter of saying that we are no longer going to provide these services, that we are no longer going to monitor or no longer going to look at the way we provide protection for the health and safety of the community; it is a matter of how you do this.

I understand the concerns of the Public Service Association: it is fighting to protect jobs and membership, and we acknowledge that; it is a legitimate position and concern. However, Governments have a responsibility to the broader community to be accountable for the way in which they spend the financial resources of the community. We also have to look at the best and most

effective way of providing services and things such as an assurance of quality to the community.

This has not been something that has been dreamt up and we have rushed into. There has been detailed analyses of the best and most effective way of providing these services in relation to both quality and efficiency. In terms of maintaining a staff of marine biologists, for example, who may not be able to be deployed on a full-time basis, I would think that that is an area of a gross waste of public resources.

One of the other areas that was raised was with respect to plumbing inspectors. I have had quite a lot to do with the plumbing and gasfitting industry, the union and the employers' organisation, and these things have been negotiated over a long period of time. I would like to ask Mr Manoel whether he would like to pick up the plumbing and drainage side of that question and then I would like to ask Mr Norman whether he would talk about water quality and the marine aspects that the honourable member has raised, because I cannot let these allegations go unsubstantiated and unrefuted. We really do have a very good story to tell in terms of the quality of the services we are providing and the efficiency and effectiveness in the way in which we are providing them.

Mr Manoel: The reduction in the workforce that we employ on plumbing and drainage inspections of 40 per cent is in fact correct but is part of an ongoing reduction: it represents a step in that process. There has been an ongoing program to rationalise the extent of inspection for the plumbing industry. It is variable to the extent that some plumbers have had the practice of requiring repeat inspections, and we are trying to modify the extent of that service but not to the level that it will interfere with the end result. In fact, some of the plumbers are of the standard where inspections repeatedly show that their work is satisfactory and the matter of continuously and repeatedly inspecting those same plumbers can be reconsidered. Indeed, these people do inspection work internally on the department's own works where we are continuously moving more towards quality assurance with less reliance on inspection.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I have had a number of discussions with the plumbing industry and there are a number of really valid points in relation to this. We have more inspections than any other State in the country. What we have done is look at not a self-regulation model but a model that is somewhere between self-regulation and over-regulation. If the honourable member thinks about the plumbing issue for a moment, he will realise that if we are to have huge numbers of inspections one actually holds up work and adds to the cost of housing and building. When we have looked at the quality assurance issues—and we have done so independently as well as in consultation with the industry itself—we have found that we are inspecting for no good reason. It is not as though we are showing, through the inspections, that we need to have the number of inspections that we have had historically.

The other way of approaching this is to ensure that plumbers are trained to a sufficient level of professionalism and quality that they are able to perform the work without this over-inspection kind of regime that has existed in the past. I think that it really is not presenting an accurate picture to the community. Nobody

has actually told the community what it costs in terms of over-regulation and over-inspection, and there has to be a balance somewhere between having a self-regulatory model and having an over-regulated model.

I pay tribute to the officers in the department who have had long negotiations and discussions with the industry over a period of years, and I think we have now got it right. That is one area that I feel quite strongly about and have had quite a deal of input into myself. I would like Mr Norman to take up those other two areas of water quality and the marine environment.

Mr Norman: I think two questions were posed by the honourable member, one relating to the public health quality of our drinking water supplies and the other being discharges into the marine environment and their impact thereon. With respect to the quality of our public water supplies, they certainly have not been in any way jeopardised by the changes that are occurring in the E&WS Department. Priority has been given to ensuring that we continue to confirm with the guidelines for drinking water quality in Australia which have been developed by the Australian Water Resources Council and the National Health and Medical Research Council in respect not only to the quality of water supply but also to the monitoring of those supplies in order to ensure the public health safety of those communities, be they receiving filtered or unfiltered water.

As I indicated earlier, with the advent of toxic algal blooms in recent years, monitoring of those biological occurrences has certainly not been jeopardised by the current changed staffing arrangements in the department's organisation. Mr Chairman, rest assured that the public health safety of people receiving public water supplies in South Australia is certainly well and truly in hand and well under control.

With respect to discharge into the marine environment and the question relating to marine biologists and our capability in that regard, it is true that we have had a capability over a number of years in the marine biology area. Given that capability, along with the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Environment and Planning, we have been able to get an extremely good understanding of the effects of our discharges into the marine environment. Those effects have been ongoing and, in some cases, have stabilised.

In these budget papers there are proposals to improve, reduce and in fact eliminate in two cases, those discharges—and they are the discharges of sludge to the marine environment from our Glenelg and Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works come the end of 1993. The impact of the department's activities on the marine environment is declining. It will certainly decline further as we are able to fund further enhancements not only with the cessation of discharges of sludge but possibly as a result of a very important suite of studies that we have under way at the moment through consultancies with international connections who are looking at our discharges from each of the four metropolitan sewage treatment works—Bolivar, Glenelg, Port Adelaide and Christies Beach. These consultancies are considering options ranging from the possibility of land disposal of effluent from those treatment facilities to a reduction of nutrients that are contained in those effluent discharges. It is a fact that was discovered by the work of our marine

biologists in the past that the nutrients in these effluent discharges has had an effect on the marine environment in most of those cases: that is quite well identified and quantified.

The need for us to have a marine biology capability into the future is one that will require ongoing consideration, but certainly that capability is available to us, either from other agencies in the form of the Department of Fisheries or through consultancies that we can engage. So, I am confident to recommend to the Committee that the department on the one hand has a very good understanding of the present impact of the effect on the marine environment and if, indeed, it is necessary for us to review that position in the future, then we certainly have at our disposal the possibility of engaging services from other agencies, be it public or private, or possibly we may have the need to reinstate that capability within our own ranks, but at the moment we do not see that as being a necessary move.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: With the advent of the EPA we are having six positions transferred across from the water quality area in the E&WS Department to the new EPA. The EPA will be responsible for a lot of the monitoring that is currently being undertaken by the E&WS. I would have to differ with Mr Norman in that I believe that the marine monitoring would be best carried out by the EPA in terms of a cross-Government agency. Certainly that function will be picked up by the EPA, and that would put to rest any fears that we are lessening the monitoring; in fact, we will be increasing and improving it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I now turn to depreciation, which is referred to in a number of areas in the Auditor-General's Report (pages 58, 62, and so on), as well as in the Program Estimates themselves. We learn that the depreciation for the entire E&WS Department is anticipated to rise from \$49.2 million in 1990-91 to \$80.4 million by the end of this financial year. I am particularly interested to learn that, as far as the metropolitan water supply is concerned, depreciation will rise from \$17.1 million two years ago to \$33.8 million in 1992-93.

Why is there such a significant increase as far as the metropolitan water supply is concerned? How have the economic lives of assets been determined to enable the depreciation rate in turn to be determined? I ask that as a result of the comments that are made in the Auditor-General's Report, where it states:

There is no timeframe for an engineering review of the economic lives of non-current assets.

Further it states:

There was insufficient information available with respect to certain groups of assets, particularly mains, which constitutes 70 per cent of the departments's asset base to confidently predict the economic lives of these assets. The economic lives of other asset categories would be reviewed during 1992-93, where information was available.

I want to refer to a number of areas regarding this matter, one of which comes out of the report that was prepared by Hugh Hudson in July 1990, where he states:

In water supply and sewerage, complications arise because of the very long life of certain assets and the fact that appropriate maintenance arrangements or, indeed, the water pressure adopted will alter the life of assets. Depreciation is not independent of the maintenance program.

Another section of that report states:

Care must be taken not to overestimate depreciation through underestimating the economic lives of assets.

I would like to hear some comment from the Minister on the significant increase in depreciation, particularly as it relates to metropolitan water supply.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Again, quite a number of issues are touched upon by the honourable member. I would like to refer him to the Auditor-General's Report at page 58, because the honourable member stopped quoting from the report, when he read the sentence:

The economic lives of other assets categories would be reviewed during 1992-93 where information was available.

What he did not continue to read and what I think is very relevant to this whole matter and what needs to be factored in is:

A strategic goal study was set up incorporating a working party to identify world best practices, and ultimately the strategies which the department must undertake in the area of asset management.

The Auditor-General goes on to say:

It is anticipated that this study, to be completed in September 1992—

and I understand that will now be completed in October of this year—

will bring a much needed focus to asset management and in particular the coordination of accounting, policy and operational activities in this area.

So, the department is addressing this whole question of asset management. One of the points that the honourable member has talked about in his question is: 'How do you determine the lives of the assets?' We are talking about underground mains, both water and sewerage. We are also talking about the whole concept of world best practice.

It is interesting to note that, for example, of the relatively small number of mains that were laid about 80 years ago, many have been replaced because of the need to increase the size of that main for capacity purposes rather than the fact that the main rusted, had deteriorated or was no longer appropriate. It was not that the asset had deteriorated to the point where it could no longer be used.

Also, we have had the new technology supplied; for example, we no longer just remove the whole sewer, rip it up and replace it with new piping. We have a very comprehensive and thorough system of relining the main sewer mains and sewer trunk mains. This has proved to be extremely successful. What this has done is extend the life of that sewer trunk main, or whatever it happens to be, by a significant number of years. At this stage, it is not possible to quantify just how many years because we are having to do a number of studies as we go.

The honourable member touched on a whole range of other issues, and I ask the Chief Executive Officer whether he wants to comment on some of those other areas. It is not as simple as one might find if, for example, one is looking at a building. One can more objectively appraise the realistic life of a building. With our underground water and sewerage mains, we have found that some of the mains that we thought would not last as long as they have look like going on for many years to come, and we found other areas where we thought they might have lasted longer and they have not.

The department is working on a number of other factors in conjunction with other authorities around the

country to see how we can get the best possible means of assessing the life of our assets and therefore being able to put a value on them.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Minister satisfied that the Government is keeping up with the maintenance required in regard to assets such as underground mains infrastructure, because recent statements, for example, on the part of the Adelaide City Council, which have complained about what it sees as an increase in the amount of inconvenience caused by motorists in the inner city area as a result of burst pipes and mains, have suggested that that is not the case.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will get the figures but, as I understand it, there has not been an appreciable increase in the number of burst mains within the city of Adelaide. There were 1 535 burst mains in 1990-91 and 1 512 burst mains in 1991-92. In terms of choked sewer mains, in 1989-90 there were 2 915, 2 836 in 1990-91, and 2 997 in 1991-92. With respect to choked sewer connections, the most recent figure is lower than that of the previous two financial years. In 1989-90, there were 17 261 choked connections, 17 108 in 1990-91, and 16 173 in 1991-92. The figures do not bear out what the Adelaide City Council is saying.

To the extent that no Minister would ever be fully satisfied with the replacement program, I am as satisfied as any Minister could possibly be. The Economic and Finance Committee has had a look at the asset replacement provisions and policies of the department. I understand that the E&WS Department is probably the best, if not one of the best, in the whole of government. We have an asset management and replacement policy which the department takes very seriously. As Minister, I have taken it very seriously, and I just do not think there is any evidence to suggest that we are not acting responsibly in this area. It may not be appropriate just to take my word for this, so I ask the Chief Executive Officer to comment.

Mr Phipps: I have another role as Chairman of the Government's Capital Budget Works Committee in which each year we discuss with agencies their capital budgeting and, in particular, the amount of money that is going into asset replacement. I endorse the Minister's comments that the E&WS is very sophisticated in its approach to assessing and investing in the renewal of assets. It is a very important issue for the E&WS because the estimated replacement value of its assets is approximately \$11 billion. If we write that down for the amount of asset consumed so far, it is of the order of \$6.5 billion. With an asset stock that size, it is very important that our analysis of the asset renewal situation is rigorous and sophisticated.

It is also important that the actual investment that we make in the renewal of assets each year keeps pace with the sort of investment that we need, having regard to the life of the assets. We have been carrying out comprehensive expenditure on renewal of assets, the rehabilitation of the major metropolitan sewage treatment works, the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, gulleys on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and the Bundaleer trunk main, the sewer grouting program, and major trunk sewers—the Warren Avenue sewer and the North Terrace sewer. Basically, the E&WS models, which are based on our latest assessment of pipe life, indicate that we are

investing the amount of money that the model would require. We feel reasonably confident that planned renewal expenditure is keeping pace with that which the model would demand.

Another question was asked by the honourable member in relation to the increase in depreciation between two years. Basically, that relates to the financially responsible practice of moving over time from historic valuation of assets—valuation in historic cost terms, which is the amount of money that was paid at the time—to valuing the assets on a full replacement cost basis. It is important in producing the annual accounts that the amount of money that is allowed covers the consumption of the asset. If the asset has a 100 year life and has a replacement value of \$1 million, it is very important that we allow that \$100 million for the consumption of the asset. If we were to value our assets only on historic cost, the risk is that, over time, we would underestimate the amount of asset that is consumed. We have been introducing the financially responsible practice of valuing our assets over time, moving to a full replacement cost basis, whereby the true cost of consuming the assets is brought to account in the financial statements. That is really the reason for the increase in depreciation over time.

Mr HOLLOWAY: At page 302 of the Program Estimates, it is stated that 45 major cost reduction and productivity improvement projects were undertaken during the year which identified major savings. Will the Minister give us a brief resume of the nature of those projects and perhaps give some indication of the sorts of savings involved?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will ask Mr Killmier if he would like to provide the honourable member with an answer.

Mr Killmier: The department has been undertaking for some nine to 12 months a number of reviews of all of the activities of the department to try to ensure that they are up with the best practice in Australia or around the world. I have with me a document 'Cost and Productivity Improvement Projects', and they range over a whole smorgasbord of activities: accounts payable, burst main repairs, rationalisation of use of chemicals, power costs, telemetry, and so on. There are 50 or 60 of these particular projects. The way we did it was to use our staff, the people that we believed understood the processes best, and appoint teams of people, some from the area concerned and some from other parts, to ensure the objectivity of what we were doing, and we also had reference panels whereby we involved the other employees, people from unions and so on to ensure that when it came time to implement these projects there was acceptance throughout the department. It was a rather innovative approach. In the past we had adopted a process of internal audit, if you like, but the problem with that was that when it came time to implement the recommendations you could get a certain degree of negativity when trying to implement, whereas this methodology means that the people who actually do the work have agreed that that is the best way to go about it, and therefore you have already won them over, and it is quite easy then to proceed with implementation.

The savings that arise are quite considerable. Naturally enough, they take some time to achieve because

sometimes you may require changes to legislation, or you may require new equipment. There is a whole range of recommendations and things that need to be done to turn the practice into the very best, but we believe it has been a very successful operation. It has certainly had the full support of the staff of the department and savings arise out of it. I think that, in some instances, there has probably been a bit of double counting because the figures look a little bit optimistic sometimes. That arises out of the enthusiasm of the people doing the project who naturally enough want to be able to claim that they have come up with ideas that will achieve maximum savings, but it is a methodology that I feel has worked very well. The team has come along and presented to the executive panel the work that it has done, and it is reviewed by executive and then these people go away and get the responsibility for implementation. The end results have been excellent. I would commend the idea. In fact, I was even cheeky enough to tell the Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee about what we were doing. He commended us on the process. I felt very happy about that. That is the story behind the cost and productivity improvement program.

Mr HOLLOWAY: My next question relates to the trial woodlots at Bolivar and my reference for this is page 296 of the Program Estimates which states that monitoring of the hardwood irrigated afforestation woodlot is continuing with the Department of Woods and Forests having technical control over the project. What progress has been made with that trial?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We have made excellent progress with the trial. The success of the trial thus far is measured in the number of people from other parts of Australia, but most importantly from overseas, who have come to have a look at what we have achieved in this hardwood irrigated afforestation trial. It is a bit of a mouthful but I think it does explain exactly what it is. The objective of the trial initially was to determine the potential to develop large scale native hardwood plantations utilising reclaimed water, principally water reclaimed from Bolivar, and I have to inform the honourable member that there are about 50 species of native trees included in the plantation of about 30 000, covering a 14 hectare site. Five main species are being tested for performance under alternative irrigation and forest management conditions.

To meet the objectives of the trial, six major experimental projects comprise the scientific research program as follows. We have tree water use determination, tree growth assessment, nutrition investigation, environmental monitoring, irrigation management and commercial viability. Results from the research program are now becoming available, and initial assessment of the results has commenced. The current program for the trial is to assess the results received from the scientific programs up to 30 June 1993 to determine the future of the trial. One has only to visit the actual woodlot to see how prolific the growth has been, particularly in that section of the woodlot where we have used treated effluent from Bolivar, and to recognise that there are a large number of areas within Australia where we could use this type of scheme.

Not only does it ensure that we can dispose of the effluent on land but the fact that it is creating another

product that can be used as a resource in the community I think really does add a new meaning to the term 'recycling'. If one thinks about what we start with, where it comes from and what happens to it, and the fact that we then can produce hardwood that can be used either for firewood or for fuel, and indeed some of the wood in the trial can be used, I believe, for furniture manufacture, one realises that we are perhaps looking at the beginning of a very exciting new industry.

When I was in Sydney recently talking to the ACF about the States' responsibilities and the opportunities coming out of the Rio conference, it was interesting to find some of the elected representatives from the seaside councils in Sydney coming up to me and wanting to know about woodlots. They had seen an article in *The Weekend Australian* some weeks ago and wanted to know all about this particular woodlot, because in Sydney they are still at the stage where they are pumping into the marine environment untreated sewage; it is merely disinfected. Of course, representatives of those seaside councils in Sydney are feeling fairly concerned about the environmental consequences of that. So I have extended an invitation to anybody who raises the matter with me to come to South Australia and meet with officers of the department who, I might say, are working very closely and constructively with Environment and Planning personnel, and more particularly with Woods and Forests Department personnel, and I believe with Industry, Trade and Technology personnel, in looking at the ways that this trial can provide long-term and very significant consequences for South Australia.

Mr HOLLOWAY: The reference to my final question is page 300 of the Program Estimates and it refers to stormwater management. During the Environment and Planning estimates examination, the Minister discussed some of the environmental factors in relation to stormwater management. Can the Minister give us an E&WS perspective on what its role is in relation to harnessing stormwater?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will try to keep this brief, because in fact the department plays an enormous role. It is involved very extensively in a whole range of projects and policy development in respect of the management control of stormwater. First, we have the joint State Government and local government task force group, and that, of course, has representatives on it from the E&WS Department. I hope the recommendations from that group will be available later this year. As far as I am concerned, I would like to see those recommendations as soon as possible, because it is vitally important that we move forward.

One project that I referred to earlier is the Onkaparinga estuary wetland project. This involved the construction of an estuary wetland. This scheme has been completed and it was officially opened on World Environment Day on 5 June this year. The initial vegetation planting has been completed and guidelines for a water quality monitoring program are currently being drawn up and will incorporate involvement by local community groups. We also have the River Torrens wetland, where the E&WS is overseeing the construction of a wetland on the River Torrens, as a pilot program, if you like, in the Athelstone-Highbury area, as part of the linear park and the flood mitigation scheme.

Further, we have the Happy Valley wetland, where the department has designed and constructed a multiple purpose demonstration wetland on a tributary discharging into the Happy Valley stormwater catchment drain. The wetland in Happy Valley has been designed to treat water to a standard suitable for discharge into the reservoir. Again, it is important that we look at ways in which water that is coming from the catchment areas into our reservoirs can be ponded and treated before it arrives. It will certainly be very cost effective to do it that way, rather than treat it with sophisticated technology once it has arrived in the reservoir.

The other area is the Patawalonga Basin, and we will be looking at a number of areas during a one year trial, seeking to ensure that the Patawalonga is properly cleaned up. We also have a storm water monitoring program. The E&WS Department is monitoring the performance of a wetland at The Paddocks, in the Salisbury area, as part of the joint State-local government funded urban storm water monitoring program. I have about five or six other areas listed, and I will refer to them by title.

The E&WS Department is involved in the Northern Metropolitan Regional Storm Water Management Study, as was acknowledged in the *2020 Vision* document. We have commissioned consultants B.C. Tonkin to complete the Mount Lofty Ranges Urban Storm Water Management Manual. We have the Hydrologic Monitoring of Storm Water Quantity and Quality, which is vitally important; and we have the Better Cities Program, where we have sought funding from a number of areas.

I understand that the Happy Valley wetland has been designed but the construction is yet to begin. The department is working on quite a number of joint projects, particularly with local government, private consultants and local communities, and I believe that we will see some very exciting and innovative projects in the future.

Mr HOLLOWAY: Has any attention been given to the Sturt River in that program?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I did allude to this earlier. The Marion council has already indicated that it would like to see some of those rather environmentally and aesthetically unsound concrete channels removed from an area of parklands and the establishment of wetlands take place as a joint project. At the moment, we are waiting for the final results of the EIS from the Glenelg redevelopment project in order to get a handle on the commitment from the proponents of the development, from Glenelg council and also from the upstream councils, as well as a Government commitment to look at what we do with that whole Sturt River/Creek area.

That may well be one of the first pilot projects we look at undertaking. It is a matter of getting all the players into the game and ensuring that we are all playing as a team. Hopefully, that will take place in the near future.

Mr LEWIS: Tonight at 1.30 there is an earthquake measuring 7.6 on the Richter scale along three fault lines; all metropolitan reservoirs rupture; the Mannum-Adelaide and Murray pipelines go and 12 bridges go out on the freeway; there is a slippage in all the areas on which, because of their abrupt elevation, we have chosen to put forward storage tanks, and there is no potable water left

in Adelaide by tomorrow. What contingency plans do we have for potable water supply and how will we remove the sewage?

This is not a matter of if: it is a matter of when. It is in circumstances of high tides, with a full moon bringing these tides even higher, with several billion tonnes of water extra in Gulf St Vincent, reservoirs full and saturated fault lines lubricating the release of tension. All our reservoirs are built on fault lines, which is why they will fail. In consequence, there will be flooding and massive disruption with no means of getting water from the Lower Murray because the freeway is out with the collapse of 12 bridges.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That is certainly a scenario for absolute disaster. I could not be totally honest and say that we could cope totally calmly tomorrow, but it seems to me that the stormwater proposals are really important. At the moment the department is studying whether it is possible, through the use of ponding and wetlands, to put much of that water back into the underground aquifers.

The results of the research thus far—and I am not an expert, but it might be good that I am not because perhaps I can convey in lay person's language exactly what we are looking at—indicate that with some of the underground aquifers this may be impossible. However, there are I believe very hopeful signs that in a number of our underground aquifers that water could be put underground. If the earthquake had gone deeply enough and had fractured all the underground aquifers and that water had become contaminated, I guess the member for Murray-Mallee's scenario would be even gloomier than the one he has painted.

Mr LEWIS: I am talking about the immediate supply of potable water and removal of sewage.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am actually answering—

Mr LEWIS: Do you have a contingency plan for public health?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: We will get to the contingency plan. We have a member of the department who is on the State Disaster Committee, and I am sure there are contingency plans.

Mr LEWIS: Good. That is what my question was about.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think it is broader than that. I think we also have to be looking at long-term contingency plans, and that is what good planning is about: it is planning for the longer term as well as for the immediate future. If we can use the underground aquifers as huge reservoirs and be able to put water back into them—

Mr LEWIS interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Mr Chairman, am I allowed to finish the answer?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Could the member for Murray-Mallee desist?

Mr LEWIS interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think it does have something to do with the broader perspective of the question, but we are all aware of the way the member for Murray-Mallee's mind operates, having been 10 years in the Parliament. If the member for Murray-Mallee is not interested in long-term or medium-term solutions to problems, then that is his problem.

I will ask the member of the department who is on the State Disaster Committee to answer that. I think the short answer is that there would be so much death and destruction that I guess that those people particularly in the Hills who have large tanks that have not been fractured in the earthquake and those of us like me who have tanks in our domestic houses would be prepared to provide drinking water and the basic necessities for neighbours and friends, and a lot of people in Adelaide already have tanks. I guess it would be one of those situations where there may not be a short-term solution, but I will ask Mr Peter Norman whether he would like to address this hypothetical scenario.

Mr Norman: The Minister is quite right that there is the possibility of enhancing Adelaide's public water supply through the enhanced storage of water underground through recharge from stormwater. There are certainly some possibilities in that regard that are being investigated not only by the E&WS Department but also by the Department of Mines and Energy, and it is also supported by the Australian Centre for Groundwater Studies based on—

Mr LEWIS interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: He is going to answer that. Mr Chairman, I do not want my officers to be harassed by—

The CHAIRMAN: I apologise to the Committee, because it seems that I am unable to urge the member for Murray-Mallee to desist from constantly interrupting. I would not like to think that the member for Murray-Mallee is testing my patience to such an extent that I would resort to the Standing Orders that are available to me. I would not like to think that he is doing that. I would like to appeal to the member for Murray-Mallee to think about the fact that present here in this Chamber are not only his colleagues but also public servants who are here to give assistance and advice to the Committee.

I would hate them to leave this Chamber tonight with a lower impression of us than perhaps they might have had before they walked in. A question was asked by the member for Murray-Mallee; the Minister has given one response; and now the one person who is on the State Disaster Committee is attempting to give some assistance not only to the member for Murray-Mallee but also to the rest of the Committee. I would ask the Committee to listen in silence to Mr Norman.

Mr Norman: In respect of the immediate possibility of an emergency striking in the metropolitan Adelaide area, such as the honourable member suggests could occur, the scenario he outlined is very much the extreme possibility. A more likely but nevertheless less extreme possibility would be for one of the reservoirs that provided Adelaide with its public water supply to be threatened under an earthquake situation. The chance of more than one of those storages being impacted by such an event is really an absolutely extreme possibility, albeit possible.

If that were to happen, indeed, the demand for water supply would plummet immediately, because there would be many other priorities; in fact, I think it would be a situation of evacuation of metropolitan Adelaide, rather than staying put and looking to public water supply and other services to be sustained. It would be a quite catastrophic situation. In the more likely, albeit still extreme, possibility of one of the reservoirs being

impacted by an earthquake event, then the water supply distribution system is extremely flexible in being able to shunt water north and south and be manipulated such that, whilst we may not be able to maintain a full supply to all across the metropolitan area, certainly a basic supply could be maintained, possibly in combination with reduction in consumption.

There is a State Disaster Act, which puts in place a framework to stitch together an integrated organisation between the police, the State Emergency Service, Metropolitan Country Fire Services, as well as the engineering function, combining the E&WS Department, ETSA and the Gas Company, as well as many other agencies, including local government, to respond to such emergencies. That organisation is exercised on a very frequent basis and was partly brought into play during the recent flood events, and in my opinion it responded very effectively under those circumstances.

Mr LEWIS: What the Minister and Mr Norman have overlooked is that the very factor of the extremely wet weather conditions which have put pressure on the fault lines by virtue of the millions of tonnes of water retained behind those storage dams, and that wet weather condition also making the tension release on the fault lines more likely than would otherwise be the case, coupled with the full moon bringing even higher tide levels, weight in the gulf resulting in further compounding that likelihood, means that more than one will fail at once when it happens: it will not be one in isolation. That aside, what is the contingency plan to deal with the likelihood of the escape of tilapia into the Murray-Darling?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will have to ask one of the officers.

Mr LEWIS: That is another disaster on our hands. Tilapia is a fairly recent fish in evolutionary terms; it is far more voracious and damaging to the environment than carp. It has already been allowed to escape into fresh water streams on the eastern watershed in Queensland. Unless we do something about it nationally it will find its way in to the Murray-Darling system, and it will destroy the ecosystem of all the wetlands and the main channels of those streams in a very short time indeed. The biology of the fish is well documented. Because it has been allowed into the country and been released, I suggest that what we need to do is get a contingency plan together to get rid of the thing before it gets into the Murray-Darling basin system on a national basis.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will refer that question to the Premier, who is the Minister of Fisheries, because that would need to be dealt with by the Fisheries Department in conjunction with the E&WS and possibly Marine and Harbors, which has some role and responsibility for the Murray. It would be more appropriate for the matter to be dealt with by the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr LEWIS: We have seen and heard about the social justice strategy of the department, although that question is not addressed in the budget papers as such. What about social justice for the people in the Lower Murray? There are three aspects to this question. Usher Road, which is just out of Murray Bridge, like many other fringes around country towns, does not have a water supply. None is provided and none is to be provided. The people who live

there are generally on very depressed incomes. There is no question about that. That is why they chose to live just out of town. They cannot afford it. No matter where they are on the fringe, that is the way it is. Their children suffer more illness because they do not have a decent reticulated water supply; yet the Government is prepared to spend money on cosmetic plans for introducing and establishing wetlands in the Onkaparinga, Dry Creek, Happy Valley and the Patawalonga, and five or six others to which the Minister referred. The Government is prepared to install sewerage at no cost to the indentured people at Seaford; yet we cannot address the problem of social justice on the urban fringe of some provincial towns and in other parts of rural South Australia where it would not cost very much at all.

In the name of social justice, the Government has spent a few million dollars on providing a water supply to people who, for 50 000 years, lived without it and have a culture in their tribal lands of being able to live without it. However, we cannot do likewise for people on the urban fringe. Just a few thousand dollars are needed to fix that problem. Not only is the Minister unprepared to allocate any funds for that essential service but also she is unwilling to do anything more than leave the Lower Murray, where it is in the closest proximity to the filthy water and where there is least opportunity for it to settle, to be the last cab off the rank for water filtration. That annoys me and aggravates all my constituents because they feel they would be better off in an electorate where there are swinging voters or Labor members. I clearly remember 12 years ago the member for Whyalla belly-aching for 20 minutes about his dirty water supply. What is to be done?

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the member for Murray-Mallee that there is little chance that the Minister will have time to respond because I have to close this line, open the next line and close it before 10 p.m.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I ask the honourable member to provide me with that information. I believe that the department has a genuine concern for those who are less privileged in the community. I do not believe that the honourable member has approached me about the Usher Road matter. He might have: I cannot recall off the top of my head. I ask him to provide me with that information. I remind the honourable member that we have put money into Murray Bridge sewage treatment to get it off the river. We have done a number of things there and I have not said that we will leave the Lower Murray until last. We are doing what we can. We have spent enormous sums of money in these areas and we have certainly spent a lot of money in some very remote communities under the framework of the social justice strategy, and I am happy to take up those matters.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My question relates to the Christies Beach treatment works. First, I understand that a consultancy is being carried out on all metropolitan sewerage works. I would like to know who the consultants are, what the recommendations are and when they will be put before the public. I understand that there was a suggestion that that would be the case. Is there some problem with that?

I would like to know what the situation is, because it is all tied in with regard to Maslins Beach, where I understand that some suggestion has been made that that

area should go to common effluent. I wonder what is happening in regard to that matter. I realise that because of the time it may be necessary to have this information provided on notice, but I would like to know where the plans are in regard to Aldinga water that is being provided as well. How much has been spent at Aldinga to date? Does the recent consultant's report done on Aldinga support the current site; show land based possibilities etc.; or does it suggest location, as with the Sellicks marina EIS? There is some confusion about that.

When Aldinga was started and some residents were able to hook into that system, they were not required to pay capital contributions. I would like to know if this will be the norm for all residents in that area from now on. Finally, I ask what sewerage facilities are going to Maslins Beach. How many extra houses at Aldinga and Port Willunga are to be connected, and when and how will the Christies Beach work handle the extreme load? Also what plans are there for on land disposal, recognising that initially it was stated that it was not expected that the Christies Beach treatment works would be upgraded fully before the year 2000? My major concern is that, as I understand it, that is all virtually at capacity now, so all of those areas are tied in.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I think it would be totally inappropriate for me to do anything else but tell the honourable member that I will take his question on notice and provide answers as though the question was a question on notice on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note from the Estimates that the chemical costs for disinfection and treatment of water supply for metropolitan water and country water have been estimated to increase by 11 per cent in the 1991-92 actuals. Is this because of a change in methods,

higher levels of pollution, etc.? Is the Minister satisfied with the level of chlorine being used, particularly in the metropolitan water supply at the present time? I am aware of concern being expressed about that matter. Also, is the Minister satisfied with the levels of copper sulphate now being required in some reservoirs to ensure that that water is of high quality?

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I will get the specific answers to those questions for the honourable member, but I think that what the honourable member is asking totally reinforces the decisions I have taken with respect to the controls in the Mount Lofty Ranges, because I remind the honourable member that 60 per cent of our water supply comes from the Mount Lofty Ranges and we cannot continue the 'business as usual' approach in terms of the destruction of those ranges. I think his question certainly supports the very courageous decisions which I have taken in the ranges. We will provide the detail of those answers to the honourable member.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous,
\$4 939 000—Examination declared completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 17 September at 11 a.m.