

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday 19 June 1998

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Acting Chairman:
The Hon. R.B. Such

Members:
Ms F.E. Bedford
Ms L.R. Breuer
Mr R. L. Brokenshire
Ms A.K. Hurley
Mrs K.A. Maywald
Mr G. Scalzi

The Committee met at 9 a.m.

Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal
Affairs, \$97 235 000,
Administered Items for Department for Environment,
Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs, \$1 330 000
Minister for Environment and Heritage—Other
Items, \$2 645 000

Witness:

The Hon. D.C. Kotz, Minister for Environment and
Heritage, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. Scanlon, Portfolio Chief Executive, Department for
Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs.
Mr D. Rathman, Chief Executive, Division of State
Aboriginal Affairs.
Mr D. Moffatt, Financial Coordinator.
Mr R. Starkie, Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive.
Mr P. Campaign, Senior Project Officer.
Ms C. Divakaran-Brown, Team Leader, Heritage and
Strategic Development.

Membership:

Mr Hill substituted for Ms Hurley.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: My first task is to outline the procedures. A relatively informal procedure will be adopted. Members do not need to stand to ask or answer questions. The Committee will determine an approximate time for consideration for proposed payments to facilitate changeover of departmental advisers. Have the Minister and the Opposition spokesperson agreed on such a program?

Mr HILL: We have agreed on an allocation for Aboriginal Affairs this morning. I have not agreed to the breakdown from 10.30 a.m. onwards. The Minister's suggested timetable breaks it down into bureaucratic elements which, in my opinion, do not really relate to the budget. I suggest that we maintain some flexibility from 10.30 a.m. onwards and allow examination to cross all the portfolio area because, after all, it is only one portfolio.

I would like to talk about the figuring of the budget, trying to understand what the budget means, that is, looking at the figures. The second area relates to national parks and botanic

gardens; the third relates to the EPA; the fourth area covers biodiversity, and I have a question about recycling; the fourth is about water; then a question about heritage; and then some miscellaneous bits and pieces. I might have missed out something, or have some things in the wrong area, but it is a bit hard to work out from the way the budget is structured.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I point out that it is up to the Committee to determine the schedule, but does the Minister object to the honourable member's suggestion?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We have no difficulty in attempting to accommodate the member for Kaurna and the elements about which he has spoken. They do, in effect, fall into the range of the identified portfolio units. When we reach that part of the portfolio, perhaps the honourable member could indicate the relevant sections about which he wishes to ask questions, remembering that heritage and biodiversity come under the one unit. The honourable member might be able to identify those units, because it makes it simpler for us to arrange the necessary expertise to be available. From what the member for Kaurna has said, I do not think we will have too much difficulty, as long as we can maintain the questions in the unit areas.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Does it suit the member for Kaurna if the areas are grouped?

Mr HILL: I am happy with that, if we can work it out.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We will retain a degree of informality and flexibility but we need to address the particular lines and the categories for estimates. We will proceed on the basis that we will be examining Aboriginal affairs until approximately 10.15 with, once again, a little flexibility; then we move on to environment and heritage, covering the areas that were just outlined, such as national parks, the Botanic Gardens, the EPA, water issues, heritage and biodiversity. As the Minister indicated, it would be easier for her staff if the groupings were largely maintained. I might have missed a category, but is that generally agreed?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Yes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I remind members that, if there are changes to the membership of the Committee, the Chair must be notified, with the appropriate form. If the Minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard*, with two copies submitted no later than Friday 3 July 1998 to the Clerk of the House of Assembly. I propose to allow the lead speaker for the Opposition and the Minister to make an opening statement, if desired, of about 10 minutes but no longer than 15 minutes. I indicate that, as happened in another Committee yesterday, with the consent of the Committee, if someone wishes an opening statement to be included in *Hansard* without being read, that is the prerogative of the Committee; the Minister and others do not need to make an oral statement. There will be a flexible approach to calling for questions, based on about three questions per member.

Members may be allowed to ask a brief supplementary question to conclude a line of questioning, but any supplementary questions will be the exception rather than the rule. Subject to the convenience of the Committee, a member who is outside the Committee and who desires to ask a question will be permitted to do so once the line of questioning on an item has been exhausted by the Committee. An indication in advance to the Chair from the member outside the Committee wishing to ask a question is necessary. Questions must be based on lines of expenditure as revealed in the Estimates Statement. Reference may be made to other documents, including the Portfolio Statements. Members must identify

a page number with the program and relevant financial papers from which their question is derived.

In order to expedite things, I will not be enforcing absolutely strictly the requirement that all the fine detail be provided, but the questions must relate to the Estimates Statement and the Portfolio Statements. Questions not asked at the end of the day must be placed on the next day's House of Assembly Notice Paper. I remind the Minister that there is no formal facility for the tabling of documents before the Committee. However, documents can be supplied to the Chair for distribution to the Committee.

Incorporation of material in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the House, that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length. All questions are to be directed to the Minister, not to the Minister's advisers, although the Minister may refer questions to advisers for a response. For the purposes of the Committee, some freedom will be allowed for television coverage by allowing a short period of filming from the northern gallery. I now invite the Minister to make a brief opening statement, if she wishes.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I will make an opening statement in terms of the restructuring that took place within this department. I will then address some comments to the Aboriginal portfolio area.

The Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs was established on 23 October 1997 through the amalgamation of the former Department of the Environment and Natural Resources, but that was minus the land services group and the former Department of State Aboriginal Affairs. With responsibilities in environmental protection and management, Aboriginal and European heritage, and Aboriginal affairs, the department is making a significant contribution to the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the State.

The new Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs has been restructured internally to ensure more effective and integrated delivery of key outputs to Government and to the community. The new department now comprises six divisions: namely, the State Aboriginal Affairs Environment Protection Agency, environment policy, heritage and biodiversity, resource information, and the corporate strategy and business services group. In addition to its presence in metropolitan Adelaide, the department operates offices in country areas of South Australia, including the major regional centres of Port Augusta, Berri, Mount Gambier and Kangaroo Island.

The 1998-99 budget marks a major improvement in the presentation of budget information. For the first time, the South Australian budget has been presented on an accrual output class basis. It should be noted that the figures in the 1998-99 papers cannot be meaningfully compared with those in the 1997-98 Estimates of Receipts and Payments given the portfolio restructure of 23 October 1997 which amalgamated DOSAA with DENR and transferred the land services group to DAIS. Also, there was the conversion from cash to accrual accounting, the adoption of the 1998-99 basis of appropriation funding on a global basis, the separation in the new papers of administered revenues and expenses previously included in the department's budget, and the transfer of financial activity previously categorised as 'administered' to the department's control.

The same arguments apply to attempts to compare the 1998-99 accrual budget with the 1996-97 accrual financial statements published by the Auditor-General. The 1998-99 budget also represents the first year of a transition to output-

based budgeting. One of the major tasks faced by agencies in preparing for this year's budget has been estimating the full cost of delivery for each output class. In broad terms, the budgeted costs for output classes for 1998-99 have been based on 1997-98 cash budgets which have been adjusted for decisions relating to the department's three-year budget strategy, the non-cash accrual items, such as depreciation, increases in employee entitlements and, of course, allocations of corporate and divisional overheads.

The outputs operating statement, which is on page 925 of the Portfolio Statements, shows the allocation of costs and non-appropriation revenues to output classes. It also shows allocations of appropriation revenue and an operating result for each output class. The requirement for agencies to allocate appropriation amounts to each of the output classes has raised a problem where the revenues from any output class exceed its expenses. That is because the appropriation is calculated to deliver a zero profit for the whole agency. A profit in any one output class must be offset by commensurate losses in one or more output classes.

In the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs the administration of Crown lands output class makes an operating surplus (or profit), which, effectively, subsidises other operations of the department, but conversely a deficit has been attributed to the Aboriginal development output class because it has around \$1.2 million of expenditure, which relates to the Head of the Bight stage 2 development, to be carried forward from 1997-98 and with no offsetting revenue being received in 1998-99, having received the funding for that project as part of the Government's 1997 budget priority funding package. This being a transitional year, and for the reasons that I have just stated, the apportionment of expenses and appropriation to output classes should be treated as indicative only.

In previous years the annual budget for an agency comprised two parts—recurrent and capital—and with the transition to accrual accounting this distinction has now disappeared. The Portfolio Statements Paper 4 includes a capital funding statement for each department. This statement lists only those departmental projects meeting the criteria of asset creating, that is, investing expenditures, and controlled by the department rather than administered. The scope of the capital works department is broader than the definition reflected in the capital funding statement, in that it includes works which do not result in the creation of an asset, works which do not improve an asset or extend the life of an asset beyond its original design life and works which are carried out on behalf of the Commonwealth and therefore administered rather than controlled.

Therefore, the total value shown in DEHAA's capital works statement of \$30.2 million cannot be reconciled directly with the capital funding statement of \$15.48 million. I trust I will have the opportunity to highlight in more detail key elements of the department's capital works program over the course of today's proceedings. With the Committee's concurrence, I now insert in *Hansard*, without my reading it, the following statement referring to the specific area of our Aboriginal affairs portfolio:

The Government is committed to delivering outcomes to enable Aboriginal people to function with a sense of dignity and equality with all Australians. The delivery of specific targeted programs by the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs in the areas of essential services to Aboriginal communities in remote areas, Aboriginal heritage management, support for Aboriginal business and employment opportunities ensures

Aboriginal access, involvement and participation in the activities taken for granted by the wider community. Eighteen Aboriginal communities' essential services are maintained by the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs including the provision of power, water and sewage.

Agreement has been reached with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and its Program Manager P.P.K. for the project management of the National Aboriginal Health Strategy infrastructure on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands. This will provide \$6 million of services to community.

State Grants projects managed on contract from ATSIC will provide substantial improvements for the community including the Nepabunna Powerline. The construction and commissioning of the power line provide significant savings in removing the reliance on diesel generators for the Nepabunna Aboriginal community and pastoral properties adjacent the transmission line.

The development of Aboriginal enterprises to create long term employment in four regions of the State will be a focus for sustainable economic development. The Winmante Art Centre, Nalte Ruwe Yabby Farm and Kuju Enterprises flower project are examples of the projects supported and assisted by the Division. Work with local Aboriginal communities to develop a series of link Aboriginal tourism trails across the State shows strong potential especially in the South East and Riverland.

The importance of the role and well being of the family in the Aboriginal community is recognised and the Aboriginal women's planning group involving women in senior policy positions across government is important in identifying issues of importance to Aboriginal women and children.

A further meeting of Aboriginal Elders will be facilitated this year. Over eighty senior Aboriginal men and women will gather in Coober Pedy to confirm and demonstrate the cultural and community role of the Elders within Aboriginal society.

Improved coordination and cooperation with Aboriginal communities effected by proposals which impact on Aboriginal sites will be supported. Many communities are involved direct with developers to address concerns at an early stage. Further stage of the Site Conservation Strategy will benefit the community by providing more defined site locations and management plans.

The Chairman, State Aboriginal Heritage Committee has been instrumental in supporting Traditional Owners in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands and Maralinga Tjarutja Lands in addressing their heritage concerns.

Amendments to the State Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 continue to be developed especially in relation to the proposals before the Commonwealth Parliament to amend the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984.

In consultation with the Aboriginal Justice Inter-Departmental Committee the actions of State Government Agencies will be monitored and cooperation fostered to continue to address the over representation of Aboriginal people in the Justice System.

The South Australian Aboriginal Education and Advisory Council provides a valuable mechanism for advice relating to Aboriginal education issues. The Council holds its meetings in regional centres to ensure state wide coverage community input.

A Senior Advisory Group has been established from key agencies to comprehensively consider and provide advice to the Minister on South Australia's response to the National

Inquiry into the Forced Removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families Report 'Bring Them Home' recommendations.

Outputs purchased by the Government are included under Aboriginal Development—\$5 498 000, Heritage and Conservation \$1 189 000 and Portfolio Policy and Ministerial Support \$1 400 000.

Membership:

Ms Hurley substituted for Mr Hill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to pages 179-183 of the Estimates Statement and part 9 in the Portfolio Statements. I now invite the lead speaker for the Opposition to make a brief statement if she wishes.

Ms HURLEY: Thank you, Sir. I will not make an opening statement on the Aboriginal affairs part of the portfolio, but I understand that the shadow Minister (the member for Kaurana) will be making an opening statement at the conclusion of the Aboriginal affairs section. I refer the Minister to page 9.2, 'Administered Items', and page 9.4, 'Aboriginal Advancement Works', where it is stated that Aboriginal advancement works represent Commonwealth funding under a Commonwealth-State agreement to cover a range of infrastructure works in remote Aboriginal communities. I understand that the department administers these funds but does not control them. Will the Minister give details of the purposes of the funds; what they will be used for; the amount of the funds; and where the funds are deposited?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The capital expenditure total for minor works is \$100 000, and that relates to DOSAA's purchase of plant and equipment. As to the new capital projects that have been identified, I advise that there is an amount of \$450 000 relating to Davenport and Umeewarra essential services. Umeewarra is the incorporated mission and it has surrendered its lease to the Davenport community. The existing building infrastructure is now part of the community housing program.

Over the years the Davenport community has had its essential services upgraded, but at no time have these upgrades extended to include Umeewarra. The existing effluent disposal system presents a health hazard, as untreated effluent is pumped via an underground reticulation system to irrigate the oval and it requires immediate attention. DOSAA and ATSIC have proposed replacement of the whole sewage system and it will be connected to the service at Davenport. The existing water system is in poor condition and that also requires upgrading. It has been recommended that a single metered water supply be installed, as is the case for Davenport.

To complete the integration of both Umeewarra and the Davenport community, the existing roads need to be upgraded and sealed to reduce water ponding, dust and health problems. In summary, that project will provide a level of amenities at Umeewarra that are expected and enjoyed by the rest of the Davenport community.

Another \$520 000 has been provided specifically for roads and services at Nepabunna, and that project's principal objective is to provide bitumen roads within the Nepabunna Aboriginal community. The project will serve as a model community involvement and includes ATSIC, Nulla Wimula Kutju and both local Aboriginal groups. The regional council of the Nepabunna community, DOSAA and DEETYA are all involved in this. The project will be extended to include an

upgrade of essential services: compounds, paving and landscaping within the community.

There is also a rather large amount of \$2 105 000, which will provide a powerline on the ETSA grid at Nepabunna. The existing powerhouse has two diesel generators located at Nepabunna community, and that has deteriorated over time. It does not meet current standards and it will not adequately provide for the future needs of the community. The power and generators will be replaced by a connection to the ETSA high voltage power grid line from Leigh Creek. The grid line will connect Nepabunna to the ETSA grid with single metering to all consumers, and that will be at Adelaide tariffs. The electrical reticulation within the community will become the responsibility of ETSA.

The original budget of \$1.5 million was received from ATSIC in 1996-97, \$50 000 of which was expended in that year as part of the feasibility study. Unfortunately, no construction was able to be undertaken in 1997-98 because the resolution of native title issues prevented further works at that time. The native title issues have now been resolved and the project can proceed further in 1998-99. An additional \$700 000 will be allocated to the project by ATSIC in 1998-99 to upgrade the street lighting and reticulation extensions to the current water storage tanks. A water reuse system will also be required.

The initial capital cost will have a recurrent savings of approximately \$100 000, which will enable a redistribution of the funding to other Aboriginal communities, such as Oak Valley, which would not be possible if this project did not proceed.

There is a further amount of \$1.15 million, which is for Head of the Bight Stage 2. The 1997-98 budget included an allocation of \$1.350 million for Head of the Bight Stage 2, but it is estimated that only \$200 000 will be expended on the project during the 1997-98 year. The carry-over has resulted from the Yalata Aboriginal Community Incorporated not having completed its management plan on how the site will be managed, and at the moment it is awaiting results of a water search in the vicinity, to determine whether the site can sustain additional infrastructure. So any commitment from DOSSA is contingent on the satisfactory resolution of all of these matters.

The original concept of Stage 2 comprises the establishment of infrastructure to support a visitor interpretation centre. The other area of minor works, which also involves a large amount of \$3.992 million, relates to capital projects that are funded by ATSIC as part of the bilateral agreement between State and Commonwealth Governments to provide essential services which, of course, are water, power and sewerage in Aboriginal communities. The 1998-99 estimate includes numerous projects that have been carried forward from the previous years.

The inclusion of State Government funding of \$1.150 million is the State Government contribution for Head of the Bight Stage 2 and, again, that is contingent upon the Yalata Aboriginal Community Incorporated having its management plan on how the site will be managed and the water search results. The commitment from the State Government in relation to those funds is contingent on the satisfactory resolution of all of these matters. DOSSA will directly commit \$500 000 and SA Tourism has made a commitment for the remaining \$650 000. The larger amount of \$7.067 million is the Commonwealth Government contribution, and that relates to ATSIC meeting its commitment to the State and Commonwealth agreement on the

provision of essential services—water, power and sewerage to Aboriginal communities, and this amount also includes carry-over moneys forwarded in previous years. I should add that the recurrent maintenance of capital projects is the responsibility of the State Government as a condition of the State Government infrastructure agreement.

Ms HURLEY: If I could ask a supplementary question: it is obvious from the Minister's answers that, for whatever reason, a lot of the purposes for which the funds are there are moved back. I just wonder what happens to the interest which then accrues on that money and who decides how that is allocated.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Any interest that is accumulated from held funds goes directly into the projects on a continuing base. They are not diverted anywhere else. They are utilised in those projects.

Ms HURLEY: I refer the Minister to page 9.19 in relation to employment. Will the Minister provide details of any employment or training programs involving local and State Governments for regional and metropolitan areas, and what money has been available for those programs?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It is one of the areas for which the department has certainly attempted to put together as many innovative schemes as it can to support employment in Aboriginal areas. It is certainly a means of recognising that Aboriginal people and their communities wish to move towards greater self-determination, and they believe that this can occur through education, employment and economic development. This is something that this Government is committed to supporting, to achieve a greater measure of prosperity and economic independence for Aboriginal people.

To progress the economic empowerment of Aboriginal people, we have set up an Economic Development Unit within the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs. The unit has developed a draft document titled 'Aboriginal Economic Development Strategy', which describes a comprehensive and culturally appropriate support service to individuals and communities who wish to develop enterprises that will create employment and, therefore, generate wealth. The Economic Development Unit works with Aboriginal people, State and Commonwealth agencies and the private sector on a range of economic development initiatives.

One of those initiatives includes the Head of the Bight whale-watching venue: advice and support is now being provided to the Yalata Aboriginal community to assist them in developing a tourist facility at the Head of the Bight. The first stage of the Head of the Bight development has now been completed, and was officially opened on 16 July 1997. Five rangers from Yalata worked at the Head of the Bight during the last whale-watching season, and it is anticipated that the forthcoming season will again provide employment for Aboriginal rangers. It will certainly be a significant tourism destination in South Australia.

In the area of aquaculture, there is the further development of an Aboriginal owned and operated oyster farm at Wardang Island. Both this and the abalone farm at Point Pearce are important wealth generation enterprises, and they have immense potential for our own domestic and export markets. Both those enterprises seek an injection of funds to progress the next stage of development, and the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs is assisting with this task.

In the youth enterprise development area, three business skill programs have been sponsored by DOSAA. The course is held at Murray Bridge, and has been successfully completed. In about April of this year, courses also commenced

at Port Lincoln and Coober Pedy. The programs run for 26 weeks, and are aimed at providing young Aboriginal people with an introduction into starting and running their own businesses. It is planned at this time to extend that scheme across the State.

In relation to the Winmante Art Centre, ATSIC funding has been approved to construct a cultural interpretative centre at Glossop for the Riverland Aboriginal community. A purpose-built viewing gallery and coffee shop are a central theme of the interpretive centre. The Division of State Aboriginal Affairs successfully tendered for the project management of the construction of the centre, and that construction commenced in early April this year, with an anticipated completion date at the end of this month.

Officers of the division are working within the Aboriginal community at Port Lincoln to develop a concept plan for the Poonindie site. The plan includes restoration of the Poonindie historic mission site; development of a floricultural and horticultural enterprise; and tourist development, including walking trails and a bush tucker experience.

Within our own local area, in December 1997, a group of Aboriginal women from the Salisbury area approached DOSAA seeking help to establish an art and craft business. I am pleased to say that officers from DOSAA have worked very closely with those women and have assisted with the registration of a business name; sponsored legal advice on company structure; and prepared two grant applications for materials. I am pleased to say that both grants were successful.

They also obtained 10 places on a NIES training scheme at no cost to the women at all. I believe that, on the completion of the course, assistance will be provided to help them further develop a business plan and to look at finding them suitable premises, which is one of the concerns that will emerge once the applicants from this Aboriginal community have completed those courses. With respect to some of the other enterprise initiatives that are currently being developed, DOSSAA is working closely with ATSIC, the Indigenous Land Council and the AP Council to prepare a strategic business plan that will provide for a coordinated approach to the development of business, tourism and primary industry enterprises within the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands.

We are also looking at the development of a sales outlet, possibly linked to an Internet site, for high quality Aboriginal cultural products, including arts, crafts and ecotourism, as well as traineeships for three young Aboriginal people to gain hands-on training in tourism. The division has also sponsored the development of a business plan for the development of an olive tree plantation on Aboriginal-owned land. The CDEP organisation at Ceduna and the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs are working at the moment with a consultant to plan a diversification strategy for their emu farm.

In association with Victorian Aboriginal Affairs, the South-East Tourism Trail project is being developed and will provide tourists with a cultural experience relating to Aboriginal traditions and cultural trailing of the South-East coastal region of South Australia and Victoria. This is a proposal that will certainly provide an opportunity for Aboriginal people to be directly involved in developing tourism and holiday-maker enterprises. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will realise that we are seeking to encourage a fair diversification of enterprises within the Aboriginal community.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask that all members keep questions and answers brief.

Ms HURLEY: There have been ongoing discussions over the past 20 years about the need for specific solutions in Victoria Square. Some of the discussions have included the need for a gathering place adjoining or, at least, near a detoxification centre. There are other centres in the area, such as Nunkuwarrin Yunti and the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, but the feeling is that these are specific centres and that there needs to be a detoxification area. There has also been talk about a specific place for Aboriginal people to pursue activities such as art, culture, craft, horticulture, dance and theatre. Will the Minister say what progress has been made in discussions relating to a detoxification centre for Aboriginal people sited in the inner city precincts?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member will understand that there has been quite considerable controversy relating to differing opinions about the area of Victoria Square. I note that the honourable member did not specifically ask me about a dry area but other aspects that relate to concerns that have been raised in the past. It has been interesting working with Aboriginal people and having discussions that relate specifically to some of the concerns that have come out of the Victoria Square issue.

In the past I have made very definite comment about those who ask the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs questions relating to Victoria Square's being zoned a dry area. I believe that the questions being asked of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs seek to identify the problem of alcoholism, as it relates to dry areas, purely as Aboriginal specific, which, of course, I do not accept at all because it is a matter that goes right across the board. The related questions the honourable member has asked certainly are also of concern. Current strategies are aimed at the CBD and looking at rather wide approaches.

Discussions are currently taking place with the Department of Human Services, which is preparing a scoping paper and proposing a realignment of some services. During the time that I took to research some of the available services within the city and the surrounding areas, it was identified that there are some 60 detoxification centres that exist within the CBD and outer metropolitan areas. It is a means of being able to garnish complete information about the services that are available at present and making sure that appropriate means of access for the needs and requirements of individuals are serviced to a far greater degree than we might have seen in the past.

Part of the scoping paper prepared by the Department for Human Services will include documentation relating to historical approaches, the range of services, funding sources and other resources. The paper will look at the analysis of services, identification of gaps and the need for linkages and realignment of services. The information that I received in the first instance sought to determine just what services were available within the city area. Different services involving approximately \$20 million were apparent in the first look at the provisions available within the city and the greater metropolitan area.

It is a matter of determining exactly where those services lie, how the services are provided, whether they are efficient and whether they are providing the needs and requirements that we see on a daily basis and, if not, ensuring that there is a realignment of those services, and that the linkages for those needs are more efficiently handled. The realignment of services that are coordinated and targeted to meet the needs will certainly be more suitable. The project will employ a full-time project officer over a three month period and will be followed by a 12 month implementation process.

The process will be guided by a reference group, including the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs. No evaluation strategy has been developed at this stage but time frames are particularly tight in view of the consultative processes and the coordination of funding cycles inherent in a realignment of services. The coordination of services facilitated by the creation of the Department of Human Services will provide advantages of time and will reduce the need for inter-agency negotiation. The final version of the scoping paper is expected to be approved shortly and key stakeholders will be provided with details of the proposed project at that time.

It is also relevant to note that the Aboriginal Sobriety Group has negotiated use of the former Colebrook site from the Aboriginal Lands Trust for dance and cultural activity. An application for the lease has been accepted in principle by the Aboriginal Lands Trust Board. The board is awaiting the ASG's signing of conditions of the lease before submitting it to me. The honourable member is probably aware that a grassed dance area was developed leading up to the highly successful 1 June Reconciliation Day celebration. The first annual corroboree and cultural festival organised by the Aboriginal Sobriety Group was held on 17 and 18 October 1997.

This was a successful event with Aboriginal dancers from around the State, Australia and Canada sharing their experiences with the community through dance performances as a medium for cultural revival. This event was attended by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal members of the South Australian community.

The work of the ASG is also supported by this division. It is consistent with recommendations from the ministerial summit on Aboriginal deaths in custody, which reinforced the need to focus on the underlying issues that contribute to the high level of over-representation of Aboriginal people in the criminal justice system.

Mr SCALZI: Page 9.16 of the Portfolio Statements refers to a review of the Aboriginal Heritage Act. For some time the Government has recognised that the State Aboriginal heritage legislation needs to be a more transparent and efficient process that increases the certainty in decision making impacting on Aboriginal communities, landowners and developers. Will the Minister provide information on the status of the draft Aboriginal Heritage Bill and a brief overview of the scope, community consultation and intentions of the new legislation?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Government consideration has been given to amending the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 with a view to enabling it to increase effective protection for Aboriginal heritage; to improve the compatibility between Federal and State Aboriginal heritage legislation; to strengthen South Australia's adherence to the proposed national principles for heritage protection; to provide Aboriginal communities in South Australia with an administrative process that will assist them to clarify their territory and membership; to provide timely and reliable processes by which affected parties can deal with Aboriginal heritage issues relating to their property; and to maintain South Australia's leadership in Aboriginal heritage legislation.

The Government approved the release of a draft Aboriginal Heritage Bill in March 1997. The Bill does not represent a final Government position on the terms of a new Aboriginal Heritage Act: the proposed amendments evolved from the Government and Aboriginal consultation meetings, the evaluation of various submissions to the Government and considerations of the Ministerial Council for Aboriginal and

Torres Strait affairs. There was widespread consultation undertaken with Aboriginal communities, Government agencies and industry representatives, and they include the Aboriginal Heritage Committee; ATSIC Regional Council; the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement; the Flinders Ranges Aboriginal Heritage Committee; the Kungari Aboriginal Community; the South-East Nungas, Umoona Council, Dunjiba Community; the Anangu Pitjantjara, Goreta Aboriginal Corporation; Maralinga Tjarutja Incorporated; Aboriginal communities in the Riverland, Broken Hill, Port Augusta, Ceduna and the West Coast.

There were also academics from the Adelaide University, Flinders University and the University of South Australia, the Chamber of Mines and Energy Incorporated, the Conservation Council, the Local Government Association, the South Australian Farmers Federation, archaeologists and anthropologists. So, a wide range of people were consulted on this draft. An assessment is now being made of the submissions, and it is intended to proceed with proposals to amend the current Act at the earliest opportunity. The new Act will incorporate as many of the comments and suggestions from the community consultations as possible. I also note that on 2 April 1998 the Commonwealth introduced a Bill to amend the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984 to enable State Aboriginal heritage regimes to be accredited, thus removing the likelihood of Commonwealth intervention.

Mr SCALZI: Page 9.13 of the Portfolio Statements refers to the maintenance of essential services infrastructure. Will the Minister outline the initiative taken to ensure that the essential services infrastructure (water, power and sewerage) in South Australian Aboriginal communities is maintained effectively and that emergency breakdowns are rectified expeditiously?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We had a question recently about the infrastructure being placed within Aboriginal communities. In any regime it is necessary that maintenance be applied to the infrastructure, otherwise at some time that infrastructure regime is liable to be not effective. The State Government allocates \$916 000 annually for the hardware maintenance of water, power and sewerage services for this State's major Aboriginal communities. The maintenance program is outsourced by way of a tender process in the form of annual period contracts. These contracts for all three service areas incorporate an emergency breakdown component—generally, service personnel are deployed to remote sites within 24 hours of notification of a problem—and the introduction of period contract procedures, where plant is serviced and replaced on a regular basis.

This has significantly reduced the incidence of service failure, thereby alleviating the problems that would arise of water shortage, food spoilings and other disasters. In most instances, the State funds the salary of an essential services officer in each of the communities, those officers being responsible for the day-to-day operations of the essential service plant. They must immediately report a problem or potential problem to the essential services team or the division of State Aboriginal Affairs. That, in itself, ensures immediate action. Overall, essential services in Aboriginal communities in South Australia are maintained to a level as good as or even better than some rural townships.

Ms HURLEY: I refer the Minister to a question asked of the Premier, in his capacity as Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, during Estimates Committee A on 16 June 1998. It refers to what is understood to be an official

translation of an article in a Polish newspaper *The Republic* on 19 September 1997 under the title 'Howard is done in Australia.' The article is an interview with Dr Sev Ozdowski, Chief Executive Officer of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. He was asked by the interviewer:

If Australia takes such care of migrants, then how can one explain the fate of the indigenous population, the Aborigines?

Doctor Ozdowski answered by stating in part:

The situation of Aborigines is different. Simply, 200 years ago they lost the battle for Australia.

He went on to talk about other Aboriginal issues, of which I am sure the Minister is aware. Given the stated objectives by the Minister and the Department of Aboriginal Affairs of reconciliation and equality for Aboriginal people, if this report is correct will the Minister be calling on Dr Ozdowski to formally and publicly apologise?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I was aware that this matter was brought up in another Committee. I believe that the alleged comments appeared in a Polish newspaper almost a year ago. I have not seen a translation of those alleged comments and do not like to respond to what appears in the first instance to be alleged interpretations. I would like the opportunity to verify whether the comments have in fact been made. I point out to the honourable member that the Chief Executive of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs has recently met with the Chief Executive of OMIA to discuss a program to introduce the concepts of reconciliation to the ethnic communities and to meet with our respective management teams to develop a project brief that would look at creating better understanding in the area of staff within OMIA and the ethnic community groups, specifically to create that greater understanding and to provide a greater cultural awareness about Aboriginal people and Aboriginal affairs more generally.

In this instance, I believe that the Director's actions represent the most appropriate way to proceed. We all understand that there is still a long way to go across all our communities in terms of moving people's minds towards cultural awareness and accepting across-the-board differences in cultures. In this instance, I believe it is a very proactive means of looking at another way of introducing the understanding that needs to take place if we are to move towards true and lasting reconciliation. I am quite happy at the moment with the directions taken by my Chief Executive, and we will await some of the outcomes of those moves.

Ms HURLEY: The Minister said that her Chief Executive Officer would meet with Dr Ozdowski. Does the Minister have any plans to meet with Dr Ozdowski and discuss, first, his statement, and, secondly, the other issue she has raised?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Not at this time.

Ms BREUER: I refer the Minister to page 9.7 of the Portfolio Statements, 'Outcomes and strategies': what consultation is taking place between the department and Aboriginal communities in relation to health and education?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We did touch quite lightly on some of the areas of education moves within the Aboriginal communities. I am sure that the honourable member will be pleased to know that, through the support of the State Aboriginal Affairs Division, the South Australian Aboriginal Education and Training Advisory Committee (through SATAC) has been able to commit itself to support the active involvement of Aboriginal people in planning, implementation, evaluation and monitoring of education and training policies and practices in both the public and private education and training sectors. A key component of this accomplish-

ment is the provision of staff and resources that supports the operation and the function of SATAC.

Membership of the committee is comprised entirely of Aboriginal people who represent all levels of education and training—from early childhood to higher education. To ensure proper Aboriginal community consultation and local participation in this process, SATAC conducts State meetings in Adelaide and in major regional centres. During 1997 many achievements and activities took place through the South Australian Aboriginal Education and Training Advisory Committee. If the honourable member is interested, I could give her an example of a few of the achievements that have taken place in this area.

Six SATAC State meetings were held: three in regional locations at Mount Gambier, Ceduna and Port Augusta; and the other three were held in Adelaide. It plays a major role in the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the eight priorities of the report, 'A National Strategy for the Education of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples, 1996-2002', by the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment Training and Youth Affairs, and it works with education providers to sponsor and at times assist them to conduct research on a selected number of key issues aimed at advancing education outcomes for indigenous people.

Other features include: to look at further financial assistance and support to independent Aboriginal children centres; to continue their drive towards successful quality assurance implementation in their respective programs; and to include financial assistance and support for research to be undertaken to establish the need for a middle school at Crossways Lutheran School in Ceduna. There was also financial assistance and support for a research project in Ceduna that looked at the reasons for absenteeism and at the ways we might be able to increase the number of indigenous students staying at school. I know that the honourable member has a very strong interest in this area and that she would be aware that that is a substantial problem within Aboriginal communities. We are also providing ministerial advice on the role and the function of Aboriginal education workers in the State school system. SATAC has also reviewed and evaluated its 1997 operational plan and it has redrafted its 1998 plan, which is now in full swing.

The two meetings have largely been used to consolidate the 1998 strategic State and operational plans. As a result, SATAC guidelines will be launched later this year. The most exciting part of SATAC's work so far in 1998 is the number of research projects that it has either fully or partly financed. These will enable us to look more closely at issues such as attendance, retention and the effects of health problems such as hearing loss and calcium deficiencies, two of the other major health areas of serious concern within Aboriginal communities, particularly for Aboriginal children.

Ms BREUER: Again, I refer to page 9.7 of the Portfolio Statements, 'Outcomes and strategies': will the Minister give details of the level of funding provided for programs specifically related to Aboriginal drug and alcohol abuse?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I will have to take that question on notice. It does relate to resources and to dollars that will be spent in other areas of other jurisdictions. I will be quite happy to get that information and bring it back to the honourable member.

Mrs MAYWALD: I refer to the Minister's opening statement about the exciting venture in relation to the tourism trails which will link areas across the State and, in fact, across the border. As the Minister would appreciate, this has

particular reference to my electorate. Over the last seven years, the Gerry Mason Centre in Glossop has been working to put together a project for the Winmante Arts Centre Incorporated. Recently, it received a grant of \$300 000 from ATSIC for the first building stage of the art centre. It is a very exciting project in that it actually offers economic independence for the Aboriginal community if it is able to have sufficient start up capital in relation to working capital.

At this time the \$300 000 for the first building stage has been provided by ATSIC; however, no further funding has been made available for the ongoing start-up costs of staffing the building. The concern in the Gerry Mason community is that we will be building a white elephant which is doomed to failure before it starts. Will the Minister expand upon the State Government's role in the development of the Aboriginal tourism trails and the development of Aboriginal enterprises, in particular the Gerry Mason Arts Centre?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It is one of those developments that we all will seek to ensure is a success. I referred to it earlier when talking about the cultural centre through the Winmante art group. The economic development unit out of DOSAA is certainly one of the supportive means by which we will be working with the group at the interpretive centre to determine what options can be pursued to ensure that this project is continued and is indeed successful. At this time there are certainly no specifics—and I agree with the honourable member's concerns—but it is something that none of us do not want to see proceed and be successful. The economic development unit has certainly taken a great interest and will continue to be supportive to ensure that there is a means by which that project is seen to be extremely successful throughout South Australia.

Mrs MAYWALD: What support will the Government give to the tourism trails referred to in the Minister's opening statement?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The arrangements at this stage are in the early stages of development. The means of people coming together to provide the concept for the trails is well and truly established but, as it is still at the preliminary stage of opening up ideas to put the whole project together, those areas of either determining resources or specifics have not yet been completed. I know that the honourable member realises that it is an exciting concept: it involves things about which people have talked for a very long time. Unfortunately, many of them, although they have been innovative ideas, have not come to fruition. Although it is still in the early stages and is a concept, I believe that now it certainly has the means of being a very realistic program which will be supported by both Victorian and South Australian Governments.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: The Portfolio Statements, page 9.13, refers to the provision of essential services infrastructure in South Australian Aboriginal communities. I understand that the State is negotiating with ATSIC to undertake a program of capital works projects in Aboriginal communities on Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands amounting to about \$6 million. Is the Minister able to provide details on the scope of the capital works under the Commonwealth national Aboriginal health strategy and the status of the urgent essential services work required under the agreement?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: This is certainly a very large project that has been undertaken. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) has resourced a national Aboriginal health strategy program for community housing and infrastructure in Aboriginal communities in South Australia directed toward improving health related capital

infrastructure for Aboriginal people, particularly in remote areas. The aims—and I think we have discussed quite a bit of this this morning—relate to the delivery of essential services; new and refurbished housing; and addressing environmental health issues, such as dust reduction, which is brought about by the sealing of roads.

The division has secured three new capital works projects for 1998-99. DOSAA placed submissions with ATSIC for national Aboriginal health strategy program funding for major infrastructure improvements for Aboriginal communities in South Australia. The three successful submissions were for projects at Pipalyatjara, Ernabella and Indulkana—Aboriginal communities on Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands. A total of \$6 million has been made available for improvements to roads, community housing, water, sewerage and power systems in the three communities. The spread of dollars into each of the communities is: \$1.5 million, Pipalyatjara; \$3.3 million, Ernabella; and \$1.2 million, Indulkana. Work for all the three communities is proceeding at present.

The urgent work associated with water supplies at Ernabella is nearing completion. These works include the provision of new water bores and a new 7 kilometre reticulation pipeline to existing water storage tanks. This now provides the community with a badly needed reliable water supply.

Membership:

Mr Hill substituted for Ms Hurley.

Ms BEDFORD: I refer the Minister to page 9.5. Under the heading 'Key Issues' it states that the department makes a significant contribution to the social and economic fabric of South Australia. Given that we in the metropolitan area are seeing the impact of poker machines on the community, will the Minister provide any information of research carried out (or proposed research) into the impact of poker machines on the Aboriginal communities of Marla, Cadney Homestead and Coober Pedy? Has there been any extra demand on Government money or services which can be attributed to poker machines in these and other areas by Aboriginal people? Is the Minister aware of any other risk areas for Aboriginal areas in southern regional South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Quite obviously, in terms of the social aspects relating to poker machines and the gambling habits so derived, the effect on the social fabric of individuals and family life is exceedingly important. The Division of Aboriginal Affairs has undertaken many other social surveys which have looked into drug and alcohol and health related circumstances. At this stage, no surveys or monitoring have been undertaken on the effects within Aboriginal communities specifically related to poker machines but, in a very general sense at this stage, Aboriginal groups recently brought up the issue of gambling. At this stage the division is looking at a means of setting up a review covering different areas of Aboriginal communities to determine the relationship between social deprivation and gambling.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The member for Kaurna wishes to make a statement and, if he has questions that cannot be accommodated now, he can put them on notice.

Mr HILL: Before making my statement, I congratulate the Minister for her explanation of accrual accounting and its comparison with other forms of budget documents. It was the clearest explanation that I have heard. It is a shame that the Premier, regarding the budget, did not have the same script writers: we might have been a little more enlightened a bit

earlier. The Minister pointed out the problems with accrual accounting. As a result of it, we now have an impressive array of operating statements, financial statements and cash flows, all important, no doubt, for managing our financial affairs, but we can no longer tell how much we are spending on coast management or wildlife conservation, for example.

Whereas previous budget papers, and in particular the Program Estimates and Information, provided the Parliament with program information on estimates of expenditure compared with the previous year's budget and the previous year's actual expenditure, this information is no longer available. As a result of the changeover to accrual accounting and changes in format, all program details have been deleted. Last year the Program Estimates provided details across the four major programs: resource, conservation and management; environment protection and restoration; environment and resource information; and land services. This year three pages of information have been reduced to just eight lines under the heading 'Outputs Purchased'.

A second matter of concern is that in the new Estimates Statement, which is Budget Paper 3, the appropriation figures, the operating statement and the statement of financial position are now shown as a comparison with last year's actual expenditure, and comparisons are not made with last year's budget. This means that in future years members will not be able to compare budget changes year on year or make any judgments about over-expenditures or under-expenditures.

The third issue relates to the new Portfolio Statements. At this stage key performance indicators appear to be totally inadequate as a replacement for the information provided in the Program Estimates. For example, the output class for biodiversity covers a wide range of issues including conservation services, pastoral management, native vegetation and wildlife regulation. While there are many key issues under these programs ranging from the protection of our marine environment to the clearance of native vegetation, one of the key indicators is given as the number of koalas sterilised. That is hardly an all-embracing indication of how we are doing with the marine environment.

During briefings before the budget, the Under Treasurer and senior officials assured the Opposition that the transfer to accrual accounting would be totally transparent. The opposite is true: it is totally opaque. The Minister made that clear in her explanation of accrual accounting when she said, in part, that it is impossible to compare this year's figures with last year's figures. In addition, as she pointed out, there has been departmental restructuring, which makes comparisons very difficult. It means that the Opposition's job in trying to understand what the Government is attempting to do is very difficult, so I appreciate the statement of cooperation made by the Minister at the outset, because we would like to understand what is happening in this budget and where the losses and gains are.

Before I start my questioning, I indicate that the Opposition has a number of omnibus questions that it would like to ask. They have been asked across all the Committees and I believe that has been put to the end of the session. With your leave, Sir, I would ask to do that today.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee agreeable to that? If so, the omnibus questions can be put at the end.

Mr HILL: I indicated to the Minister's office, and I commented in Parliament a couple of weeks ago, that I would be asking this question: can the Minister table estimates of expenditure for 1998-99 under the same program headings

as shown in last year's budget with comparisons made to last year's budget?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Are you still referring to Aboriginal affairs?

Mr HILL: No, I am talking about the environment because I thought that we had moved to that vote.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I advise the member for Kaurua that we are still dealing with Aboriginal affairs.

Mr HILL: I apologise, Sir.

Ms BREUER: I refer once again to page 9.7 of Portfolio Outcomes and Strategies. On a recent visit to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands I was appalled at the condition of a lot of buildings and the grounds, particularly in the Anangu schools. I have consulted with the Education Minister about one school at Wataru, and he assures me of immediate action, which I am very pleased about. Can the Minister explain what occupational health and safety measures have been taken with respect to asbestos, particularly in the schools and other buildings in the lands? What has been done to assess the safety of playground equipment and grounds in Aboriginal schools in the remote communities? I am referring to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands and to the Maralinga and Oak Valley areas.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I concur with the honourable member's comments. The administration of the areas that the honourable member has mentioned come within specific areas of jurisdictions, and the PY administer their own educational objectives as well as their health, so it is a matter that rests with the other jurisdictional portfolios, more specifically in terms of what outcomes can be assisted. I am glad that the honourable member has already brought this to the attention of the Education Minister. If the honourable member puts a report together about what she is concerned about in terms of what she saw while she was in the lands, I would be happy to look at it because I have an interest in this matter. However, as it is another jurisdictional matter, at this time I cannot give her a specific answer.

Ms BREUER: I thank the Minister for that suggestion. I refer again to page 9.7 regarding equality for Aboriginal people and the statement by the Attorney-General in Estimates Committee B on 16 June 1998 regarding dry zones. My question relates to the dry zone in Coober Pedy. Does the Minister have any details on the effect of the dry zone in relation to movements of the Aboriginal community? Is the Minister aware of an increase in domestic violence in and around Coober Pedy?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The subject is one of concern to all of us, including the Aboriginal communities. I point out that whilst Aboriginal people are proportionately less likely to use alcohol but more likely to use heroin than non-Aboriginal people, they do have patterns of consumption and substance abuse that are markedly different from that found in non-Aboriginal societies. These behaviour patterns have a detrimental impact on Aboriginal health and society and they contribute to situations of conflict with non-Aboriginal people.

A response made by some Aboriginal communities and local government bodies has been to declare particular areas dry and, as the honourable member knows, that involves regulations under the Liquor Licensing Act or the Aboriginal Lands Trust legislation. The use of dry area provisions on Aboriginal communities has in a limited way, despite difficulties in policing which I am sure the honourable member would recognise, generally reduced violence in and is acknowledged as improving the health status of those

communities. These benefits are usually associated with the use of liquor trading restrictions in the region.

Generally the use of dry areas by local government in the absence of complementary strategies would appear to displace rather than actually address problems of concern, and those problems are often associated with Aboriginal drinking behaviour. The Division of State Aboriginal Affairs has advocated consultation with local Aboriginal groups prior to the application for a dry area with a view to considering the implementation of alternative strategies, including the strongly advocated use of a range of education and harm minimisation strategies, which include sobering-up centres and mobile assistance patrols where problems are associated with Aboriginal drinking behaviour.

The Division for State Aboriginal Affairs also participated in the review of the Liquor Licensing Act and in a national study of the impact of licensing provisions on Aboriginal communities. The division supported the intent of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 to involve licensees in promoting responsible drinking. Future work by the division will have a specific focus on certain areas. We will be looking at the Yalata community, which is a dry community, but a problem continues to be experienced through access to alcohol through roadhouses in the region and through outlets in Ceduna itself. The division is exploring a range of strategies to encourage responsible drinking and in particular to discourage binge drinking.

The division will also look at Ceduna, and as the honourable member has identified in her question, she has noted that tensions have developed in the community related to the behaviour of those whom we believe to be transient Aboriginal residents. Many of these residents visit local people who previously lived at Yalata. Local government is hosting a ministerial advisory committee in an attempt to coordinate the range of responses to the issues that are starting to emerge within the Ceduna area.

We are also looking at Coober Pedy. Three years after the introduction of a dry area in the town, public intoxication offences have lessened, but women, children and the elderly are experiencing increased levels of violence. Despite the existence of a dry areas committee no complementary strategies have been established at this time, so the division is convening an interagency approach in an attempt to address this particular situation. The dry area is about to be renewed and it will cover a larger area of the town. In Port Pirie the police and council are seeking to establish a dry area to address perceived behavioural problems. There has been a considerable increase in the Aboriginal population in the community, and DOSSA is working at the moment with other agencies to assist the community in a range of socially related areas.

At Nepabunna the community has discussed with DOSSA and with the Aboriginal Lands Trust ways to address alcohol problems. They trialled drinking within the yards and homes during Christmas of 1997 but not in the public areas, but we understand that, unfortunately, there were breaches in that area as well. I also believe that DOSSA is working with the Umoona Tjarutja Health Service and with the Department of Human Services to examine greater support for addressing substance abuse in Coober Pedy. So the member is quite right: there is still an immense amount of work to be done. I believe that we have moved forward to quite a degree, but quite obviously there seem to be other impacts from whatever moves we make, and it is disturbing to see that the incidence of domestic violence seems to be increasing; but this is

recognised and the division is certainly taking steps to attempt to address and support, where it can, some of these issues that concern us all.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Before closing the examination on these lines, I point out that the omnibus questions will be taken at the end of the Estimates Committee and they will include Aboriginal affairs. In this respect, all lines will be covered at the end of today's session. There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed.

Membership:

Mrs Geraghty substituted for Ms Breuer.

Additional Department Advisers:

Mr J. Scanlon, Environment and Heritage Portfolio Chief Executive.

Ms A. Harvey, Director, Corporate Strategy and Business Services.

Mr A. Holmes, Director, Heritage and Biodiversity.

Mr D. Carman, Principal Consultant, Corporate Development.

Mr R. Janssan, Manager, Corporate Finance.

Mr P. Hoey, Director, Environment Policy.

Mr T. Stubbs, Director, Resources Information.

Mr R. Thomas, Executive Director, Environment Protection Agency.

Mr B. Morley, Director, Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I declare open the Environment and Heritage portfolio lines and refer members to pages 175 to 178 and 184 of the Estimates Statement and to Part 9 in the Portfolio Statements. Does the Minister wish to make a statement?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Last year saw the launch of the Government's major nature conservation initiative—the Parks Agenda. This initiative is designed to revitalise the management of our parks and wildlife by increasing community understanding of the value of these assets to the State's economy and by securing a long-term commitment to resourcing park and wildlife management. The Parks Agenda entails a commitment by the Government to provide an additional \$30 million to parks and wildlife management over a six year period commencing in 1997-98. With funding of \$2.5 million in its first year, the Parks Agenda has been allocated an increased budget of \$2 million capital and \$500 000 recurrent in 1998-99, bringing the total budget for parks and wildlife management throughout the State in 1998-99 to over \$26 million.

Considerable progress was achieved in 1997-98, the first year of the Parks Agenda's implementation. Significant initiatives relating to the provision of visitor facilities and services included the tourism facility upgrade in the Flinders Ranges National Park of some \$200 000, and an upgrading of park headquarters and the visitor precinct in the Innes National Park of some \$100 000. We also had work commence on the development of a visitor information system to provide accurate visitor statistics for the parks that are most visited, and a comprehensive upgrade of community information and awareness programs, including information centres and signs, marketing and media-advertising campaigns of some \$330 000.

The Parks Agenda has seen the appointment of five new rangers and a specialist biodiversity officer to support park

management, bringing the total number of staff employed in parks and wildlife management to 249 in 1997-98. In addition, \$175 000 was allocated as seed money to facilitate the work of Green Corps and Australian Trust for Conservation Trust project teams in various parks. To date, these project teams have employed approximately 100 young people, who have gained valuable work experience in a range of projects. As a further indication of the strong level of community support for the State's parks system, the efforts of the employed parks work force continued to be supplemented by over 7 000 volunteers, who serve in the parks system in a voluntary capacity. These groups contribute an estimated \$4.5 million of voluntary labour to the parks system per year through about 370 projects. Most of the community support groups are not only self-supporting but also raise funds for national parks. However, to provide some assistance to the Friends of Parks groups, the Parks Agenda allocated \$60 000 in 1997-98 for grants on application from these groups, and a further \$70 000 was allocated to the National Parks Foundation.

In 1997-98, the first full year of the operation of the Natural Heritage Trust, the South Australian Government allocated an additional \$3.4 million of new funds to boost the State's ability to secure matching Commonwealth funding under the NHT. Together with existing funding, this resulted in a total of approximately \$21 million being committed by the State Government, including in-kind local community support to NHT projects in 1997-98. This combined commitment was successful in attracting some \$24 million of matching funds from the Commonwealth, making a total of \$45 million of cash and in-kind support being invested in NHT projects in South Australia in 1997-98. These projects included the Upper South-East Salinity and Flood Mitigation Program, which received \$1.8 million of State and Commonwealth funds under the NHT for drainage works, salt-land agronomy, revegetation, and wetland restoration and management.

In 1998-99, the State Government has doubled its allocation of new money for NHT projects to \$6.4 million. This has helped to increase the amount of matching funds being sought from the Commonwealth under the NHT 1998-99 to approximately \$28 million. Major programs for which matching Commonwealth funding is being sought include native vegetation management, biodiversity protection and planning, parks management and the protection of endangered species.

The Government would also like to recognise the significant contribution made by KESAB, as the peak body implementing litter strategies and programs across South Australia. In order to provide a secure funding base for KESAB, 30¢ per tonne of the levy on solid waste in metropolitan Adelaide will be allocated to KESAB to provide it with annual funding of about \$270 000 to fulfil its responsibilities. The solid waste levy will increase by \$1.30 per tonne on 1 July 1998 to fund this and other waste management initiatives.

Under its Pollution Prevention Fund, the Environment Protection Authority will continue to provide grants and loans to businesses to assist with the implementation of pollution and waste reduction initiatives. In 1998-99, \$500 000 will be injected into the Pollution Prevention Fund, from which \$260 000 will be allocated for grants and loans, and a further \$240 000 will be allocated to pollution training. To assist the development of policies and procedures for the minimisation, transport, treatment and disposal of commercial and industrial

waste, the EPA has allocated approximately \$250 000 to undertake an audit in 1998-99 of the commercial and industrial waste stream.

Ensuring appropriate management of metropolitan Adelaide's beaches is an ongoing priority of the State Government, in conjunction with relevant local councils. A contract to place 600 000 cubic metres of sand at Brighton after dredging the sand from off shore at Port Stanvac was successfully completed on 28 November 1997, with no impact on marine life around Port Noarlunga reef. While the project cost a one-off total of \$4.4 million, it is expected that it will indeed save some \$2.9 million over at least the next six years by removing the need for smaller dredging operations of the kind carried out previously. There is unlikely to be another large dredged replenishment project for another six to 10 years.

Following a comprehensive review of State water resources legislation, the Water Resources Act 1997 came into operation on 2 July 1997. Six catchment water management boards have been established to date. Since the establishment of the Torrens and Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Boards in May 1995 under the now repealed Catchment Water Management Act 1995, additional boards have been established under the Water Resources Act 1997 for the Murray River catchment, Northern Adelaide and Barossa region, the Onkaparinga River catchment and the South-East region. As a key partner in the Murray-Darling Basin Initiative, the South Australian Government contributes to all initiatives of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and Ministerial Council.

Two major achievements of the commission in 1997-98 were the implementation of the Murray-Darling 2001 project and the establishment of the interstate River Murray Water Board. The Murray-Darling 2001 project is the result of the South Australian Government's vision and initiative that has since been embraced by all partner Governments; 1997-98 was the first full year of operation of the project using Natural Heritage Trust funding. The project has resulted in a dramatic increase in the level of funding for on-ground works and measures to improve natural resources management throughout the Murray-Darling Basin.

These works and measures will help to secure the quality and quantity of Murray River water flowing into South Australia. Funding throughout the Basin increased from \$34 million in 1996-97 to \$63 million in 1997-98. South Australia's funding increased from \$2.3 million in 1996-97 to \$7.2 million in 1997-98. This significant increase was made possible through using a large proportion of the catchment environment levy funds raised by the River Murray Catchment Water Management Board to attract matching Commonwealth funds under the Murray-Darling 2001 project. This increased level of funding will continue in 1998-99, with a further increase in funding throughout the Murray-Darling Basin from \$63 million in 1997-98 to \$75 million in 1998-99. The Environment Protection Authority has developed a code of practice on stormwater pollution control as a basis for all sectors of the community to address the prevention and management of stormwater pollution in the context of integrated catchment management.

I now come to a most important matter for South Australia, namely, the intention of the Governments of New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth to corporatise the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority. Legislation to enable corporatisation to proceed has already been passed by the respective Parliaments; however, those Acts will only

come into effect once a number of critical issues have been resolved.

The present timetable is to have these matters resolved so that corporatisation can proceed by the end of 1998. South Australia's strong interest in this matter lies in the connection between the Snowy Mountains Scheme and the water that it delivers into the Murray River and Murrumbidgee valleys. Departmental officers and I have been and will continue to be very actively involved in discussions about the proposals for corporatisation to ensure that South Australia's access to a reliable supply of good quality water, as provided for under the Murray-Darling Basin Act 1993, remains unaffected by these proposals.

Earlier this year I undertook an inspection of the scheme and met with officials to discuss the proposals. In May 1998, I provided a submission on behalf of the South Australian Government to the Snowy Water Inquiry. This inquiry is investigating options for providing environmental flows to the Snowy River, one consequence of which could be a reduction of flows from the Snowy Mountains Scheme into the Murray River and the Murrumbidgee valleys. I have arranged for the commissioner of that inquiry to meet with the South Australian Cabinet on Monday 13 July to discuss the submissions that have been received and how the inquiry will proceed from here.

In relation to the Great Australian Basin and the Lake Eyre Basin, and to ensure that South Australia's interests in the Lake Eyre Basin are protected, the South Australian Government will make a formal submission to the Queensland Government indicating its concern over the potential impacts of the draft Water Management Plan that the Queensland Government has prepared for its portion of the Cooper Creek. More importantly, the South Australian Government will maintain the momentum of current negotiations with Queensland and the Commonwealth to ensure that a formal agreement on the long term sustainable management of the Lake Eyre Basin is signed by all parties by the end of 1998.

Priority actions for 1998-99 in the Great Artesian Basin are to progress significantly, if not complete, the bore rehabilitation program and to assist the development of a basin-wide management plan by the Great Artesian Basin Consultative Council. While it has been the previous practice of the department to conduct all financial activity of the Environment Protection Authority and its office through the Environment Protection Fund, this approach has now changed for the 1998-99 financial year. This approach mirrors the revised institutional arrangements within the portfolio. From 1 July 1998, accounting for the former Environment Protection Fund transactions will be reflected within the department's controlled statements.

The decision reflects the need to improve the transparency of departmental accounting, improve operational efficiency and provide a more effective service to the community, increase the level of resources available for environment protection through the elimination of overlap and duplication, provide better opportunities for regional development, and ensure a consistent approach to licensing, enforcement and inspection of all environment protection functions of the department. The above changes have also been precipitated by the loss of the fuel franchise levy as a result of the High Court decision which was previously directed to the Environment Protection Fund.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Following the previous technical mishap, does the member for Kaurna wish to make a statement adding to that which he made earlier?

Mr HILL: No, Sir. I apologise to the Committee for not paying proper attention to the proceedings. Before I ask my first question, would the Minister circulate the statement she has just made? It contains some information and, if I had it with me, it might shorten the time taken to ask questions.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Is the Minister agreeable to that request? It will be in *Hansard* but I know that some people cannot wait for *Hansard* to be published. Is the Minister agreeable to that request?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am certainly happy to do that. The statement has disappeared into the hands of *Hansard* but, as soon as it is returned, I will be happy to pass it on to the honourable member.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am sure that it will be a best seller.

Mr HILL: I raised this issue in Parliament a week or so ago, as well as mentioning it to the Minister's staff. I appreciate that this is not the Minister's doing but part of the budgetary process. It is arcane science and we are all governed by it, but it does make it very difficult for anyone properly to scrutinise individual budgets. Will the Minister table estimates of expenditure for 1998-99 under the same program headings as were shown in last year's budget with comparisons made to last year's budget? I accept that she may not have that with her but could she undertake to take that on notice?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I anticipated that question but it would be extremely difficult. There is a certain amount of detail we could give, but to align the programs *per se* is almost an impossibility. We have attempted to assist the honourable member by preparing a matrix, which shows the department's former sub-programs and the main output classes to which they have been translated. I know that the honourable member also expressed an interest in the level of funding from the department's activities relating to this but, because the department accounting records for 1997-98 are based entirely on outputs, we no longer record activities by sub-program. It is not possible to translate current year costs from outputs back to sub-programs to provide accurate costings on the old basis.

However, I can provide a reconciliation of the department's funding macro at the level which demonstrates not only that the department's funding has been preserved but that it has in fact increased by some \$3 million. That is when one compares the 1998-99 estimates with the 1997-98 estimated results. Looking at the budgeted operating statement on page 928 of the Portfolio Statements and at the equivalent statement for DEHAA's administered items on page 939, we can see that the total administered revenues and expenses decrease while total controlled revenues and expenses increase.

In large part these movements actually reflect the transfer of environment protection activities from 'administered' to 'controlled'. When the changes to administered and controlled items were added together, the previous cash budget did not make any distinction between 'controlled' and 'administered', but when we add them together the overall impact on the department's revenues and expenses is that both revenues and expenses are expected to decrease from 1997-98 levels by approximately \$7 million. I have a table but it is not separate from our text. I could have that photocopied for the honourable member's benefit. The main reasons for decreases in both revenues and expenses are specifically a reduction in what was the one-off coast protection works of \$4.4 million which related to the sand

dredging program. The 1997-98 revenues and expenses both included \$4.4 million relating to what was an accelerated sand dredging program that will not be repeated this year.

The other reasons for decreases in revenues and expenses relate to a reduction in budgeted payments to the Murray Darling Basin Commission 2001 Project, the amount of which is \$2.9 million. There is also renegotiation of this State's contribution to the Murray Darling Basin Commission in 1998-99, an amount of \$3 million. The total of these reductions is \$10.3 million, which exceeds our overall decrease of \$7 million. We can conclude that funding for DEHAA's level of activity has not only been preserved in the conversion from cash to accruals and the restructure from DENR and DOSAA to DEHAA but has in fact been materially increased. The additional \$3.3 million is being used to increase our level of spending in other areas. I have the matrix, which we can give to the honourable member.

Mr HILL: I thank the Minister for attempting to provide that information and there is no criticism of her or her department, but this new system makes it very difficult for the Opposition to find out what is going on. I refer the Minister to Paper No. 2, page 5-7, table 5.4, which says that the total outlays for environment, heritage and Aboriginal affairs will fall from \$127 million in 1997-98 to \$111 million next year, a cut of \$16 million. Will the Minister explain that cut in light of the comments she just made, which I took to mean that there is an increase in funding? What programs will be affected by these cuts?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The statement that I just made was indeed a means of assuring the honourable member that the budget has not been cut but in fact increased. The 1998-99 Budget at a Glance document, which was not published in previous years, provides a summary of the budget, including a table on page 5 showing the total outlays by portfolio. This table shows DEHAA outlays falling from the \$127 million in 1997-98 that the honourable member just mentioned to \$111 million in 1998-99. However, the operating statement, page 9.28 of the Portfolio Statements, shows expenses increasing from \$116 million to \$126 million in the same period. The outlays information shown in the Budget at a Glance document is presented on a Government finance statistics basis, which is not directly comparable with the expenses information shown on the operating statement.

'Outlays' includes both controlled and administered payments. It is cash based, that is, it takes no account of non-cash expenses and other accrual items. It includes expenditure incurred within the portfolio but not by the Department of Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs; in particular, expenditure of the various catchment water management boards. 'Outlays' offsets controlled operating cash receipts from sales of goods and services against cash payments to give a net outlay figure. 'Outlays' excludes certain cash payments included in the department's general purpose financial reports and, in particular, any grants or transfers that are paid to other Government agencies. The Department of Treasury and Finance has provided a reconciliation that identifies the major variations from 1997-98 to 1998-99. I can offer the honourable member a copy of this variation and, as it is specifically statistical, I ask for the table to be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Department of Treasury and Finance have provided the following reconciliation which identifies the major variations from 1997-98 to 1998-99.

	1997-98	1998-99	Effect on outlays
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Receipts			
Sale of Goods and Services (controlled)	(11 772)	(15 847)	(4 075)
Investing Payments			
Purchase of property, plant & equipment (controlled)	18 844	15 480	(3 364)
Expenses			
Water Resources Levy Fund (Administered)	6 200	3 300	(2 900)
Coast Protection Fund (Administered)	5 190	790	(4 400)
Catchment Water Boards	7 377	5 080	(2 297)
Other Cash Payments	101 243	102 691	1 448
GFS Outlays	127 082	111 494	(15 588)

Mr HILL: I am not too sure that I am satisfied by the answer, but I do not blame the Minister for that. I give notice that I may want to come back to this at some stage during the day, after having a chance to study those documents. Moving on to the issue of employment, the 1997-98 budget provides an estimate of 1 280 full-time equivalent staff at 30 June. What is the expected outcome for 1997-98 and the estimate for total staff numbers for 1998-99, and where will any variations occur?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The department's work force comprises both Public Sector Management Act and weekly paid employees. PSM Act employees span all streams, while the weekly paid employees are predominantly covered by the Government Services and Civil Construction and Maintenance Awards, which are both State awards. The full-time equivalents within the department number 1 045.8 as at 22 May 1998. All FTE figures exclude participants in youth employment programs, people on leave without pay, etc. The estimated FTE target for the 1997-98 financial year is 1 086. That can be related to the previous (DENR) target, which at 30 June 1998 was 1 280. That figure was then reduced on the transfer of the Land Services Group from the old DENR to the Department for Administrative and Information Services, showing a reduced number of 320.

We gained by bringing in the Department for State Aboriginal Affairs, so another 52 FTEs are added to that figure, plus 74 FTEs to meet Commonwealth funded and State Government approved initiatives such as the parks agenda, the Mount Lofty Summit, and including NHT projects. That should bring that total to the amount that I previously gave of 1 086. The department's estimated target for June 1999 is 1 076 FTEs. The department has endeavoured to work within its head count targets through continuous restructuring, job redesign, the review of programs and services and the use of staff from employment agencies to meet requirements during peak periods.

Mr SCALZI: Page 9.13 of the Portfolio Statements refers to the Youth Environment Council, involving a very important area. Will the Minister provide further information on the Youth Environment Council?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I thank the honourable member for his question and I know of his great interest and support over the years of youth within our society, and I know also of his interest in the environmental area. Specifically, the Youth Environment Council is also something of which he has been supportive. It is a joint ministerial initiative of the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training and the Minister for Environment and Heritage. The formation of the Youth Environment Council was announced on 13 May 1997

by the former Ministers for the Environment and Natural Resources and Education and Children's Services. The Youth Environment Council was established to provide advice to Government on the environmental perspectives of young people and to support young South Australians in actively caring for the environment.

During 1997, a student planning group of primary and secondary school student leaders, representing key environmental education schools, prepared recommendations for the framework and constitution of the Youth Environment Council for the Minister's endorsement. The council is composed of one representative from each of the 23 Department of Education, Training and Employment districts and eight ministerial nominees of the Minister for Environment and Heritage. The ministerial nominees represent peak youth organisations committed to environmental care. The inaugural meeting of the Youth Environment Council occurred on 25 November 1997. The council has held three successful meetings since then. On 28 May the Youth Environment Council executive was elected at the council's annual general meeting.

The first Youth Environment Council newsletter has been prepared and is due for immediate release. I have seen a draft. It is an excellent information sheet, which I am sure members will also support and be interested in when it is received. In August, the council will initiate development of an Internet site in conjunction with the Department of Education, Training and Employment. Mechanisms for providing regular advice to the Ministers are being established, and that will ensure a youth perspective on key environmental issues and initiatives that may be canvassed.

Recently, I had a meeting with the specific nominees under the Minister for Environment and Heritage, and I was most impressed by these young people, whose experience and commitment to the environment was so obvious in such an optimistic and most encouraging way. I then met with the nominees from the environment area and also the appointees from children's services and education. They were a younger group of people from primary and secondary schools, but it was most heartening to see and to speak to young people who do have quite a grasp on environmental issues and who today can so easily articulate their concerns in a most mature manner. I look forward to the continued involvement that we have with the youth council, because I can see that it will provide dividends for future involvement of young people within the environment.

Mr SCALZI: How does South Australia compare with other States in terms of these sorts of initiatives?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: There is a range of initiatives that have been alive and well in many States for a long time. The youth council is something that is not new to the Australian environment scene, but it was time that it was started in South Australia and supported at ministerial level, and I am very pleased to be able to be a part of it.

Mr SCALZI: I refer to pages 9.16 and 9.37 of the Portfolio Statements concerning the year 2000 compliance activities. Will the Minister provide further information on that?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The department has conducted an initial impact analysis of the effect of the year 2000 problem on its systems. A consultancy examining the effect on the department's PC equipment and systems has recently been completed. DEHAA's exposure to the problem is regarded as moderate. The major effects appear to be in the land ownership and tenure system (LOTS), and a detailed study

has now been undertaken. Plans have been set in place to deal with the problem by July 1999 as that is part of the Government timetable. Currently, work is being done to ensure that some of the less obvious effects are catered for. For example, data supplied by the department to its customers incorporating dates may be affected.

Microprocessors used by the department for air and water quality monitoring and watering systems such as in the Botanic Gardens may also be dependent on dates. In many cases, the older, personal computers will not continue to operate. Some funding has already been provided to deal with the problem, specifically within the LOTS budget. Some problems are being dealt with by external firms whose software the department uses or in the course of normal replacement programs, for example in the area of personal computers. Some \$50 000 was allocated in 1997-98 within the departmental budget to start dealing with this problem. An increase to \$300 000 has been budgeted for the 1998-99 year.

Mr SCALZI: I refer to page 9.15 of the Portfolio Statements in relation to reducing emissions through encouraging compliance with the Environment Protection Act and investigating serious breaches of that Act and the Water Resources Act. I also refer to the restructuring of the department and to the amalgamation of the operational sections of the office of environment protection and the water resources group to form the Environment Protection Agency. What does this mean to the environment in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The office of environment protection and the water resources group complemented each other in a number of areas: policy formulation, pollution abatement, catchment management and regional operations, sharing responsibilities with local government, licensing, enforcement (that includes inspections), and data collection and information. This inter-relationship was not well reflected in the old departmental structure. The new Environment Protection Agency can provide better service delivery to industry and developers through better coordinating the processing assessment of development applications, better coordinating environmental impact assessment and through taking a consistent approach to licensing, enforcement, inspections and monitoring. Also, it can increase the level of resources available to assist the Environment Protection Authority to discharge its functions under the Environment Protection Act and reduce the duplication of effort across the department, particularly in relation to water and marine-related functions.

It can provide better opportunities and a clearer focus for the sharing of responsibilities of local government. In developing expertise in regional offices, it can provide a more immediate response to local environmental issues. All in all, there is a means of creating better efficiency but also a means of being able to service the requirements of the community in a far more efficient way.

Mr HILL: What was the cost of pay rises granted in the 1997-98 budget, and what provision has been made in the 1998-99 budget for anticipated wage increases?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: An enterprise agreement was approved in the Industrial Relations Commission in November 1997. That agreement provides for a 10 per cent wage increase to be paid. The breakdown is: 2 per cent on 1 May 1997 in recognition of past productivity; 4 per cent on 31 May 1997 to account for productivity since the expiry of the first agreement and to gain commitment to the agency's change agenda; 2 per cent on 1 July 1998 for implementing

the change agenda; and 2 per cent on 1 July 1999 for implementing the change agenda.

This was quite an intensive process over 12 months and it culminated in this particular agreement. The process was managed by a dedicated project team. A single bargaining centre, which comprised management, staff and union representatives, provided the principal negotiating body in accordance with the Government's 1997 enterprise bargaining policy and process guidelines. The bargaining process was characterised by periods of industrial dispute which also necessitated management and staff representation at voluntary and compulsory conferences in the IRC. The geographic spread of the agency and associated costs of meeting the representation and consultation requirements of enterprise bargaining certainly added to the cost of the process. The implementation costs also include sharing with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet a representation by senior council in the IRC for arbitration of any additional payment to staff for productivity gains achieved during the term of the previous agreement.

The full year cost of the 10 per cent increase awarded under the second EB agreement is approximately \$5 million. Arrears of 2 per cent, which are backdated to 1 May 1997 and a further 4 per cent increase payable on 1 June 1997, have been paid during the 1997-98 financial year at a cost of some \$3.3 million. Further annual increases of 2 per cent are payable effectively from 1 July 1998 and 1 July 1999 at a cost of \$2 million per instalment. The Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs will have been provided with an appropriation of \$3 million in a full year, that is, 2 per cent per annum over three financial years. OMIA-Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs-DOSAA agreement was approved in February 1998, thereby concluding the second round of enterprise bargaining for the whole agency.

The DEHAA agreement, which includes the DOSAA agreement, provides for a 6 per cent wages increase. They range from 6 per cent from 1 September 1997 at a cost of \$125 000; 2 per cent from 1 July 1998 at a further cost of \$50 000; and a further 2 per cent from 1 July 1999 at a further cost of \$50 000. The full year cost of the DEHAA-DOSAA agreement in the year 1999-2000 is \$250 000. DOSAA was provided with supplementation of \$150 000 in a full year and that equates to 6 per cent in total spread equally over three financial years.

Mr HILL: Will the Minister advise the Committee whether the budget has been given extra appropriation to cover those increases or whether the Minister has had to find them from within the department's own resources?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: There has been no appropriation to cover those increases.

Mr HILL: Will the Minister tell the Committee what was the total cost of establishing the new structure of DEHAA following the election—she referred to the restructuring in introductory remarks—and what additional costs are anticipated to be incurred during this coming financial year to finalise any restructuring that needs to be done?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We do not have that information available. I am happy to take that question on notice and provide the information to the honourable member. Before the next question, I come back to the question the honourable member asked previously about the appropriation. In relation to the statement about which we spoke in terms of the enterprise bargaining agreement, I did say that there has been appropriation in two different areas, that is, \$3 million in a

full year from the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs. So I was correct in my statement that there was an appropriation. There was an appropriation of \$3 million in a full year, which was the 2 per cent per annum over the three financial years. There was also supplementation to the budget in the DOSAA section of the enterprise agreement, which was \$150 000 in the full year. That is standard supplementation to agencies, not additional, in respect of the areas I have just mentioned. The honourable member will note that that is the case when he reads my statement in *Hansard*: that is, there are two areas of appropriation. In relation to the other question, I will bring back information on notice.

Mr HILL: I turn now to the question of public relations. I have noticed from departmental documents that a bit of a cult of personality is appearing: many documents are put out with photographs, signatures and personal messages from the Minister—and not just in your department, Minister, but across all Government departments. I am curious to know what the budget is for public relations, newspaper ads, glossy publications, brochures and so on for the coming year and for the year we are just finishing; and what percentage of those contained photographs of the Minister?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am very pleased to know that the member for Kaurua is interested in my photographic collection and I will be happy to provide him with an answer. I am afraid the question will need to be taken on notice because of the amount of detail asked for by the honourable member. Any of the pictures or any of the notes that appear from the Minister on brochures and publications throughout the department have been done as a result of comments from the many people across the State saying that they would either like to hear from the Minister or to know exactly what a particular Minister looks like. It probably does both, but we will be happy to provide the honourable member with the answers to that question.

Mrs MAYWALD: Not surprisingly, my question relates to water catchment boards and the concerns raised by the Economic and Finance Committee and also by members of this House. I refer to the Portfolio Statements, page 9.8, in which it is stated that one of the strategies is to administer the Water Resources Act. As a bit of background, I point out that yesterday the South-East Catchment Water Board met and it too questioned the prepared budget of the board. Although it accepted that there needed to be a levy, it felt that \$10 was unfair and inequitable and that the maximum levy should be around \$7.50 rather than \$10 per irrigation equivalent. Given that the South-East Catchment Water Board has not supported the \$10 levy, as gazetted by the Minister—the \$10 per irrigation equivalent for the division 1 water base levy—what action does the Minister plan to take?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member appears to have more information than I at this stage. I know that the board undertook to meet. The process that will now take place is that a letter prepared by the chairman of the board—if it has already made a decision that needs to be brought to the Minister for notice—will be sent to me and, when I receive that letter giving me the advice of which the honourable member appears to be aware at this stage, I will take appropriate action. If the information that the honourable member has is correct, it would appear to me that one of the further successes we have achieved in managing to establish catchment water boards around the State, and particularly in the South-East, has been the fact that the board has accepted that a levy at all was part of what was required. I will wait

until I get the information to see just exactly what has transpired. If the board has ratified the levy, I take that to be an acceptance of the moves that the Government has attempted to provide in integrated water management throughout the whole State.

Mrs MAYWALD: I have a supplementary question. In relation to the \$10 that is already gazetted, if my information is correct, would there be an opportunity to change that levy to \$7.50?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Changes to levies can be made prior to the end of the financial year.

Mrs MAYWALD: What would be the last date on which the Minister would need to receive advice for it to be changed for the next financial year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Probably within the next few days.

Mrs MAYWALD: Given the concerns that were raised in Parliament and by the Economic and Finance Committee in relation to the processes establishing these levies and the accountability of the boards to the community, is the Minister considering reviewing the Water Resources Act so that at least half the members of the catchment water boards are elected rather than appointed by the Minister, which would enable better accountability to the community?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The provisions in the Water Resources Act in relation to water catchment boards will be monitored with respect to the performance of the boards. If as a result of that monitoring it is determined that a review should be undertaken, such a review will take place. I am of the view that, when moving into new areas, an assessment of the outcomes that we hoped to achieve at the end of the appropriate time should take place. In the first instance, Parliament agreed to the regimes that we now follow in the Water Resources Act. The means by which the Minister administers that Act has been accepted by Parliament.

Given that we are implementing new and different measures in new areas, I believe that we should continue to look at the perceived outcomes and the actual, determined outcomes to see that they meet with the objectives of Parliament, of the Water Resources Act and of Government. A review will occur at an appropriate time.

In terms of the honourable member's specific question about the election of officers, I think that will be determined further down the track. The boards that have been set up so far have been established through appointment. A series of requirements are set out in the Water Resources Act, and they determine the skills that are required for individuals to take part in a catchment board. They are wide, varied and professional. The boards that have operated since 1995 have been extremely successful. I do not believe that the principle has been proved that an elected board is more efficient than an appointed board, but anything can be reviewed over time.

Mrs MAYWALD: My question concerns page 9.8 and the strategy in relation to environmental water allocations. I recently visited New South Wales and I was very disturbed by the move by New South Wales irrigators—and it is a large movement over there—to have repealed the cap on the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. Their argument is that it was a one-year temporary cap that was established on a trial basis and that it has been extended but now should be repealed. The Minister would appreciate that the implications for South Australia are serious. Can the Minister advise what is the South Australian Government's position on the cap in relation to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission's stance? What measures can South Australia take to ensure that this

positive initiative for the sustainability of our most valuable water resource is maintained?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am quite sure that the honourable member is aware that we are now talking about an extremely complex issue, but it is one of great significance to South Australia. In the first instance, let me comment about the cap. There has never been any inference that it is only a temporary, one-year cap. The cap has been negotiated since the late 1960s. As far as we are concerned, the cap is there to stay. As far as the Murray-Darling Basin Commission is concerned, and as far as the Ministers on the council are concerned, I suggest that at this stage the cap is reasonably secure in the manner in which it has been negotiated. However, that does not address the aspects of the honourable member's question.

In my opening statement I referred to my visit to New South Wales and Victoria to look at the Snowy Mountains Scheme. Part of this problem has come about because of corporatisation. Under the scheme, which effectively captures waters from every stream, tributary, creek or river that runs within a radius of the Snowy Mountains, the major capacities that have been taken from these rivers are stored, and through diversions that have been negotiated under the cap, we receive water flows through the Murray and Murrumbidgee Rivers into South Australia.

For the past few years, Australia has suffered as a result of low rainfall. Unfortunately, we are led by the nose considerably by the elements of nature, over which we have little control. It is recognised that low rainfall has caused significant concerns particularly in areas where there has been a growth of irrigation areas that utilise immense quantities of water. Once we have regulated areas where water is required for economic development but is issued only on specific allocations, that means that we have management over a regulated area. The impact on South Australia in relation to environmental flows is significant.

Discussions have been taking place in New South Wales. If there are diversions for purposes other than what we use water for at the moment, it could have an impact on our diversions into South Australia. It is not necessarily the cap that we are talking about: it could well be surplus flows. When we have reasonable rainfall and we have peak storage in the Hume Dam, the Dartmouth Dam and all the others that make up the Snowy Mountains Scheme, we in South Australia benefit from the excess waters because of the surplus water which flows through the Murray, and that keeps the Murray Mouth open, which is another problem we are facing at the moment.

There is greater discussion among environmental lobbies in New South Wales to increase environmental flows in rivers that have not flowed for the past 40 years or more, and that means taking waters away from South Australia. That is a big concern to us. I can assure the honourable member that New South Wales and Victoria have been told quite strongly by South Australia at ministerial councils that any decisions they take that will divert extra waters to be utilised outside of our negotiated arrangements must be an impact on New South Wales and Victoria and not on South Australia. All these areas are still under discussion. The seriousness of this whole issue will not be solved in the short term, but I assure the honourable member that the South Australian Government does not take this matter lightly. We have pushed our position strongly and we will continue to do so until we come to some form of arrangement that settles down the latest discussions about extra waters being diverted out of the schemes that we use now.

Mr HILL: I turn to national parks and the botanic gardens. As a point of reference I refer to Budget Paper 3, page 175. In relation to botanic gardens I refer to the hills gardens. I asked the Minister about this by way of Question on Notice No. 105 and I was grateful for the response. The situation is that there are three hills gardens: Mount Lofty, Wittunga and Beechwood. Over recent years the amount of money available for those gardens has been reduced and, as a result, the Wittunga Botanic Gardens in particular has substantially changed its orientation. I understand that Beechwood, which is a four hectare garden, continues to have up to \$100 000 a year spent on it. This garden is open for only 50-odd days a year. It was down to 25 days a year in 1996-97. The figures from the annual reports show that it has about 5 000 visitors a year, so the level of subsidy for those visitors is almost as great as the subsidy for somebody going to see the opera or one of the concerts in Adelaide.

I think it is a scandal that such a large sum of money is being used on a piece of infrastructure which gets very little public use. In fact, the majority of the use of the garden is enjoyed by the private landowners of the property which used to go with the gardens. As the Minister knows, there have been a number of reports into the future of the garden. There was a report in April 1995 by Mr Robert Glenn, who recommended that the Government sell Beechwood. The Botanic Gardens supported it and recommended the sale to the Minister. The previous Minister at the time decided not to sell the gardens. I note that it was in his electorate so he may have had some other interest in it as well. But that is no longer the case. Will the Minister review the Glenn report and will she bite the bullet and dispose of Beechwood so that the money which is being spent there can go to public use in the other hills gardens and not be spent for private benefit in Beechwood?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I appreciate the question from the member for Kaurna. He has correctly identified that it is a dilemma for the Government in terms of the two aspects that are involved. One, of course, is the heritage aspect of the gardens themselves; the other is the arrangement that has been made with private tenants within the gardens. So I certainly do not deny that we do have a dilemma in terms of what the eventual outcomes may be in relation to whether in fact we look at selling or whether some other arrangement can be made with the tenants that now occupy the Beechwood home. In relation to the Glenn report, in fact another internal review has been conducted just recently. That was intended to build upon the Glenn report. At the moment there are recommendations before me which I am considering in relation to Beechwood. I have not drawn any conclusions at this stage, but I am quite happy if the member for Kaurna would like to join me in a discussion on what the possible options are for Beechwood, and I would certainly welcome his bipartisan approach.

Mr HILL: I am always prepared to be bipartisan. I appreciate the answer. The 1998-99 Budget Paper 3, page 175, shows expenditure this year for national parks and botanic gardens estimated at \$27.248 million, and this is shown as a reduction on the current year estimated outcome of \$27.965 million. Given the Minister's announcement on 28 May of an extra \$2.5 million for parks over the next year and allowing for the note at page 519 of Budget Paper 2 that \$2 million refers to capital funding, can the Minister reconcile how the allocation for next year is an increase in funding when it is in fact less than the 1997-98 outcome?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The member's question of course relates back to the difficulties that we are going to have in this move from cash to accrual. We can certainly attempt again to take the member through the budget figures to show him that, in effect, the supposition from him that there has been a decrease is not correct. But this will not happen without some difficulty. So perhaps if the member is agreeable we will take the question on notice and attempt to give him the transitional outcomes, which will show the honourable member that in fact there is an increase and not a decrease.

Mr HILL: Last year the budget for protected areas management was a program within a grouping called resource conservation and management, and last year's Program Estimates at page 410 indicated a cut from \$13.5 million in 1996-97 to \$12.8 million in 1997-98. Can the Minister reconcile the 1997-98 figure of \$12.8 million for protected areas management with the 1998-99 budget and tell the committee how much will be spent this year on protected areas management?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am afraid that, once again, my last answer relates to this whole area, and it is extremely difficult. There are areas where it is totally impossible to be able to relate one figure to another. The member would be well aware that we are not judging apples with apples this year. Next year should be different.

Mr Hill interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I hope not; we have gone through enough changes this year without contemplating any other changes, I can assure you. It is not just from your point of view. Perhaps if the member would like to have a briefing at a later stage to take him through the moves to the greatest degree that we can, we can arrange that as well.

Mr HILL: I thank the Minister for that.

Mr SCALZI: I refer to page 9.9 of the Portfolio Statements which makes the following reference:

Improve water catchment management through the establishment and support of Catchment Water Management Boards.

The Torrens and Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Boards have received approximately \$12 million from the catchment environment levy over the past three years. I have had many questions from my constituents as to what are the benefits of that \$12 million. Minister, what have the boards achieved with this funding?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I thank the honourable member for his question and I know of his very specific interest in this area and in particular his support for the Torrens board and therefore his constituents in his own area, and he has worked extremely hard. I know there was a major concern with a particular trash rack and that the member took great steps not only to supply a solution but to make sure that not only the constituents but the board and the local government all managed to come to a negotiated agreement on that, for which I congratulate him. The major achievements for both the Torrens and the Patawalonga are pretty well established. They have been numerous and most effective. There was first of all the preparation by both boards of comprehensive catchment plans, which outlined their respective programs for the next few years.

Other achievements include the dredging of the Torrens Lake for the first time in 60 years, in partnership with the City of Adelaide and the Department of Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs; the provision of funds to over 70 private land holders on the Torrens River to undertake remedial works on their properties along the riparian

zone; the installation of the trash racks that we have talked about on Fourth Creek—and there was approximately \$225 000 involved in that, but it is extremely important for the quality of the water flows; the installation of trash racks at 14 locations throughout the Patawalonga catchment; the board grant of \$120 000 to the City of Campbelltown for the construction of the Alder Street ecosol gross pollutant trap, which is working exceedingly well; the establishment of four Our Patch Groups, which is a community education project, and that is in conjunction with the East Marden Primary School, residents' groups, the Magill Sunrise Rotary Club and the Norwood Morialta High School; the removal of exotic trees and woody weeds from and the revegetation of more than 35 kilometres of the Torrens River watercourse under the exotic plant control program; provision of funds to the Tea Tree Gully City Council to assist in the construction of a wetland at Dernancourt, and the commencement of the construction of the Warriparinga Wetland at Science Park; a contribution of funds towards both the establishment of the Urrbrae Wetland and the detention basin at Glenside; the installation of a high volume trash and silt trap at Brighton to stop polluted stormwater from discharging into the Gulf St Vincent—and we all know how important that is; the establishment of some 12 pollutant load monitoring stations—in addition, macro-invertebrate and riparian surveys are being undertaken at 18 other locations to monitor the health of both the Torrens River and the Patawalonga Basin; and the provision of funding for twice weekly clean-ups throughout both catchments by crews from the Department for Correctional Services—and that has been not only a most innovative but an exceptionally good program that has benefits both for the environment and certainly from the point of community services.

There was also the provision of funding for several other projects, some examples of which are: the Eastern Metropolitan stormwater protection project; the Changing Streams industrial pollution prevention project; Stormwater Smart, which is also a pollution reduction project; the Street Smart River Clean Project; Clean Waters; Shop to Shore; the Our Patch program; and the very successful Kids Congress for Catchment Care, which is increasing every year. The number of children and schools now involved in that project is an absolute delight to see. I believe that that covers a fair range of the achievements that we have now seen within both those specific areas of catchment boards.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I refer the Minister to page 9.8 of the Portfolio Statements, concerning environmental flow allocations for the Murray River in South Australia. I was lucky enough to be invited down to the launch of Jock Veenstra's new *Spirit of the Coorong* recently, a magnificent vessel which was built at Goolwa. It will be cruising down across the barrage and through into the Coorong, and the owners are obviously keen to market the magnificent Murray mouth as well.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: This is a statement and a question—and an advertisement for a very good entrepreneurial tourism operator. I know why the river is closing at the moment, and it is a matter of concern, even if it does not happen very often. Will the Minister tell the Committee what she is doing about this matter?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It is an extremely important question, and I believe that we have already touched on the aspects of this finite resource of water which it all relates to. We currently have a severe restriction of the Murray River

mouth, which is primarily due to the recent dry period throughout the Murray-Darling Basin. There is a continual net movement of sand into the area just inside the mouth, which has resulted in the mouth channel being reduced to about 30 metres wide and less than two metres deep at low tide. That has significantly reduced the tidal flow, particularly to the Coorong, and is likely to lead to complete closure in the near future—as I believe we all know.

The large amount of sand that is kept in suspension by wave action on the ocean beach means that the incoming tide brings more sand into the Goolwa channel and the Coorong than the outgoing tide takes out. So, it requires a significant—and I really mean a significant—river flow to flush the sand from the mouth. From past records, it is evident that restriction of the mouth occurs whenever there is a period of more than 12 months without a flow event that is sufficient to flush the sand from the mouth area—and we are talking about a level of water of some 600 gegalitres in a month.

For the past year we have had extremely dry conditions; we have had about a one year in 20 drought; in the preceding year we also had a lower than average rainfall and, as a consequence, not only has there been no river flow past the barrages since 17 November 1997 but there has not been a significant flow event since December 1996—that is 18 months. So, it is estimated that the frequency of possible restriction of the mouth has increased from the one year in 20, before the barrages were constructed in 1940, to about one year in six currently. This change in frequency is due to the combination of the reduced tidal flows in and out of the Murray mouth because of the barrages and the reduced river flows due to upstream diversions for irrigation and the urban water supplies.

So, the Government is certainly taking all possible action to manage the current situation and to prepare for the possible closure. The Government is also investigating longer term options to reduce the possibility of this type of restriction at the mouth occurring in the future. To that end, the Murray Mouth Advisory Committee has been re-established to provide the Government and the Murray-Darling Basin Commission with advice and to prepare for the possible closure. The committee has implemented upgraded monitoring programs to ensure that any changes in the hydrogeology and ecology of the Coorong and the Goolwa channel are identified early and can therefore be addressed. Regular aerial photography is being undertaken to monitor the sand build-up in the mouth area, and a detailed survey has been undertaken to identify the best possible site for reopening the mouth should it, in effect, close.

It will not be possible to reopen the mouth with confidence of sustaining that opening until there is a reasonable flow in the Murray River. I am advised that this is unlikely to occur until at least September this year. The low amount of water storage throughout the Murray-Darling Basin makes it likely that a significant flow will not occur this winter. However, if the mouth does close, the height of the sand bar that builds up at the mouth will quickly exceed the pool level in Lake Alexandrina and, therefore, it may become necessary to reopen the mouth, even though there are only moderate river flows, to avoid flooding that could arise in those circumstances. It has been estimated that the cost of reopening would be in the order of some \$250 000. The Murray-Darling Basin Commission has recently agreed, in principle, to fund the activities directly related to reopening the mouth. So, that will reduce our cost, which I am very pleased to say.

The committee is investigating options for reducing the risk of the problem occurring in the future by making better use of the available water in the Murray-Darling Basin. But, at the moment, a lot of the answer will rely upon the elements and whether in fact rainfall to the degree that we require will come in the short or the long term.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Before calling the next question, I understand that there is an emerging consensus that we may be able to finish earlier this afternoon, at approximately 4.30 or 5 o'clock. We are not committed to that at this stage but, if the Parties could sort that out over the lunch break, it will give everyone an indication of the likely closing time.

Mr HILL: Of course, it partly depends on the length of the answers to the questions. I would like to ask the Minister about the various parks that are part of the State's reserve system, and I refer the Minister to her reply to my question on notice (No. 66) relating to the annual budget for the various parcels of land which comprise the State's reserve system. The Minister did not answer that question—perhaps she was not able to answer it. The Minister made this statement:

The resources allocated to the management of these reserves are not specifically allocated to each individual reserve but allocated by the outputs required to achieve the strategic objectives of the Government.

The Minister had obviously been reading from the accrual accounting handbook. What are the strategic objectives, what outputs are required and how are resources allocated? Could the Minister answer that question by way of example to a couple of parks, perhaps Yumbarra and the Onkaparinga Park?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member would recall from my opening statement that we have specified a budget of \$26 429 000 for the management and development of the State's national parks. The funding will be directed to five key output areas: addressing planning and development of a representative reserve system; the provision of visitor facilities and services; biodiversity management; cultural and natural heritage; and community involvement. The funding is derived from State and Commonwealth grants, which includes Natural Heritage Trust funds and fees and charges recovered from park users, including visitors, lessees and licence holders.

The parks agenda is a major environmental initiative directly contributing the additional \$30 million in funding to parks over six years from 1997. The parks agenda funding has been increased this year by \$2.5 million to \$5 million. Notable commitments within this year's budget include the ongoing development and management of visitor facilities and services in the parks recognised as key tourism destinations, an allocation of \$700 000 to the nationally recognised operation Bounce Back, which is an integrated threat abatement program and which aims to impose control of major pest species in the Flinders Ranges National Park within five years, and the provision of a \$500 000 State and Natural Heritage Trust component for parks.

The representative reserve system—and I am now looking at the five key output areas to which I referred earlier—involves a projected income of \$1 000 with outgoing expenditure of \$2 926 912. With respect to the output, which relates to the visitor services—the second of the key areas—the expected income will be \$5 701 835 and expenditure will be \$17 567 405; the expected income from output biodiversity management would be \$16 000, with expenditure of

\$4 546 508; output cultural and natural heritage is zero income, with expenditure of \$327 038; and community involvement, income of \$59 500 and expenditure of \$1 061 157.

Income in those five key output areas totals \$5 778 335, with the overall expenditure at \$26 429 020. A breakdown of specific funds from the parks agenda program includes the five new ranger positions, an OPS3 ranger position at Innamincka, a senior wildlife ecologist for park management, two park assistant positions, two project officers to develop the statewide visitor monitoring and survey program, and \$50 000 funding for botanical support for the Friends of Parks.

Mr HILL: I do not think that the Minister really answered my question. I was trying to focus in on what that language means for individual parks and I mentioned a couple. Could the Minister say what it means for just one park in my electorate and in the member for Mawson's electorate because I am sure that he is interested, namely, the Onkaparinga National Park? What does it mean? How much money will it get? What will be spent on the ground?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I know what the honourable member is asking but, in terms of the coming budget, it is not a question that I can answer at this time. The budget delivery over the area to which the honourable member refers is a global budget and it will be in terms of outputs and the needs of those outputs as they arise. We could probably provide the honourable member with the amounts that would have been spent in the range of parks at the end of this financial year, and I have no doubt that they will be indicative of what we are liable to spend in the coming year.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Minister can take that on notice and prepare what is relevant to the question. Is the Minister happy to take that on notice and prepare whatever she can to assist the honourable member?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Yes, if the honourable member believes that it would be of assistance to provide him with a breakdown of the previous individual amounts allocated. As I say, they should be indicative of what our expected expenditures would be this coming year.

Mr HILL: Yesterday in Committee B I asked the Minister for Primary Industries a number of questions in relation to the Yumbarra reserve and, in particular, the anomaly that the Department of Mines, or what was the Department of Mines, wanted to explore. I asked him whether or not his department was examining whether it could use provisions within the legislation to extend the meaning of 'scientific investigation' to include mineral exploration. As the Minister would understand this would be somewhat of a controversy. In answer to my question:

So you are using the provisions which allow investigation to see whether that will allow you to explore?

the departmental officer, Mr Alley, replied:

That decision will be made by Minister Kotz.

Is the Minister aware of what the Department of Mines is attempting to do, and what is her position on it?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I can only presume that the answer the honourable member was given by the departmental officer was in terms hypothetical.

Mr HILL: I did not realise that the Minister was unaware of this. Apparently Crown Law opinion has been sought by the Department of Mines.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am not aware of any such approaches. Quite obviously, if Crown Law advice has been

sought we will all find out about a determination down the track, but it is not in my hands at this stage and therefore I cannot give the honourable member a conclusive answer.

Mr HILL: What percentage of State Government funding for the Wilpena development, into which I understand the Government has put \$4.5 million, will go towards improved park management as opposed to the private financial gain of the lessees?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member will be aware that the Government is in partnership with Flinders Ranges Tourist Services in the major upgrade of the Wilpena Tourist Centre at a total cost of some \$6.5 million. The Government has spent approximately \$3.9 million on essential infrastructure works including a \$1 million visitor centre, incorporating public information, a shop, toilets and National Parks and Wildlife Office facilities; an upgraded water supply; roads and parking areas; an upgraded camp ground and 50 new camp sites; some 24 new powered sites; and a new ablution block. Flinders Ranges Tourist Services has spent \$2.5 million to construct 26 new motel units, fully upgrade the existing 34 units and substantially upgrade and enlarge the existing chalet and lounge area.

Special attention has been given to rehabilitating and restoring degraded areas around Wilpena, and over 4 500 native plants are being established to provide additional habitat for birds and animals and improve the amenity of the area for visitors. ETSA is constructing an innovative solar/diesel power station at Wilpena, at a cost of some \$2 million, to replace the old, rather noisy and inefficient power generation service. The new power station will provide quiet, efficient power well into the next century and, with underground reticulation, will avoid the use of unsightly powerlines in what is a very beautiful area of the State. In fact, the Premier is at Wilpena at this moment officially opening the redeveloped resort.

Mr HILL: Before the most recent State election the Liberal Party in its executive summary of policy commitments, under the heading 'Focus on the Mount Lofty Ranges', said that a multi-use Greater Mount Lofty Ranges Park would be created, including upgrading of facilities at Waterfall Gully, Morialta, the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens and the Heysen Trail. At what stage is the creation of that Greater Mount Lofty Ranges Park and how much money has been committed to it in this year's budget?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It is a matter of great pride that the Liberal Party and this Liberal Government, in terms of its policy initiatives, is looking at improving and increasing the size of a very important part of our State through the Mount Lofty Ranges into an exceedingly greater area than we have seen. Some \$450 000 has been allocated in this year's budget to take steps to enable the greater park to be established. Obviously, some considerable preliminary work needs to be done in establishing the areas that we as a Government can immediately put under the Mount Lofty Park reserve area, and that will mean looking at negotiations with South Australian Water, with Primary Industries and with other jurisdictions that have ownership of the different areas through which we need to negotiate. It is certainly our aim and a target for the coming year.

Mr HILL: Do I take it from what the Minister said that she will be declaring a Greater Mount Lofty Ranges Park in the coming year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: In terms of the specific question relating to the word 'park', as the honourable member would realise at this stage it is a concept, and talking about it as a

park is part of that concept, but in terms of its declaration, no, it will not be declared as a park.

Mr HILL: Is that ever or just this year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Ever.

Mr HILL: It is a broken promise.

Mrs GERAGHTY: What funding has been allocated for progressing the Greater Mount Lofty Park initiative in 1998?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It is \$450 000.

Mrs GERAGHTY: What was spent on the Friends of Parks program in 1997 and what has been allocated for 1998?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: There has been quite considerable movement in that. As the honourable member will be aware, we have some 7 000 volunteers in parks across the board, and 90 groups within the Friends of Parks groupings. In their own right they contribute a considerable amount of voluntary labour in terms of dollars to the parks and assist with about 370 projects. A grant of \$60 000, doubled from \$30 000 under the parks agenda, was made available on application from Friends groups and is allocated from the capital works budget. The parks agenda, which wants to continue to promote community involvement in parks in order to educate volunteer participation in the management of native flora, has had an extra allocation of \$50 000 to provide botanical expertise to the Friends groups. Over 20 botanical training contracts were signed. The work will be carried out over the next few years.

The Friends who are interested in the conservation of particularly flora within the parks system can have access to the scientists who can easily identify some of the perhaps rare and native species that those of us on the ground who may have a commitment to conservation but who cannot readily identify the rarest of our species cannot identify for greater protection.

Mrs GERAGHTY: What is the difference between 1997 and 1998 in terms of money that was spent?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The budget has been maintained. The same balance was provided last year as this year. For the honourable member's information, I point out that, in the area that supports the Friends of the Park, an additional person has been brought on board to assist community involvement within the parks area. In the whole range of community involvement, the department expends \$1 061 157. That is our expectation of expenditure for this coming year.

Mrs GERAGHTY: What was spent running the parks consultative committees in 1997, and what has been allocated for 1998? I refer strictly to State Government funding.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: In relation to the consultative committees and, therefore, their membership, they all are put together on a voluntary basis. The membership of the committee is purely voluntary. No costings are recorded through the department for the consultative committees, because they are worked purely on a voluntary basis.

Mr HILL: I have a range of questions about the EPA budget. I assume in some ways that the answers the Minister has already given in relation to other questions will be echoed here, because it is about trying to understand what is happening in the EPA budget as a result of this new form of accounting. Will the Minister detail the budget of \$31.198 million under 'environment protection' for 1998-99 and explain what programs are included under this figure?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: In the 1997-98 estimated result columns of the outputs operating statement, the environment protection output class encompasses predominantly those activities of the former water resources group. This is because the activities of the former office of the Environment

Protection Authority were treated as administered items in 1997-98 and, as such, could not be included in DEHAA's controlled outputs operating statement. When DEHAA structured its activities in January 1998 to provide more operational efficiency, the Environment Protection Agency was formed by merging the operational activities of the former office of the Environment Protection Authority and the former water resources group. The merger is reflected in the 1998-99 budget columns of the outputs operating statement.

This restructure, combined with the loss of fuel franchise levy and the desire to improve the transparency of departmental accounting, has required revenues and expenses relating to the environment protection fund previously treated as administered to be incorporated within DEHAA's controlled revenues and expenses. The broad effect of these changes on DEHAA's output class operating statement is shown on page 9.25 of the Portfolio Statements. The honourable member will note that the final bullet point on page 9.34 of the Portfolio Statements relating to DEHAA contains a typographical error that, unfortunately, was not detected by DEHAA or the Department of Treasury and Finance during the collation of the budget papers. To be consistent with the previous figures, the first line should read:

As indicated above, \$8.6 million of revenue reported.

I have a table breakdown in which the member for Kaurna may be interested. It is purely statistical, and I will insert it into *Hansard*.

	\$ Million
Revenues	
Water Resources Group (1997-98)	6.5
Plus: Transfer from Environment Protection Fund	8.6
Less: Prescribed percentage of fees which must be credited to the Fund	(2)
Loss of revenue from Fuel Franchise Levy	(4.0)
Reduction in the Commonwealth Specific Purpose Payment for the Murray-Darling Basin Commission 2001 Project	(2.9)
Plus Revenue Measures:	
Increase in solid waste levy	1.5
Increase in Environment Enhancement Levy	1.1
Total Environment Protection Output Class (1998-99)	10.5
	\$
Expenses	Million
Water Resources Group (1997-98)	35.0
Plus: Transfer from Environment Protection Fund	9.6
Less: Reduction in payment to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission	(3.0)
Total Environment protection Output Class (1998-99)	41.6

Mr HILL: How much does the EPA expect to spend on enforcement in 1998-99, and how many staff will be engaged in enforcement during that period? Will there be an increase or a decrease in both cases over the 1997-98 figures?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Once again, it is extremely difficult to project at this point the amount that will be directed into an area that has not yet fulfilled and will not fulfil its charter until certain circumstances arise which will require it to be operational. At this point it is not possible to define the cost that would be related specifically to events that have not yet occurred.

In terms of enforcement, there have been and will be more moves within the catchment management boards. At this time they have provided funds to bring on board two pollutant enforcement officers who will be trained under the auspices of the Environment Protection Agency and who will be operational on ground within the Torrens and Patawalonga boards. I expect to see more of this type of usage occurring as greater negotiations between the different metropolitan

boards take place to address the possible requirements of putting more policing measures, if you like, on the ground. I also add that a new unit will be established within the agency specifically to investigate major breaches of the Environment Protection Act, the Water Resources Act and the Coast Protection Act. The unit will consist of a small team of officers focused on ensuring that investigations are carried out efficiently and professionally and that breaches of the Act are met with the full extent of the law.

Preliminary work has already started on the structure of the unit and it is hoped that that unit will be fully operational by July 1998. The major driver, if you like, for the establishment of the specialist unit arises from the rigour of the Act that dictates what is required in investigations to obtain successful criminal prosecutions. It is just another step towards what we hope to be an effective solution of the EPA in South Australia. In addition to the major investigations, the unit will also play a role in compliance auditing of industry and industry groups against specific environment protection policies. For example, the compliance auditing of dairies within South Australia against the EPP for the management of dairy waste water could be undertaken.

Mr HILL: I think the Minister was saying that there will be a more aggressive approach to investigation of complaints within the department as a result of having a better investigative service—and that is to the good. I think the EPA has copped a fair amount of criticism—been called a toothless tiger and so on—because of the lack of that investigative arm within the department. It will be interesting to see in a year's time whether the EPA has some prosecutions that it can proudly reveal to us. How many EPA matters are currently with Crown Law or the DPP, and when does the Minister expect these matters to be brought before the courts?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am afraid that we will have to take that question on notice.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Brokenshire): I am not sure whether or not this will help but, if there are a series of questions on this topic, perhaps the Minister can take them on notice and seek to provide responses as soon as possible. It might be helpful to the Committee, if members are agreeable.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We would not be able to provide an answer on when the matters are due to go to court but we can certainly provide the information regarding the matters under investigation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think the member for Kaurna is happy to get what information he can as soon as practically possible in respect of some of those specific figures, whether they be budget lines or potential prosecutions.

Mr HILL: Once again, I refer to the EPA but in doing so I refer to an article in the *City Messenger* of 13 May. Does the Minister agree with Rob Thomas from the EPA that the EPA Act is unworkable and needs to be amended? Has money been committed in this budget to facilitate this?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I think the honourable member is probably aware that we are approaching a time when many of the Acts under our jurisdiction will be reviewed. This will certainly be the case with the Environment Protection Act. If there is a requirement to review concerns that have been expressed from different areas, then that will be the opportunity to do so. In fact, I have approved the terms of the review—at least I will approve them—but generally, several Acts within various jurisdictions at the moment are coming up for review. The Environment Protection Act is one. There

will certainly be an opportunity for the community to contribute to the development of any amendments that may be required, and I am sure that at that time we will hear the concerns. I am also sure that we will receive some kudos from different areas that know exactly how well the Environment Protection Agency has conducted itself over the years.

Mr HILL: In 1996 the EPA issued an integrated waste strategy which required a strategic plan for waste management infrastructure to be developed by the EPA and the Department of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government and foreshadowed only one major landfill to the north of the city. On 22 June 1995 the Executive Director of the EPA told the Estimates Committee:

It is important to understand that the EPA does not have full control over this matter—

that is resiting the Dublin dump—

and I am not trying to handball the issue: it is a reality. Planning control rests with the Development Act.

Given the Minister's answer to question on notice No.61 that under section 47(2a)(iii) of the Environment Protection Act the EPA may not refuse to grant a licence for a landfill where development approval has been given, does the Minister agree that the lack of final authority has severely restricted the ability of the EPA to introduce an integrated waste strategy for South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: My first reaction to that would be to say 'No'. The primary role of the EPA in waste management is regulatory. As the honourable member knows, the EPA always licenses depots, and they must operate in accordance with the conditions set. The agency has recently undertaken a project to review conditions of licence with a view to making the requirements both more understandable by industry itself and also more enforceable. The regulatory role relates to existing landfills. In recent years, we have seen the closure of a number of unsatisfactory landfills and a steady improvement in the standard of the operation of those remaining. A proposal for a new landfill must gain an approval under the Development Act 1993—and that is administered under the Department of Transport and Urban Planning.

For major landfills this has generally meant the preparation of an environmental impact statement by the proponent, which is then assessed by the Environmental Impact Assessments Branch of the Department of Transport and Urban Planning. They take into account issues such as amenity, transport, locality, compatibility and surrounding land use. They will also consider advice provided by the EPA on the environmental aspects of a proposal.

The Department of Transport and Urban Planning restricts its responsibilities to planning and location issues. Other than its regulatory role, the EPA promotes waste minimisation through its cleaner production programs and it provides advice to industry and local government to assist in the development of waste management infrastructure and to develop standards such as guidelines for landfills and green organics processing facilities to provide greater certainty to industry.

The two major environmental objectives of the Government and the Environment Protection Authority are to establish a best practice waste management system and to promote pollution prevention within industry and the community. The integrated waste management strategy for metropolitan Adelaide is a series of objectives for the management of waste over the next two decades, supported

by programs that are geared to meet those objectives. A key action is the development of a strategic plan for waste management infrastructure, including waste transfer, resource recovery and disposal. To that end, a waste infrastructure steering committee has been set up to develop the plan.

Other elements of that strategy implementation include an upgrading of conditions of licence relating to the waste industry, a substantial upgrade of the environment protection policy relating to waste management, the enhancement of the pollution prevention program, and involvement in the development of a national environment protection measure for the transport of controlled waste across jurisdictional boundaries. The integrated waste strategy for metropolitan Adelaide recognised that landfill would continue to be a major destination for solid waste in the foreseeable future, even though methods of waste minimisation and recycling will most likely continue to improve. Accordingly, the EPA has prepared guidelines for major solid waste landfills which will serve as a basis for the Environment Protection Authority when commenting on development applications for landfills and also for licence conditions.

Mr HILL: I understand that the Minister is putting the Party line on this matter, but I would like to ask why she has changed her mind. As I understand it, when she was Chair of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of the Parliament, that committee released a report that stated that the EPA should be given the final responsibility for determining where landfill sites should be located.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I was Presiding Member of the ERD Committee for three years, and I know that I was there when the waste management issue was being discussed. I am also aware that I was not there at the time of the completion of that report, so the honourable member cannot establish my name as part of that report.

Mr HILL: I withdraw that comment. Does the EPA still hold the view that the number of landfills should be kept to a minimum, that is, one dump only in the north? What is the EPA's policy on the number of landfills?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I have already said that the integrated waste strategy for metropolitan Adelaide recognises that landfill will continue to be a major destination for solid waste. In general, operating standards at metropolitan landfills have been poor when compared with best practice, and that has contributed to very strong public opposition to new proposals. In the past few years, because of action by the Environment Protection Authority, a number of badly sited landfills have closed and others have upgraded their performance.

Whilst we have landfill capacity for the southern metropolitan area that will be adequate for the next 10 to 15 years, there has been the potential for difficulties to arise in the north. That has been mitigated to a degree with the approval of the IWS landfill at Dublin. A number of proposals are currently being assessed that could further expand capacity. The EPA has prepared guidelines for major solid waste landfills that will serve as a basis for the Environment Protection Authority to consider the development applications for landfills and licence conditions.

Mr HILL: I may have missed something, but the question was: does the EPA still hold the view that the number should be kept to a minimum, that is, one dump only in the north? Is that a 'Yes'? I am not sure.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member's question relates to a designated answer that the EPA does not necessarily have the right to make. In terms of best practice landfills,

the EPA would consider that an excessive number of landfills does not necessarily fulfil our requirements for landfill waste in the next 10 years. I doubt that there will be an overabundance but there is obviously a need. When that need arises, the EPA has a specific position to fill, and it has done that admirably in the past and I see no reason why it will not continue to take decisions on a very strong environmental basis when dealing with the nature of assessments for landfill applications when they are lodged.

Mr HILL: The current system allows anyone to go through the process of establishing a landfill. If they get planning approval, they have to be licensed by the EPA. What controls does the EPA have to limit the number of landfills if a dozen or so proponents decide to establish them?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The EPA has powers under schedule 22 of the Act to dismiss a general application. At the same time, I point out that the honourable member's question is hypothetical. It is not easy for anyone to set up a piece of land and put a dump on it. I doubt that those people who have sufficient finances to be able to look at the purchase of land and dump management would not also look at the market in which they would have to operate. It comes down to market forces and free enterprise, and that tends to restrict the number of players in any activity. I suggest that market forces would keep to a minimum the number of people who apply, just for the hell of it, to open up a landfill dump. I do not think that we will see an explosion in the number of people who want to open up areas of South Australia for landfill. At this stage, the EPA has sufficient means not to assist those who may have a frivolous claim on such a major consideration as this.

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

Mr HILL: Before the break the Minister was responding to a question that I had asked about the EPA's role in determining the number of landfill sites and the point she made was that, while the EPA has some limited powers, the marketplace would fix up any problems in the allocation of the number of sites. If I am not summarising the position correctly, then the Minister can add to it herself, but it is the marketplace aspect that I am referring to. The concern of the Opposition, and also members of the community, is that at the moment there is something like half a dozen proposals for new landfill sites. Some evidence I have seen suggests that there should be one or two, maximum, landfill sites developed in Adelaide. It may well be that not all of those sites develop, but some may be developed, and if they are developed there will no doubt be competition between them. It is a question of how that competition, which is the marketplace, and the need to gain share of market, throughput and so on, relates to the Government's overall strategy to reduce landfill and reduce waste in our community. So I would like the Minister to address how the EPA will manage that process.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I think my specific comments in regard to the market enterprise area were due to a comment made by the member for Kaurna that seemed to conclude that there would be a proliferation of landfill sites across the board. I was pointing out that I thought that part of his question may have been slightly hypothetical because I did not believe that we would see this proliferation. The Acts of Parliament that assist to alleviate the problem that the member is identifying are very specific. Very stringent legislative processes are set down by this Parliament under its legislation through the Development Act and through the

Environment Protection Act, with the different levels by which each of these areas determine whether any development—and at the moment we are talking specifically about landfills—may in fact proceed.

The legislation certainly provides a means by which very stringent steps have to be taken by proponents of landfills. Environmental impact statements are certainly a means by which the process is very extensive before any proponent of development of a landfill can move to licensing. Through that whole process the EPA has certain rights in terms of the comments that it may make not only on the licensing conditions but under the application processing in which it may decide that the applicant has not complied with any of the requirements of the Act. So very comprehensively each of the processes are determined by the Acts of Parliament that are already struck in this place, including, of course, the Environment Protection Act, which was struck prior to 1993 under a Labor Government, in relation to which this Parliament obviously had great debate. That included the Development Act, and with the introduction of the environment assessment process this was a means to attempt to stringently control the requirements of safeguard to our environment.

The main way in which the number of landfills will be restricted is by raising the bar, if you like, with regard to environmental standards, and the EPA has recently introduced landfill guidelines which have in fact raised that bar and these in their own right set some very high standards for future landfills, and only operators with significant financial resources and capability will get over that bar. So as to the concerns that the member has, on the one hand I think most people across the board have an abhorrence of landfills *per se*—as we all do—but they serve a purpose that is an absolute requirement for the society that we live in. The EPA also has a role in assisting to provide guidelines for waste minimisation, and that, of course, is a major step towards cutting out the litter stream, in all aspects, that eventually transcends into landfills.

So with all of the measures taken into consideration there obviously will still be problems for us in the future until we actually determine the nature of landfills, and we are continually looking towards encouraging best practice in landfills. One of the added disadvantages I think, which certainly has elicited that abhorrence that we feel about landfills, is that the manner in which the management of existing landfills has been undertaken in the past has certainly not been conducive to best practice. So all means that we can possibly devise under the different Acts that relate to how we can manage this area will certainly attempt to improve this area, and we are looking at improved best practice management in landfills from this time on.

Mr HILL: On 18 February 1998 the Minister told the House that action was being taken to resolve problems with the monitoring and collection of levies payable by dump operators. The Minister said that options being looked at included the installation of weighbridges, charging for clean air, as well as waste and random checks. Given the Minister's undertaking that this would be resolved within six months, can she tell the Committee what has happened in that time?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The comments and statements that I made at that time are certainly very relevant to the development process that is being undertaken through the department at the moment. As soon as the proposals have been developed to the degree that approvals will be sought, through me, I will be quite happy to give a briefing to the member to fill in the

details of how these requirements will take place in the future.

Mr HILL: Can the Minister let us know what was spent implementing the waste management strategy in the last financial year, and what is allocated in this coming one? What was spent in progressing the State Government's commitment to reducing waste to landfill by 50 per cent by the year 2000, and what is allocated in this year's budget for that purpose?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We have a very competent finance manager here who has figures that will certainly assist the honourable member, in terms of looking at the area of waste management and waste minimisation. The 1998-99 projected expenditure is similar to the amount expended in 1997-98, which is \$1.223 million. Community interest in waste issues has grown rapidly in recent years, due to a number of factors, which include an inappropriate siting of landfills (about which we are talking), the introduction of kerbside recycling and the uncertainties regarding the future availability of disposal sites.

The improvement of waste management in South Australia to meet our long-term needs has the highest priority in the environment and heritage portfolio, and the strategy about which the honourable member is talking (the integrated waste strategy for metropolitan Adelaide) sets out a number of key elements aimed at improving waste management practices. A number of those key initiatives will be carried out in 1998-99 according to the integrated waste strategy. The EPA has advertised for two staff to develop and implement the waste strategy, and it is planned to have them on board in the new financial year. Further strengthening of licence conditions for all waste depots will be undertaken, with the objective of achieving best practice operations—which I think I already indicated to the honourable member.

Industrial waste minimisation programs are a major component of the EPA's pollution prevention fund. Through that fund, the EPA provides consultancy grants of up to \$15 000 and loans of up to \$50 000 to businesses to assist with the implementation of pollution and waste reduction initiatives. In 1997-98, the EPA approved grants and loans totalling \$250 000 to local businesses, and the EPA is expecting to provide a further \$260 000 in grants and loans during 1998-99 and to spend about \$240 000 on pollution training during 1998-99 through to 1999-2000.

As part of the strategy, the EPA is committed to improving waste management infrastructure, and on that account the EPA will provide \$100 000 for the development of a waste infrastructure strategy, which will focus on a range of issues, including the development of guidelines for siting landfills and green waste; composting facilities; the development of a long-term strategy for the Wingfield waste depot; and the identification of suitable sites for the establishment of resource recovery facilities. It will also spend over \$200 000 conducting an audit of the commercial and industrial waste stream, which I believe I mentioned earlier. An understanding of the content and the quantity of the waste stream is paramount in effectively planning and implementing the waste strategy. The results of the audit will certainly assist the EPA in developing policies and procedures for the minimisation, transport, treatment and disposal of commercial and industrial waste.

Orphan and closed landfills are major generators of methane gas, which needs to be recovered and either used in cogeneration of electricity or, indeed, flared. As little work has been undertaken on such sites, the EPA will carry out an

investigation of landfill gas issues and also continue to play an active role in the assessment of contaminated sites. It is currently developing a contaminated site provision for incorporation into the Environment Protection Act 1993.

Recycle 2000 is under review at the moment, and waste management institutional arrangements to clarify the roles of State and local government will also be part of that review. Life cycle assessment is an important environmental management tool, and that provides a systematic approach to assessing the environmental performance of products and processes. The EPA contributed to the Life Cycle Inventory Data Project which was begun by the CRC for waste management and pollution control in New South Wales in 1997. This project is providing an important database for the development of LCA in Australia. The EPA will contribute \$25 000 for the further development of LCA in 1998-99.

I believe I indicated before that KESAB is responsible for the implementation and management of the Government's litter management strategy, Litter—It's your choice. KESAB's allocation of 30¢ per tonne of the solid waste levy will provide it with the annual funding of \$270 000 to fulfil its responsibilities. So, you can see that the waste strategy plan has a host of development procedures under way—and, in fact, some already have been undertaken and will continue throughout this coming year.

Ms BEDFORD: How much was spent in having South Australian input into the development of the national environment protection measures in 1997 and, of that, how much was spent on community consultation per measure?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Is the honourable member seeking the South Australian contribution or the national figure?

Ms BEDFORD: The South Australian figure.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It is not possible to provide that answer at the moment, so I will take it on notice. The honourable member will probably understand that there is a contribution by the South Australian Government to the Ministerial Council, which is matched by the Commonwealth Government. I will take that question on notice and seek to obtain the information as to the South Australian contribution.

Ms BEDFORD: How much was spent on enforcements in 1997, and what is allocated for 1998?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Can the honourable member clarify that—enforcement of what?

Ms BEDFORD: Enforcements within the EPA.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am having a little difficulty understanding fully the enforcement area to which the honourable member refers. Is she looking at prosecutions, etc? In administering this Act, the EPA carries out compliance, management, monitoring and enforcement programs, and approximately 90 per cent effort is directed at compliance, management and monitoring. It would be extremely difficult to make available the breakdown figures to which the honourable member refers. Could she be a little more specific?

Ms BEDFORD: Earlier today we asked how many cases were before the courts and I am alluding to the same sort of thing. How much is being spent on isolating cases and then proceeding with prosecutions?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Is the honourable member asking about the number of cases under investigation and the related costs?

Ms BEDFORD: That is right.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We will take the honourable member's question on notice and see what we can do.

Ms BEDFORD: What is budgeted for 1998 with respect to monitoring our waterways and marine areas?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I can provide the honourable member with an indicative figure. We expect a similar amount to be expended in 1998-99 as was expended in 1997-98, which will cover improvements, protection and monitoring of water and air quality. The allocation is \$1 017 000. In the area of water quality, the State will also expend amounts but they will be expended through the catchment boards, thus a different set of figures would apply. Further resources than those I am describing here would be utilised for water quality improvements.

It might assist the honourable member if I provide a bit of background information, acknowledging that the EPA supports other State agencies undertaking ambient water quality monitoring of water bodies in South Australia, which covers areas such as Lake Alexandrina, Lake Albert, the Murray River and a number of significant rivers and streams, such as the Blue Lake ground water supplies in the South-East, as well as the northern Adelaide and Willunga aquifers, and marine waters such as the Port River, metropolitan bathing waters and Boston Bay at Port Lincoln.

The purpose of this program is to provide data on water quality for the State Water Plan and the State Environment Reports, and to assess whether water quality in important water bodies is changing over time. It will also provide data to assess the long-term ecologically sustainable development of our water resources. The report assesses the results of the monitoring programs for the Port River. Results regarding the metropolitan bathing waters have been released, and reports assessing the condition of other water bodies are being developed and are due to be released soon. Data from the ambient water quality monitoring program are held in the environmental data management system. It is proposed that this data, together with reports assessing it, will be provided to the general public via the world wide web.

Mr HILL: On 10 June the Federal Minister for Resources, Energy and Coal Mining, Senator Parer, announced that the final 18 sites for a national radioactive waste repository are all located in South Australia. This suggests some new Liberal numberplate ideas, following the Premier's plan for 'Going All The Way'. We could have, for example, 'SA Glowing All The Way', or 'SA the Nuclear Waste Dump', or perhaps 'SA Gone Fishin'. Is the Minister aware of the decision to close the Scottish nuclear waste reprocessing plant, and what pressures will that decision have on the disposal of high level radioactive material? Would that mean that high level waste would be returned to South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It sounds very much as if the member for Kaurua is a bright little spark but, other than that, the answer is 'No, I am not aware.'

Mr HILL: Has the State Government agreed with the location of a nuclear repository in South Australia and what is proposed to be stored in this facility?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I believe that negotiations are still to be undertaken in that whole area, including an environmental impact statement. Until that is completed, I do not have any further information I can provide to the honourable member.

Mr HILL: The Minister cannot rule out the Government's agreeing to a repository in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The Federal Government has already made undertakings. The State Government can have only input in terms of the environmental impact statement. I am not sure whether that has started or is part of the

negotiation. Until those processes commence—and they have all been legislated for—there is no real input or information I can offer to the member for Kaurua.

Mr HILL: Does the State Government have a policy in opposition to storing nuclear waste in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I can only advise the honourable member that it is Commonwealth land that is being discussed; it is a Commonwealth process. When the processes begin, consultation with South Australia will take place.

Mr HILL: I take it then that there is no Government policy in opposition to storing nuclear waste in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I can only advise the honourable member that I do not believe there is any such policy anywhere else in Australia. The Governments of all States must look at supplying areas within their own State for radioactive repositories, because waste does emanate from our hospital systems and many other areas that are required at present. There is nothing further I can add at the present time.

Mr HILL: Will the Minister guarantee that any low level waste repository in South Australia will not become the logical place to dump high level waste, including waste from overseas?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: South Australia already has low level repositories. I believe that the honourable member was directing his question towards Commonwealth land. I have advised him that a series of processes are legislatively directed and, under those processes, certain requirements will be undertaken where each and every State, including South Australia, will be able to make some comment. I am quite sure that the Leader and members of the Opposition will be involved in that process at that time.

Mr HILL: I would like to turn to issues relating to sewage disposal at Bolivar, and other works. On 11 July 1997 the Chairman of the EPA said that United Water would pay the estimated cost of \$500 000 for fixing 'the big pong' and that the EPA would charge United Water for the cost of investigations, already at \$60 000. Did United Water pay the EPA's costs associated with investigating and correcting the Bolivar pong, including the cost of the Hartley report, and were any other penalties imposed by the EPA in relation to the failure of the Bolivar works?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The odours from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Plant impacted on many parts of Adelaide during May and June 1997. Having lived in those areas for 30 years, I know that it is not the first time those odours have disturbed the residents. The EPA engaged an independent auditor to technically review the plant operation during the period leading up to the odours and to advise on both short and long-term actions to be taken to eliminate the odours and prevent recurrences. The auditor's report was made publicly available when completed in September 1997. At its meeting of 9 July 1997 I understand that the authority resolved to request SA Water and United Water to develop a comprehensive environmental management system for the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Plant to ensure that a major odour problem did not recur.

The EMS, which must be consistent with international standard ISO 14001, should be submitted to the authority for approval and should include an environmental policy, environmental objectives, standard operating procedures, monitoring and reporting systems, an emergency response system, training programs, and auditing and continuous improvement. As a first step, SA Water and United Water

were requested to provide the EPA, within 28 days of the receipt of the request, a system of monitoring and reporting on plant operations and, in particular, the state of the biological filters in lagoons. Within the powers available under the Environment Protection Act, implementation of all the recommendations of the independent auditor's report should be pursued within the time frame specified in that report.

I understand that SA Water has complied with the recommendations of the auditor and is proceeding with the development of an EMS. As a consequence of the Bolivar incident in September 1997, the Government announced a commitment to further upgrade the Bolivar STW with the intention of eliminating background odours associated with the plant and improving the quality of effluent such that it would be suitable for unrestricted irrigation. Effluent reuse of up to 80 per cent is now proposed in the Virginia area and for the Virginia pipeline, and an associated filtration plant is well advanced in its construction. These commitments, along with trials into aquifer storage and recovery for winter effluent flow, form the basis of an environment improvement program that was appended to the EPA licence for Bolivar, which will lead to compliance with the marine environment protection policy.

Subsequent to the auditor's report, the EPA commenced formal investigations into the incident. Information arising from the investigation was referred to the Department of Public Prosecutions and preliminary advice has been received by the authority. I understand that the authority is seeking further independent advice before reaching a decision on whether to proceed with legal action. With regard to the question whether SA Water made any payment, SA Water indeed paid for the auditor's report.

Mr HILL: But not the \$500 000 for fixing the problem?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: They will pay for that as well.

Mr HILL: Given that SA Water pays licence fees of \$190 000 for Bolivar, \$31 000 for Port Adelaide, \$99 000 for Glenelg and \$33 000 for Christies Beach Sewerage Works, what inspection regime does the EPA have in relation to the sewerage works operated by United Water? Are the sites visited by EPA staff and, if so, how often? What analyses are made of discharges to Gulf St Vincent and how are these monitored to ensure that they comply with licence conditions?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I will ask Rob Thomas, the Director of the EPA, to attempt to give some information on that range of questions.

Mr Thomas: The inspection regime for SA Water would be part of the broader inspection regime used for all premises. I cannot give the honourable member exact numbers and detail on the number of inspections that have occurred, but since that incident we have introduced a more rigorous approach to that plant. We have required SA Water to report back to us on a number of requirements to which the Minister has alluded, including the auditor's recommendations. With regard to monitoring, all licensed premises under the Act are required to submit detailed monitoring plans, which data is attached to their licences. That information is now publicly available. It includes data on all the significant pollutants that impact on the marine environment, in this case, because that is where they all discharge at this point, although it is intended to phase that out through the environment improvement program process. It includes nutrients, pathogens and heavy metals. Obviously, we keep a watching brief on that information to make sure that, as we approach 2001, as is

required under the marine environment protection policy, subordinate under the Act, they reach the new standards.

Mr HILL: Will the Minister or the department take on notice the details of that question that could not be provided?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We are quite happy to comply.

Mr HILL: The 1997 Auditor-General's Report (page 252) indicates that in 1996-97 the EPA spent \$179 000 on travel. Will the EPA explain the reason for what appears to be a very large expense? In particular, for 1996-97 how much was spent on local travel; how many trips were made and how much was spent on interstate travel; and how many trips were made and how much was spent on overseas travel? I seek similar figures for 1997-98 and the budget for 1998-99, although I expect that might need to be taken on notice.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The level of detail that the honourable member is seeking is certainly not something we have on hand. We will be quite happy to take the question on notice, although I have a little concern about attempting to provide that information for 1998-99. In discussing travel, the honourable member will realise that that has not occurred as yet.

Mr HILL: Budget figures for 1998-99 will be sufficient. Last year the then Minister told this Committee that Cabinet had approved an extra \$1.9 million for dredging over six years. How much will be spent on sand management in 1998-99, and can the Minister point to this information in the budget papers?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Would the honourable member repeat the dollar figure?

Mr HILL: Apparently, the previous Minister said that Cabinet had approved an extra \$1.9 million for dredging over six years.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: In some of my earlier comments and opening statements, we talked about the one-off amount that was utilised for sand replenishment and dredging at Brighton. That was a contract, completed in 1997, for replacing 6 000 cubic metres of sand at Brighton by dredging sand from offshore at Port Stanvac. The work took one month to complete. The cost of that entire operation was \$4.4 million. A biannual amount of approximately \$2.4 million was utilised in these programs. So, that \$4.4 million included the \$2.4 million. The honourable member will find the projected budget for 1998-99 under the budgeted statement of revenue and expenses for administered items, page 250, under 'Other expenses—coast protection fund'. It shows that the projected expenditure for 1998-99 is \$790 000. That \$790 000 is for coast protection and rehabilitation works for the State's coastline. That includes rock protection, storm surge, flood control barriers and construction of groynes.

Mr HILL: How much money will be spent this year on the sand replenishment programs at the Glenelg and West Beach site?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The departments of DEHAA and Transport and Urban Planning had met to determine how the State responsibility for sand bypassing at Glenelg and West Beach would be assigned between the agencies. It was therefore determined that the Department of Transport and Urban Planning would undertake the operational responsibility for sand bypassing together with its navigational responsibilities under the guidance of the broader sand management requirements set by the Coast Protection Board. I can provide the honourable member with an indication of costs. Although these will come under the responsibility of the Department of Transport and Urban Planning, the State will provide funds

of \$.5 million per annum directly to the Department of Transport and Urban Planning for the sand bypassing at Glenelg.

Mr HILL: Does that come from your budget?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: No.

Mr HILL: Yesterday during Estimates B the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked a series of questions of the Minister for Primary Industries relating to construction of a breakwater at Penneshaw. I do not know whether the Minister is aware of this, but the Opposition has been given reports that a breakwater at Penneshaw is being constructed from stone quarried from the hill immediately above Penneshaw. This 'mine' is clearly visible to the town, the ferry terminal and tourists as they approach from the sea. As we understand it, no mining right has been granted over this land. The stone is being quarried without any mining right. At the same time I also understand that the area where the quarrying is taking place is a habitat for the glossy black variety of cockatoo which the *Advertiser* highlighted earlier this week. There are concerns not only about the environmental damage caused by the blasting and the quarrying but about the effect this might have on the cockatoo. Is the Minister aware of this? Has the Minister or her department taken any action in relation to it?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: In the first instance I would suggest that, if the questions were asked of the Minister for Primary Industries, whose portfolios include mines, and there is an indication that blasting was taking place without alleged proper processes, the question was certainly asked in the right place. I have no knowledge of the issues that the honourable member has raised. As I said, it is more properly placed within that jurisdiction.

Mr HILL: The Minister for Primary Industries was not aware, either. It appears that this is an illegal act. There are concerns not only about the effect on the local environment in terms of the aesthetics but also about the black cockatoo, an endangered species. From that point of view, I believe that it falls within your jurisdiction. I would ask the appropriate officers to investigate this situation.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I admire the honourable member's concern; I think most people here would. Perhaps if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition were to provide that information to the relevant authority we could look at that rather more quickly than by providing answers in *Hansard*, because this process will take a little longer than an approach to the proper authorities with the information so that an investigation can be made.

Mr HILL: The question was: is the Minister aware of it? She is not. Now that I know she is not, I will provide her with the information. In January, the Government released a consolidated discussion paper on a marine and estuarine strategy for South Australia coordinated by the Department of Premier and Cabinet and a committee comprising the chief executives of the Departments of Premier and Cabinet, Primary Industries and the Environment. Is the Minister aware of criticism of the draft strategy in that it fails to provide an ecosystem approach to conservation and sustainable management of South Australia's marine environment and that it lacks technical credibility?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: No, I am not aware of that criticism.

Mr HILL: You are now, Minister. Given that the Government had first proposed release of the strategy last November, what is holding up this work, and when will the Government release its strategy?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The sustainable management of South Australia's marine environment is certainly of crucial importance to the economy of State. The proper conservation and protection of marine ecological systems that certainly drives much of this productivity and the strategic management of the multiple uses of the sea are issues requiring timely attention to secure future sustainability. With this in mind, the South Australian Government approved the development of a marine and estuarine strategy for South Australia. The strategy is nearing completion and is expected to be released mid year.

Key issues addressed in the strategy include the need for clean and healthy seas, sustainable use and certainly conserving biodiversity and heritage. The principle driving mechanism for the strategy has been a high level steering committee comprising the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Primary Industries and Resources and my department, DEHAA. A technical committee has supported that steering committee and is identifying the issues and preparing the discussion papers. Community consultation has been conducted throughout the process and a community reference group has allowed a range of interests to input directly into this process. I can only say again that it is of extreme and crucial importance to the State of South Australia, and that strategy is expected to be released quite soon.

Mr HILL: Will that strategy include an action plan? The Opposition understands that part of the problem in having the strategy approved is that Cabinet has been holding it up partly because certain proposals requiring action are contrary to the views or the policy positions held by some of the Minister's colleagues.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I think the member for Kurna is drawing a rather long bow if he can tell me what Cabinet has decided in terms of a document and the comments made. I assure the honourable member that he is totally incorrect in any of his assumptions along those lines. As with any strategy, it is not a matter of providing an egotistical base for some people to put information together just to sit on a dusty shelf and gather even more dust: it is a means by which this Government will implement its policies and it will do that through the marine and estuarine strategy. I have no doubt that—once again with the honourable member's very strong interest in this area—once the strategy is out and the implementation of the different areas of marine and estuarine protection are being implemented, the honourable member will give his full support.

Mr HILL: I will certainly give my full support if I agree with it and it matches the paper put out by the Opposition in January this year. My final question on this issue is: what marine environment qualifications are held by the four senior public servants who are responsible for the development of policy; that is, the heads of the Departments of Premier and Cabinet, Primary Industries and Environment and the project officer; and does the Minister agree that the strategy needs to be driven from her department rather than the Premier's.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I think I have already answered that question. It is not just a matter of one particular area: it is a whole of Government approach. The experts within our Government agencies are garnered from all sides of the jurisdictional portfolios and each of them certainly has had an input. I have no doubt that the expertise required in terms of scientific and technical knowledge has also been provided across the range of experts in each of the departmental areas.

Mr HILL: I turn now to coastal programs. At the Third Biennial National Coast to Coast Coastal Management

Conference held in Perth this year we heard reference to a \$1 million Federal grant for a Western Australian program called 'Coast West Coast Care' and Senator Campbell, representing the Federal Environment Minister Robert Hill, spoke of \$125 million being available from the Federal environment fund for the coast and clean seas program. Can the Minister advise what Federal grants South Australia will receive in 1998-99 for coastal marine programs and indicate where these are identified in the budget papers?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I advise the honourable member that a large number of projects have all applied for specific programs to be accepted through the national heritage trust moneys. Those projects have been assessed through the different processes. They are now waiting for acceptance through the Federal Government, and it will only be when we receive advice that any or all of those projects have been accepted that I will be able to advise the honourable member.

Mr HILL: Perhaps the Minister could indicate when she will know the success of the South Australian submissions.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I would like to be able to indicate that but this is a matter for the Federal Government and its processes. Until those processes are completed by a completely different jurisdiction, I am afraid I cannot give the honourable member the answer.

Mr HILL: I turn now to the Patawalonga stormwater issue. Last year Mr Thomas said that the EPA had not had an opportunity to consider the proposal for a combined discharge of sewage effluent from the Glenelg sewage works and stormwater from the Patawalonga. Given the recognition that stormwater run-off and sewage effluent are the two major pollution problems facing our marine environment in the Gulf St Vincent, can the EPA now give the Committee advice on the effect of discharging the stormwater at Glenelg North rather than passing through the Patawalonga as a settling basin?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We will need to take that question on notice.

Mr HILL: Following up that question—and perhaps this may need to be taken on notice, too—what pollutant loads will be discharged direct to the gulf; what are the likely effects on seagrasses in the region; and what scientific studies have been undertaken by the EPA to determine the effects in relation to the discharge into the gulf at Glenelg?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I will ask Mr Robert Thomas to comment.

Mr Thomas: I presume we are referring to the discharges from the Patawalonga—existing and proposed—with regard to the question.

Mr HILL: Both.

Mr Thomas: Currently, the discharge during high stormwater flows consists primarily of sediments, as you can tell from the discolouration when stormwater hits the sea water. Of course, there is a pathogen loading as well from dog faeces and other sorts of things which we find on pavements. There is a lower nutrient loading and then there are various contaminants that you expect from run-off from roadways, including fine particles from tyres, cars and also exhausts. There is a whole range of contaminants in stormwater but the primary contaminant or pollutant is sediment. A number of the initiatives of the catchment boards, in particular the Patawalonga Catchment Board, are intended to concentrate on sediments through their sedimentation basins and wetlands to improve that. A monitoring scheme is being established with a decent baseline to determine whether that is successful, but it will take five to 10 years.

A report is being produced by the Patawalonga Catchment Board which actually has some projections on reduction in sediment loading. The other main contributors that have caused seagrass decline are the nutrients from sewage, and the Government is committed to cleaning up the sewage plants to change that. In the Patawalonga area also we have the Glenelg effluent outfall. The effects of sewage effluent are fairly well understood but stormwater effluent effects are not as well understood. The EPA is currently raising funds to conduct a major investigation of the Gulf St Vincent new shore area to understand better the stormwater effects so that we can determine future improvements.

It is also worth pointing out that there are some very encouraging signs where we have stopped sewage disposal, in this case sludge disposal, from the Port Adelaide sewage plant. A recent dive on that site demonstrated that there has been seagrass recovery, so I believe that the Government's strategy for cleaning up the gulf is working, but there is a need to implement it fully and to include stormwater.

Mr HILL: My next question concerns the secret contract that the Government made with United Water, and I assume that the EPA has a copy of the relevant sections. It sets down response times for sewage spills. For customer internal spills, the requirement is for all spills to be attended within one hour. For external spills, the requirement is for all spills to be attended within two hours. For other spills the response time is four hours. However, the contract is silent on the question of when United Water is required to inform the EPA of a spill that may threaten the environment.

For example, on 26 December 1997 it was reported that raw sewage flowed for 11 hours into Lovell Reserve in the Torrens catchment and may have contributed to an outbreak of blue-green algae in the Torrens. Similarly, a spill of sewage in the streets of Mitcham was not reported to the EPA because United Water deemed it was not serious enough. Under what circumstances is United Water required to report sewage spills to the EPA?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I know that this is an area of concern, particularly as the honourable member has used the dramatic term 'secret documents', but I do not think that there is a great deal that is secret about the environment enforcement and reporting provisions of the contract. In the first instance, local government authorities should be informed about all instances of sewage overflows, not just the most serious incidents. They should also be provided with historical data which could indicate possible sewage overflow problems in their council area. That takes reporting right across the board.

Incident reporting is determined by the severity of the incident and it has been undertaken by United Water since the commencement of the contract with SA Water. There are three types of report: a type 1 incident causes material or serious environmental harm; a type 2 incident causes significant public concern and is likely to result in further action being taken, that is, complaints to the media, Environment Protection Authority, SA Water, and local, State or Federal Government bodies and other organisations; and type 3 incidents fall between the above definitions.

Type 1 and type 2 incidents have always been reported to the EPA. A manhole overflow which results in a minor discharge into the stormwater system was previously regarded as a type 3 incident for reporting purposes, and under those circumstances it was not reported to the EPA. Since January 1998, all waste water spills of any nature that enter the stormwater system are reported. The EPA has

requested that SA Water modify its incident reporting procedures to include local government for type 1 and type 2 incidents and, as part of the SA Water licence conditions, contingency plans are required for each of the four metropolitan sewage treatment plants covering corrective action to be taken for failures at the plants resulting in environmental harm.

As part of the update of these plans, SA Water will be requested to modify its reporting processes to include local government in that reporting chain. In relation to the release of information concerning sewage overflow problem areas, SA Water has been requested to provide a report outlining current performance relating to the management of blockages and overflows in the Adelaide waste water network. Following the completion of the report, negotiations between the EPA and SA Water will be carried out to agree on performance parameters for the sewerage system using overseas and Australian benchmarks. That is to provide world best practice in the management of the system and to make sure that it is continually achieved.

United Water has been requested by SA Water to provide a reporting mechanism to identify problem spots in the sewerage system, to enable preventive maintenance measures to be undertaken and therefore reduce the incidence of failures. As another way of being open and informing the public as much as possible, this information will be made available through the EPA public register.

Mr HILL: In her answer, the Minister mentioned a date. Would she please repeat it?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: 1 January 1998.

Mr HILL: Did United Water report to the EPA the spill that occurred on 31 March 1998 when 500 000 litres of raw sewage spilled into the Panalatinga River?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I advise the honourable member that we will take that on notice.

Mr HILL: During the process of applications for approval to farm bluefin tuna at Kangaroo Island, the Opposition received several letters raising issues including the lack of research into the effect on ecosystems and proximity to sea lion and penguin colonies. What involvement did the Department of Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs have in the decision taken in 1996 to zone virtually the whole coast of South Australia for aquaculture?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member referred to the whole coast. Will he please repeat his question?

Mr HILL: I was talking about the zoning of Kangaroo Island, but I inadvertently said South Australia. I understand that all of the coast of Kangaroo Island has been zoned for aquaculture. My question was: what involvement did the Minister's department have in that decision?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member's question crosses into the jurisdiction of the primary industries portfolio, which deals specifically with that activity, although his question also relates to the input of the Environment Department in this decision. I am not aware of the declaration of the Kangaroo Island coast with respect to aquaculture.

I believe the member also mentioned that this was a decision taken in 1996. I certainly have no information that can assist the member in the question that he has just asked. It is not available to me. I believe that it probably would be more pertinent to take up this issue with the Department of Primary Industries.

Mr HILL: I have a follow-up question, and I am happy for the Minister take this on notice. If in fact my claim is correct that the whole of the coast has been zoned that way,

could the department assess whether or not there are areas which, for environmental reasons, should not be included for commercial usage?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am certainly happy to take the question on notice and furnish whatever information we can.

Mrs MAYWALD: This is a follow-up question to one that I asked earlier today and I have read through the answer because I wanted to clarify it first. Minister Kotz, I was a bit surprised when you showed surprise at the fact that I knew about the board's decision yesterday and you were not aware of it. What was the detail of the conversation between yourself and the Acting Chairman of the board last night in relation to the board meeting, and also what advice was given to him about what he can now do in relation to the levy for the South-East catchment for the next financial year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I thank the honourable member for her question. The answer that was given was in terms of the administrative processes that formally will be followed that enables the Minister to take certain actions on certain occurrences. At this time I have had no formal notification of the board's decisions. Until that formal notification is given I certainly cannot answer in terms of the details that the member has asked.

Mrs MAYWALD: If formal advice is sent through to the office today what would be the process that the Minister would undertake?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I would have to assess what the formal advice is first, before I would know what procedures I need to take.

Mr HILL: On World Environment Day, the Minister put out a media release with the Minister for Police, Mr Iain Evans, relating to smoky vehicles. I must say as somebody who drives from way down in the south on a regular basis I am perpetually amazed at the number of smoky vehicles on our roads. On 5 June the Minister said there would be a blitz on smoky vehicles and that defect notices would be issued. Can the Minister tell me how successful or otherwise that blitz was, and how many notices were issued?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The member has certainly identified a program in which we were quite happy to participate, and certainly help initiate. The Environment Protection Agency has always had a role to play in observing excessively smoky vehicles, and under the current arrangements owners of vehicles that are observed by EPA officers are sent an advisory letter requesting that necessary engine repairs be undertaken. The current program commenced in April 1996 and it is run in cooperation with the South Australian Police and Transport SA. Both of those agencies are responsible for administering regulations which control excessive vehicle emissions and they have powers, via issuing a defect notice, to require mandatory repairs of unroadworthy vehicles.

Some 1 033 vehicles—current, as of 7 May—have been observed by EPA officers, of which 45 per cent were diesel-fuelled vehicles and 55 per cent were petrol-fuelled vehicles. Approximately 29 per cent of owners have now returned repair advice forms, detailing the vehicle repairs that were undertaken. Obviously this response is not necessarily as great as we would like, so one option to improve that response rate is to adopt the mandatory repair approach. I believe this is successfully used by the Victorian and New South Wales EPAs, where vehicle owners are given 30 days to fix the vehicles and forward proof of repairs to the EPA, or incur a fine if that is not done. The legislative amendments necessary for this type of system are now being considered by EPA and Transport SA.

There is not just increasing domestic concern but also international concern about the harmful nature of emissions from diesel-fuelled vehicles. The control of gross smoke emissions from these vehicles also remains a priority for the program. Repairs for diesel vehicles normally only require regular servicing rather than a major engine overhaul. So they can be simply fixed. The EPA is organising a metropolitan-wide program targeting vehicles with excessive exhaust emissions with both SAPOL and Transport SA.

During the week of World Environment Day, a very specific blitz of smoky vehicles took place in conjunction with these other agencies and it was during that time that the police were to defect any vehicles that were not complying with the regulations. At this time I have not had any response to the end result of that week-long blitz. I hope it was successful. I think we all suffer in the traffic that we have to travel in to get from A to B in the course of our respective duties throughout the day, and it is not pleasant.

The EPA program is certainly one that raises public awareness, which is part of the concerns, and certainly that awareness then relates to the importance of reducing vehicle exhaust emissions. I think it probably promotes the need for all motorists to regularly service their vehicle irrespective of exhaust emissions being visible or not. I am as interested as the member for Kaurna in the results of the exercise that was undertaken and I would be happy to relay back to him the results once I have a response myself.

Ms BEDFORD: The Opposition has received a complaint from Mulhern Waste Oil that the State Government is ignoring the issue of management of waste oil. The company claims that the Premier refuses to meet with them and that plans by the company for a waste oil recycling plant are being frustrated by the EPA. Can the Minister tell the Committee what the Government's policy is towards regulating the reuse of waste oil, and in particular how the application by Mulhern is being processed?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I thank the honourable member for her question, which I will take in two parts. The question relates to the Mulhern Waste Oil company and it also picks up the aspect of oil reuse in South Australia, which I believe was part of the question as well. Used oil is a listed waste under the Environment Protection Act and it is estimated that some 11 million litres of waste oil is collected in South Australia. Currently, there is indeed a very strong demand, and it is reused as a fuel for brick manufacturers, as a boiler fuel and as a fuel for smelters at Olympic Dam. In fact, South Australia leads the way, in that we are very successful in turning some 10.5 million litres of the 11 million litres that we extract each year into a reusable product. Other States seem to have greater problems than we do. In fact, their storage of unused oils can be anything between 8 to 12 million litres. So South Australia certainly has led the area of environmental concern in terms of turning oil into a reusable commodity.

It is understood that Mulhern Waste Oil has raised some concerns with regard to what it sees as obstruction by the EPA to the upgrading of its waste oil treatment facility to incorporate a thin film evaporation unit. I am advised by the EPA that it has rightfully sought information from the company to enable it to undertake an assessment of the emissions and environmental risks associated with the process. However, to date, the response has been relatively unsophisticated, given the complexity of the technology that is to be used. The EPA has in fact held many meetings with the company, and is willing to hold further meetings in order

to progress the issue. However, the company needs to gain more professional advice than has been the case to date to be able to assist this process.

In early 1998, the Oil Recyclers Association published an Environmental Code of Practice for the management of used lubricating oil. This offers guidance to lubricating oil companies, retailers, transporters and recyclers on issues such as storage, handling, waste management, education, emergency planning and enforcement of legislation. At a recent meeting in Brisbane, representatives of agencies in South Australia, Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia advised that they would not be recommending to Government to become signatories to this code but would offer to support its aims. The responsibilities of Governments under the code include managing activities that produce oil, education, storage and collection of oil and enforcement, and I am advised that State authorities are ready to fulfil the responsibilities set out in that code.

Ms BEDFORD: If we agree with it, why are we not going to sign it?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I believe I just explained that the State authorities, under their respective jurisdictions, have responsibilities placed by Government under the code that they follow, so the State authorities already fulfil the responsibilities that the industry group set out in the code.

Ms BEDFORD: My information indicates that the kind of plant that Mulhern is talking about is already established and operating in Western Australia. Have we had a look at that?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: It is not a matter of making comparisons with a particular project. We have not in any way rejected the project. The fact is that Mulhern at this stage has not complied sufficiently with the request for suitable information to enable the EPA to assist it in the process and, until Mulhern complies, there is nothing further we can do.

Mr HILL: I have one other question in relation to the EPA and to another Liberal Party promise made prior to the last election, in its executive summary of promises under 'Environment and Natural Resources'. Under the heading 'A Cleaner South Australia-Pollution Control and Waste Management', the Liberal Party promised that it would facilitate development of integrated resource recovery centres at appropriate locations. Will the Minister indicate how that has been done to date and what plans are included in this year's budget?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am very pleased that the honourable member asked this question: it is very pleasing to be able to advise the honourable member that the Liberal Government continues to fulfil its election strategies. In 1997, some \$10.6 million worth of materials were recovered from our waste stream by kerbside collection and drop-off centres alone—and this does not include all the industrial recycling that is going on within Adelaide's industry base, nor does it include such waste as building and demolition waste or green waste. These last two industries are growing in Adelaide, and are certainly responsible for diverting large tonnages from South Australia's landfill. Through demolition waste recycling, for example, some 150 000 tonnes was diverted from landfill last year, and there is a very strong market growth locally for this material. The waste treatment and recycling and associated industries are already large employers of skilled and semi-skilled labour. Container collection depots employ some 600 people across the State. People are required in the collection, transport, sorting, baling, processing, value adding and sales from these commodities.

South Australia is certainly unique in that we have container deposit legislation. No other State in Australia has the privately run drop-off centres that we have. In addition, Adelaide and other centres have kerbside recycling. As a result, Adelaide and South Australia is certainly equal to the national average in terms of nearly all recyclable commodities and exceeds the national average in regard to beverage containers. South Australians recover for recycling and reuse some 83 per cent of their glass beverage containers, 73 per cent of PET beverage containers and 84 per cent of aluminium cans. The national average is only 45 per cent for glass, 30 per cent for PET and 65 per cent for aluminium.

The importance of South Australian container collection depots cannot be underestimated. Of the 109 000 tonnes of domestic materials recycled through kerbside and collection depots, 71 500 tonnes is handled by the depots—that is an accumulation of 66.1 per cent. More can be done in South Australia, however, through kerbside collection, particularly collection and recycling of newspaper and other glass containers. Kerbside collection of recyclables is facilitated within local government by Recycle 2000 Inc., while collection of materials has worked reasonably well. Markets for these materials has always been the most critical factor. Without markets and uses for the materials, there is little reason to collect them.

While some good markets exist for locally collected materials, such as newspapers and some plastics and glass, there is a need to improve our recycling industry infrastructure so that it can be processed in South Australia and not shipped to the eastern seaboard for reprocessing. Cardboard, office paper, liquid paperboard containers and PET are sent interstate, and this adds to the cost of recycling in South Australia, as freight then becomes the single most expensive component.

In this regard, the State Government is negotiating with key industries to establish facilities in Adelaide. The EPA has also provided grants and loans to various industries to develop new technologies to recover rubber, plastics and scrap metal. However, the new primary focus for these grants will be on the facilitation of local market development.

Traditionally, purchase prices for kerbside materials in Adelaide have been developed through negotiated agreements, and certain commodities are protected by a floor price. For example, ACI Glass has for many years held a monopoly on glass supply, and its purchase price has been well above the international market price. The current Australian glass price is \$72 a tonne, compared with the international market price of about \$32 a tonne. Competition policy and other events will cause downward pressure on kerbside materials pricing and pose obvious threats to the viability of recycling.

The Australia-New Zealand Environment Council of Ministers met in New Zealand recently to discuss this problem and is considering a range of options to counteract this very aspect. The Government's preference is that industry introduce greater waste minimisation in its packaging requirements and provide funding towards recycling, in particular, looking at processing and treatment. So, I am sure that the member for Kaurna can see that a great amount has been done in South Australia with regard to resource recovery.

The honourable member would also be aware that a number of resource recovery facilities have already been established, including the Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority and Recyclers of South Australia. Further facilities are under way, such as the IWS Resource Recovery

facility, which was approved by the Port Adelaide Enfield Council and which will be built at Wingfield. In addition, we have 600 bottle depots. It is important that we have not only sorting and processing facilities but also treatment facilities. South Australia has certainly a world class glass sorting and beneficiation plant, and other such plants are being negotiated. The bottom line is that many of these outcomes will be determined by international markets and their determining factors.

Mr HILL: Following the answer to my inadvertent dorothy dixer, I would like to ask the Minister something a little harder in relation to my question on notice (No. 92), which she answered in the last session of Parliament. It was about litter targets falling by 25 per cent. The Minister, in her answer, suggested that she might introduce container deposit legislation if those targets were not reached. My question relates to correspondence that the Opposition has received from Recyclers of South Australia, which indicates a number of problems with the litter stream and, in particular, reference is made to a number of products that are not subject to container deposit legislation.

Problem litter includes various alcohol containers, alcoholic and non-alcoholic cider bottles, plastic bottles for flavoured milk and fruit juices, non-carbonated flavoured waters, and so on. The correspondence refers to the volume of these containers in the litter stream. How are the targets being monitored, and is the Minister aware of problems outlined by the Recyclers Association relating to lack of data?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I mentioned in a previous answer that CDL has certainly worked very well in South Australia and that we are the only State that has undertaken this exercise at this time. Agreements were made with industry when CDL was introduced in 1975. At that time industry had two years to gear up, if you like, before the legislation became operational in 1977. The legislation was introduced primarily as a litter control measure to specifically control cans. As the honourable member knows, the legislation has been very successful in reducing beverage litter. The latest statistics show that 71 per cent of beverage litter in South Australia is related to non-CDL containers.

As the honourable member rightly points out, CDL does not apply currently to all beverages in South Australia: it applies to carbonated soft drinks, beer and wine-based beverages, including wine coolers and spirit-based mixes. The beverages to which it does not apply are wine, milk and fruit juice. Some others are exempted, such as cider and beverages made from fermented fruit—contained only in glass. Some other anomalies have emerged in terms of new beverages that have been released onto the market, such as non-carbonated flavoured waters and the new range of sports drinks. Manufacturers of these beverages have been given two years to reduce their litter by 25 per cent or face being taken under CDL.

CDL certainly achieves recovery rates in South Australia of beverage containers typically greater than 72 per cent, and as high as 98 per cent. The PET recovery rate is 73 per cent, glass is 84 per cent and aluminium is 84 per cent. A report was undertaken by Matthew Warren in 1995 who found that the scheme in South Australia, after unredeemed deposits were taken into account, cost all sectors of the beverage industry affected by CDL approximately \$176 000. One soft drink manufacturer has previously indicated that the scheme is cost neutral. The recycling industry advises that an estimated 600 people are directly employed in the collection depots.

A range of charities and community groups also benefit from the collection of recyclables and the 5¢ deposit. Beverage products certainly make up the largest volume of material collected at kerb side, and beverage glass would constitute the largest fraction of weight of glass collected. Legislation, of course, ensures that consumers receive their 5¢ deposit. Retailers and fillers cannot market beverages unless they have an arrangement in place to recover their containers either through the depot collection system or at point of sale. Contracts do exist between fillers, importers and recovery agents to support the collection depot return system.

Two-thirds of all recyclables are returned through the network of depots. Of the 110 000 tonnes of domestic-related waste recycled in Adelaide, 71 500 tonnes is collected by recycling centres, and the remainder is collected from Adelaide's kerb-side system. Local government, of course, is particularly supportive of CDL as it reduces clean-up costs and certainly assists in maintaining the kerb-side systems. Unredeemed deposits are forfeited by the consumer to the collector of the material. The industry has been advised that, if by the year 2000 it has not moved to support the schemes that reduce the rate of litter, the Government will look at further introducing greater areas of CDL that will bring other beverages and containers under this legislation.

I can assure the honourable member that industry must deal with this in the short term. It has certainly been advised of the arrangements that are in place through my department in recent times. It has been made aware that there is an imminent date of close-off for voluntary assistance through its own industry codes. If that does not achieve the expected desired results, we will certainly look at increasing the range of CDL that is covered by the legislation.

Mr HILL: Is the Minister saying that, unless the target of 25 per cent is met by approximately two years from today, she will look at introducing container legislation? That is not a very big threat. Will you introduce it or will you just look at it?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I think that it is a big threat, because we are determined that that will happen. If industry has not moved in a voluntary manner, I certainly see no reason why we will not move to increase a range of areas. We acknowledge that CDL has been extremely important to South Australia in terms of reducing the litter stream. I am fully supportive of introducing a form of regulation if industry cannot comply.

Mr HILL: I turn now to issues relating to biodiversity, native vegetation and heritage. On 17 June 1998 the *Advertiser* published a story under the heading 'Where there's muck there's good money'. The story was all about charcoal production in the Murray-Mallee and, in particular, about one operator located near Blanchetown, who is reported to operate 29 pits that each hold four tonnes of mallee roots at a time. The story said that the Mallee had three major producers and several small operators and that the producers could not keep up with the export demand. The large-scale production of charcoal using mallee roots in the Murray-Mallee region has obvious implications for the protection of native vegetation in South Australia. Where do the charcoal manufacturers source the mallee roots for their operations?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am afraid I am unaware of that. I cannot help the honourable member with any information at this time.

Mr HILL: If the Minister is not aware, will she make sure that the department checks to ensure that the mallee is not being cut in contravention of the Native Vegetation Act to

supply mallee roots to those operators? I will give the Minister a copy of the article.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We will look at the article and obtain further information.

Mr HILL: What amount was spent on progress towards implementation of the national reserves system, known as CAR, according to the IBRA regions? How many full-time equivalent staff in DEHAA worked directly on this in 1997-98 and how many will do so in the next financial year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I refer the honourable member to a previous answer that I gave in relation to the key outputs that we spoke about in 1998-99, when I noted the five key areas under the classification of output. One was the representative reserve system, and at that time I gave the information to the honourable member that the expenditure projected—again indicative figures—for this coming year is \$2 926 912.

Mr HILL: I understand that a fundraiser has been appointed to raise money for the koala management program on Kangaroo Island. What was the cost of the fundraising program in the last financial year; how much money was raised by the fundraiser; what is the anticipated program cost in the next financial year; and how much is expected to be raised?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The honourable member has rightly pointed out that there has been a public appeal and sponsorship program aimed at koala rescue management, which was established mainly to raise community awareness of the management strategy and to recoup some of the Government's funding component. To date, \$60 000 has been raised. We have had some difficulties in having to compete with the Olympic Games sponsorship and with the Princess Diana appeal. A total of \$125 000 has been spent on community awareness, an education program and the public appeal. An overall budget of \$635 000 was provided for implementing that strategy over the past 18 months, from January 1997 to June 1998.

I am sure that the honourable member is also aware that the koala rescue program has significantly assisted in raising the international profile of Kangaroo Island as a tourist destination to view Australia's unique wildlife. We have had considerable national and international media interest in the management of koalas on Kangaroo Island which has been maintained with articles published in overseas newspapers and with magazine and film crews visiting the island. In the past 18 months, something like 16 film crews from different countries have taken film either for documentaries or just for their news services, filming various aspects of the management program and other wildlife features for overseas distribution.

The program has, to all intents and purposes, been extremely successful. From the 1994 population of some 3 000 to 5 000 koalas we have now sterilised almost 2 500, with 850 having been relocated to suitable habitat areas in the South-East. The program will not necessarily involve the same amount of dollars. We have pretty well completed the program at this stage, although there will be monitoring and a continual evaluation and other programs that will look at revegetation of their habitat. In terms of absolute dollars, at this stage the program costs for the next two years are estimated to be under \$200 000.

Mr HILL: I do not think the Minister has answered my question, which was, to put it bluntly: did the fundraising efforts cost the Government money or did the Government make a profit out of it?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: If we go back to the beginning of the comments I made to the honourable member—I presume he was listening at the time—I advised that we had raised \$60 000 but at this stage what we had spent on community awareness, education and the public appeal had cost \$125 000. We did not exactly come out in front.

Mr HILL: Will the Government be maintaining this very effective program into this coming budget year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: There is no doubt that it has been an exceptionally effective program. It was quite obvious from the beginning that the Government was going to have to put in considerable money to enable this program to be the success that it is. Now that the program has been fairly well concluded (other than management arrangements that will be more minor than those we have undertaken at this stage), costs are estimated at under \$200 000 over the two year period.

Mr HILL: What contribution does the State Government make to the various endangered species programs, and what number of staff and full-time equivalents work directly on that program?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The Government has allocated \$300 000 per annum as matching funds for the National Heritage Trust endangered species program. This means that South Australia can provide a major and significant contribution to addressing the needs of endangered species in the State. We do have a full-time threatened species scientific officer who has now been appointed to conduct a review of the schedules of threatened species under the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 and to ensure that there is effective integration of the threatened species program with the regional diversity planning process. The endangered species program funds are also being directed towards a variety of projects that enhance the conservation of endangered species in South Australia.

The formerly endangered brush-tailed bettong is ensured a reasonably positive future in terms of some of our threatened species. In fact, the brush-tailed bettong was delisted from the Commonwealth threatened species schedules altogether. The greater stick-nest rat has been recommended for upgrading from endangered to vulnerable. The threats to the Kangaroo Island glossy black cockatoo have been identified and are now being managed by members of the local community. The most recent count of the cockatoo population involving 130 of the island's 4 500 residents recorded over 200 birds. In effect, this is the highest recording since systematic counting began in the 1980s. So, some exceptionally good results have come about from these focus plans. The strong community focus on recovery plans is further reflected by what is excellent work of the groups such as the Threatened Species Network and the Threatened Plant Action Group.

There is a range of other projects that are also continuing to provide valuable information on managing threatened species and threatening processes. For example, I know that the honourable member is aware of Operation Bounceback, the species re-introduction programs at Venus Bay, and new introduction programs on offshore islands as well as coordinated rabbit and fox control programs that protect mallee fowl populations. The regional biodiversity planning program is leading to a strategic approach to the management of threatened species, threatened communities and threatening processes on a regional basis. It has been exceedingly pleasing to see the results that have come out in a reasonably short time.

Operation Bounceback has been one of the most successful programs undertaken. In fact, it was recognised recently by the Federal Government. There will be a further injection of funds into that program with assistance from the Federal Government because of its obvious success. The yellow-footed rock-wallaby was one of the endangered species that is now thriving within the Flinders Ranges. When the program was first undertaken, the species population was down to about 80 or 90. Now there is a thriving population of anything between 600 and 800.

Mr HILL: I thank the Minister for that detail; it is good to hear of some success stories. What amount was spent by the department in the last financial year on marine biodiversity conservation? What is allocated for next year? What was spent on work directly on assessing and creating a system of marine protected areas in South Australia as agreed by ANZECC? What funds have been allocated in this budget for that purpose?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We spoke earlier of the marine and estuarine strategy developed for South Australia. The South Australian representative system of marine protected areas is an important component of that strategy. The Commonwealth, through involvement with the States and Territories, is also developing an oceans policy for Australia. A national representative system of marine protected areas has been identified as a key element of this policy. The Commonwealth has established a marine protected areas fund, and through that it will provide grants to States and Territories for developing a marine protected area system. DEHAA, in partnership with Primary Industries, has been successful in obtaining a grant of some \$119 000 from the 1997-98 Commonwealth NPA fund to identify candidate areas for the South Australian representative marine protected area system. Obviously, the selection process will closely involve community and industry by using the IMCRA framework.

Mr HILL: Last year, the then Minister advised this Committee that an extra \$300 000 had been made available to increase the Heritage Fund to just over \$800 000 for 1997-98. The Minister also said that over half of the additional funding would be spent in rural South Australia. Which projects received funding during 1997-98?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Is the honourable member talking specifically about the funding provided by the Government for places listed under the State Heritage Register?

Mr HILL: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The State Government estimates that in 1998-99 it will provide for a State Heritage Fund program of some \$725 000. The State Heritage Fund will support the Government's four key heritage program areas of heritage identification, protection, advice and promotion. The 1998-99 figure comprises an opening balance of some \$380 000 income from section 7 receipts of \$245 000, with reimbursements from local council for heritage advisory services of \$75 000 and loan repayments of about \$25 000. The 1997-98 State Heritage Fund figure of \$840 000 was boosted by a one-off injection of some \$300 000. Excluding this one-off supplement and carry over figures, the fund has remained stable for the last few years. In terms of identifying the list of heritage works, I do not have the information here, but that can be provided to the honourable member.

Mr HILL: No doubt, some works roll from one year to the other. Could the Minister provide the Committee with a program that indicates the full program of heritage works being undertaken, the amount of funding from the coming

budget that has already been committed and the amount of new money available for allocation this year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I will take that question on notice.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I refer to a question raised earlier concerning the solar plant at Wilpena, which, as I understand, is being launched today. What role did the department play in the project—any kind of role at all—and will the department be involved in monitoring the project to assess the environmental advantages of using such a renewable energy source for any other ventures or projects in the future?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The Department of Environment and Heritage had a role to play in terms of location and site development. Although we were extremely pleased to see the development of the solar diesel energy system, that particular area comes under infrastructure jurisdictions. Our role was purely in the environmental area, as I said, in terms of location and site development. We will undertake other areas of management in terms of interpretation of the visitors' site and other aspects along those lines. The solar power station is expected to generate considerable interest in its own right and safe walking access is being provided to a specially constructed viewing area overlooking the site which will incorporate information on the renewable energy system being used. Does that cover the aspects?

Mrs GERAGHTY: Will some monitoring be undertaken to evaluate the success? It is such a good project and, if we are to look at this type of energy for other areas, surely there will be some monitoring to assess its value.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I am told that it will be interpretive, that is, part of the interpretation of the plant in the visitors' centre. So, an ongoing regime will be looking at that whole system. A range of Government agencies will take an interest in the way in which this produces the energy that is required, its being an optional and alternative means. I have no doubt that many people will be keeping a very interested eye on the outcomes down the track.

Mr HILL: In relation to the Wilderness Protection Act, I refer the Minister to her answer to a recent question on notice in which I asked about the applications for wilderness protection that have been received by the department. In her answer the Minister said that, to date, no wilderness assessments of public wilderness nominations have been completed. In order to reduce the large backlog of assessments, as required under the Wilderness Protection Act, how much extra money has been allocated to the Wilderness Advisory Committee and DEHAA officers to undertake wilderness work? The WA requires the Government to make an assessment of the whole State for recommendation and protection under the Act. Given the current level of threats to the majority of wilderness areas due to mining activity, what extra funds have been allocated to ensure proper assessment is made before wilderness is permanently destroyed? In particular, I am very interested to know what is happening in the Coongie area where exploration activity is imminent?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The Wilderness Advisory Committee has received 12 requests from members of the public to assess nine areas of South Australia. The Wilderness Advisory Committee has assessed and provided recommendations on four of these areas. The committee is certainly continuing to assess and is preparing reports for two other publicly nominated areas. Additionally, in accordance with the Act, the Wilderness Advisory Committee has been undertaking an assessment of all land in South Australia and has provided reports on areas of the Great Victoria Desert, the Yellabinna Mallee Wilderness, Yumberra and Pilbara

Conservation Parks—that includes the Yellabinna Regional Reserve—Central Eyre Peninsula and Southern Eyre Peninsula. Approval has been granted for the process of formal consultation towards the constitution of wilderness protection areas within both the Lincoln National Park and Coffin Bay National Park.

In answer to the honourable member's question concerning additional resources, the answer is that no extra funding is available. The honourable member would understand that assessments of these areas are fairly labour intensive and time consuming. The advisory committee does a very good job in terms of the excessive and intensive requirements to establish the processes to move towards constitution of wilderness protection.

Mr HILL: As a supplementary question, when does the Minister expect the remainder of those requests to be completed?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: I advise the honourable member that no time limits are set. As each of the areas are reported they are added to an assessment list, and the advisory committee will do its job in the most expeditious manner possible. But there are no time lines.

Mr HILL: This question relates to community groups—and the Minister may wish to take it on notice. Will the Minister tell me what funding is provided to community groups for community conservation programs; to which groups does the money go; what was the difference between 1998-99 and 1997-98; how much money was allocated towards the State peak community conservation body for this year; and how much was allocated in particular to KESAB this year?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: We would be happy to take that question on notice.

Mr HILL: As I understand it, the Commonwealth Government is undertaking a review of its environmental legislation with the expectation that it will introduce, I believe, between one and three omnibus Acts of Parliament dealing with biodiversity, environmental protection, coastal protection and so on. As I understand it, the philosophy of the current Federal Government is that many of the obligations currently contained within the Federal Acts will be devolved to the States and, obviously, this raises a resource question. Has the department, or the Minister, taken into account that devolution and the potential effect it will have on the department's budget?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: The short answer, which is what the honourable member would like, I am sure, is that the State Government recognises that, when Federal legislation is negotiated in conjunction with the State, the impacts upon the State in terms of resources are very obvious. Part of the negotiation system to come to an end result with the Commonwealth is always to stress the requirement that any impact on resources of the State is complemented by resources from the Federal Government.

To what degree we are successful in that depends on the range of negotiations. I assure the honourable member that, in each instance where Commonwealth legislation reforms impact on the State budget by reducing support, there is a strong and powerful negotiated position which provides that the Commonwealth is required to supply resources to the States to enable them to comply with any Federal legislation that may be implemented.

Mr HILL: I will now place the following omnibus questions on notice. In relation to all departments and agencies for which the Minister has responsibility:

1. List all consultancies let during 1997-98 indicating if tenders or expressions of interest were called for each consultancy and, if not, why not, and the terms of reference and cost of each consultancy?

2. Which consultants submitted reports during 1997-98? What was the date on which each report was received by the Government and was the report made public?

3. What was the cost for the financial years 1996-97 and 1997-98 of all services provided by EDS including the cost of processing of data, installation and/or maintenance of equipment, including the cost of any new equipment either purchased or leased through EDS, and all other payments related to the Government's contract to outsource information technology to EDS?

4. During 1996-97 and 1997-98 were there any disputes with EDS concerning the availability, level or timeliness of services provided under the whole of Government contract with EDS and, if so, what were the details and how were they resolved?

5. What are the names and titles of all executives with salary and benefit packages exceeding an annual value of \$100 000? Which executives have contracts which entitle them to bonus payments and what are the details of all bonuses paid in 1997-98?

6. What are the names and titles of staff who have been issued or have access to Government credit cards? For what purpose was each of these cards issued and what was the expenditure on each card for 1997-98?

7. What are the names and titles of all officers who have been issued with Government owned mobile phones? What arrangements apply for the payment of mobile telephone accounts and what restrictions apply to the use of Government mobile telephones for private purposes?

8. What was the total number and cost of separation packages finalised in the financial years 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98?

9. What is the target number of staff separations in the 1998-99 budget? How many TVSPs have been approved by the Commissioner for Public Employment for 1998-99 and what classifications of employee have been approved for TVSPs in 1998-99?

10. How many vehicles by classification were hired in each of the financial years 1996-97 and 1997-98, and what was the cost of vehicle hire and maintenance in each of those financial years?

In relation to the GST, I ask:

1. Has the Minister or any of the departments and agencies under her portfolio undertaken an analysis of the impact of the introduction of the GST at the likely rate of 10 per cent or at any other rate on the cost of delivering State Government goods and services?

2. For each department and agency within her portfolio, by how much will the cost of goods and services purchased increase on the likely GST rate of 10 per cent?

3. For each department and agency within her portfolio, by how much will the cost of each service provided to the public need to rise to prevent an erosion of State Government revenues?

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.34 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Tuesday 23 June at 11 a.m.