

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Tuesday 26 June 2001****ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A****Chairman:**

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Members:**

Ms F.E. Bedford  
 Mr R.D. Clarke  
 Mr M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith  
 Mr J.D. Hill  
 The Hon. G.A. Ingerson  
 Mrs K.A. Maywald

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*


---

Department for Environment and Heritage,  
 \$112 440 000  
 Administered Items for Department for  
 Environment and Heritage, \$5 278 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. I.F. Evans, Minister for Environment and  
 Heritage, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr A. Holmes, Chief Executive, Department for Environ-  
 ment and Heritage.  
 Ms A. Harvey, Deputy Chief Executive.  
 Mr R. Janssan, Director, Corporate Finance.  
 Mr C. Bildstien, Chief of Staff, Minister's Office.  
 Mr P. Conniff, Senior Project Officer.  
 Mr D. Carman, Principal Consultant.  
 Mr C. Coxon, Ministerial/Environment Adviser.  
 Ms L. Burch, Acting Director, Environment Policy Office.  
 Mr N. Newland, Executive Director, Environment  
 Protection Agency.  
 Mr L. Best, Deputy Director, National Parks and Wildlife  
 SA.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think most people present are aware now that the estimates are a relatively informal procedure. The committee, I presume, has determined an approximate time for the consideration of proposed payments to facilitate change of departmental officers. I ask the minister and the lead for the opposition whether they have come to an agreement as far as that program is concerned and perhaps they could detail that a little later. Changes to the composition of the committee will be notified to the committee as they occur and, again, I ask that members ensure that they provide the chair with a completed request to be discharged form when required.

If the minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and two copies submitted to the Clerk of the House of Assembly no later than 13 July. It is my intention to provide an opportunity for the minister to make an opening statement, if desired, of about 10 minutes but certainly no longer than 15 minutes, and the same opportunity will be provided for the

opposition. There will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions based on about three questions per member on alternating sides. Members may also 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 of the committee and 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 to the chair in advance from the member outside of the committee wishing to ask a question is, therefore, necessary.

Questions must be based on lines of expenditure as revealed in the Estimates Statement. Reference can also be made to other documents, of course, including the Portfolio Statements, but I request that when members ask questions they identify a page number or the program in the relevant financial papers, which makes it a lot easier for all of us. Questions not asked at the end of the day may be placed on the next day's House of Assembly *Notice Paper*. I remind the minister that at this stage 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. The incorporation of material in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as it applies in the House, that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length. I remind members that all questions are to be directed to the minister, not the minister's advisers. If the minister so wishes, he can refer questions to advisers for response.

I also advise for the purpose of the committee that there will be some freedom allowed for television coverage by allowing a short period of filming from the northern gallery. I ask the minister to make a statement if he so desires.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I confirm, given your introductory remarks, that my understanding of the agreed timetable is from now until 5.30 for Environment and Heritage; between 5.30 and 6 p.m. for volunteers; and Recreation, Sport and Racing after the dinner adjournment. I will take the opportunity to make a short opening statement.

The Department for Environment and Heritage is working to secure a diverse future for South Australia characterised by healthy environment, healthy communities and healthy people. The department makes a significant contribution to the wellbeing of South Australians, promoting sustainable development and quality of life within the state. In partnership with the community, DEH is helping to create the right conditions for natural resources to be used for their best outcome within sustainable limits. The Environment and Heritage portfolio's principal responsibilities include: environment protection; policy and regulation; monitoring and reporting on the quality of South Australia's water, air and land; management of South Australia's national parks, botanic gardens and coastline; protection and management of biodiversity and state heritage; and the provision of environment and geographic information.

Fundamental changes were made to the structure of the portfolio agency in February 2000 with the inclusion of the Office for Recreation and Sport and RIDA and the splitting off of DOSAA to the Transport portfolio and the water quantity functions to the new Department for Water Resources. The resulting organisation was restructured late in 2000 to better integrate and manage the component functions. This, in turn, has led to a need to change the presentation of the Environment and Heritage outputs and the various output

classes to correspond with the new organisational structure. Despite the difficulties that these changes pose in the transitional year in terms of the analysis of budgets, I believe that the resulting presentation represents a significant improvement for the reader. Output classes now align with commonly recognisable public sector icons, such as the EPA, National Parks and Wildlife and the Botanic Gardens.

The major change to the Environment and Heritage portfolio output classes revolves around the formation of a new output class, National Parks and Wildlife, and this brings together the activities previously contained in animal welfare, biodiversity conservation and the national parks part of National Parks and Botanic Gardens output classes. Botanic Gardens now stands alone with its own output class reflecting its very discrete role. Another significant change has involved shifting the coast and marine management function out of the Environment Protection output class and combining it within the Department of National Parks and Wildlife to create an Office for Coast and Marine. Indeed, the environment has been a significant winner in the 2001-02 budget, with operating and capital expenditure both on the increase. The government's decision to fund significant new initiatives clearly signals to the community the government's commitment and investment in the quality of life for South Australians.

The year 2000-01 has been an important one in progressing environment and heritage issues within the state and I will take a few minutes to recognise a selection of some key achievements for the year. The Environment Protection Agency developed a partnership model with the Local Government Association and commenced a pilot project in three councils to share responsibility for management of non-licensing compliance issues. The Mount Lofty Watershed Protection Office was established and the State of the Catchment Report released. The Chem Collect program was operated successfully throughout the year, collecting farm chemicals and hazardous waste. The Adelaide Coastal Waters Study commenced with the letting of an initial contract to CSIRO. The department was active in supporting the establishment or amendment of a number of national environment protection measures, including diesel vehicle emissions and controlled waste, a review of the National Environment Pollutant Inventory and a review of the National Environment Protection Council acts. DEH supported the establishment or amendment of environment protection policies, including fuel standards, water quality, waste and noise. Regulations to address issues in relation to the beverage container provisions under the Environment and Protection Act 1993 and to expand the range of beverages and containers captured by the legislation were approved by government and will come into operation in January 2003.

Under the National Parks and Wildlife banner, the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar Plan was released and extensions to Coorong National Park were announced. The Adelaide coastal protection strategy was progressed and South Australia's only world heritage site, the Naracoorte Caves Conservation Park, was reconstituted as a national park. Permanent access was secured for the spectacular section of the Heysen Trail from Newland Head to Kings Head, and the Public Works Committee endorsed the Rocky River precinct development in Flinders Chase National Park, valued at some \$7.615 million over four years.

The Gawler Ranges National Park and Mokota Conservation Park were opened, and the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands-Yurrebilla was launched, bringing together more than

40 000 hectares of open space linking the city, the suburbs, the coast and the hills of Adelaide. This key initiative recognises and protects the natural cultural and social values of the environment, while providing areas of open space for public recreation, enjoyment and education.

Heritage conservation in this state was assisted through the completion of management plans for Martindale Hall and Adelaide Goal, as well as through securing external funding for the Birdsville-Strzelecki Tracks heritage survey, completion of the Oodnadatta track heritage survey and publishing of the Upper North heritage survey.

Management of the environmental and geographic information was improved through implementation of ImageMap SA, a system for providing web access and delivery capability for digital, ortho-rectified aerial photography and satellite imagery.

The property cadastre project progressed on schedule with the completion of metropolitan and near-country areas this year, and an environmental reporting web site was developed to make the department's environmental data information more transparent and accessible to the public. Crown Lands SA has also converted 375 perpetual leases and 246 shack leases to freehold title throughout the year.

With the release of the 2001-02 state budget, South Australians can again be assured that the environment remains a high priority within the state government. Our marine and coastal environment is a major focus of the 2001-02 budget, and an extra \$900 000 in total has been set aside over three years to assist the recently established Office for Coast and Marine to implement the state's marine and estuarine strategy. The strategy embraces five major commitments: clean and healthy seas; sustainable use; conserving biodiversity and heritage; working together and better understanding of the ecosystem processes and habitats.

In addition, the budget provides some \$3.2 million over the next four years (shared equally between the Department for Environment and Heritage and Primary Industries and Resources SA) to create a system of marine protected areas in South Australia. All our waters and the ways in which they are used must be managed in an integrated and strategic way. The establishment of marine protected areas is seen as one of the more effective ways to protect our marine environment while permitting a wide range of uses such as fishing, tourism and recreation.

As you are aware, the state government is committed to an environmentally and economically sustainable coast protection strategy. I am pleased to inform the committee that the budget also commits a total of \$5 million over the next four years to review, investigate and implement a sustainable strategy to protect the metropolitan Adelaide coastline. A further \$1.75 million is allocated in the budget for specific interim sand replenishment and trial coast protection initiatives.

Other significant budget features relating to the Environment and Heritage portfolio are an extra \$1.25 million to the State Heritage Fund over four years to help repair and maintain South Australia's historic buildings; \$750 000 over three years towards progressing a more integrated approach to the management of land, water and environmental issues through the proposed integrated natural resource management initiative; an extra \$1.44 million over the next four years to allow the Environment Protection Agency to expand its regional presence; \$41 million in 2001-02 to manage our national parks and reserves for visitors and conservation; \$5.6 million to progress the parks agenda in 2001-02, with

the continuation of a \$7.6 million major upgrade of the Rocky River precinct in the Flinders Chase National Park on Kangaroo Island; \$500 000 towards the newly created Greater Mount Lofty Parklands-Yurrebilla for land purchases, fencing, signage, public access and management planning; \$400 000 for regional biodiversity initiatives to assist in the conservation, management and rehabilitation of habitats; \$264 000 to continue ecological restoration projects through the Flinders Ranges Bounceback and Ark on Eyre programs; \$200 000 to establish visitor infrastructure and services in the newly-created Gawler Ranges National Park; \$1.9 million to implement water quality improvement programs in the Mount Lofty Ranges; \$1 million to implement elements of the state dryland salinity strategy, as well as \$700 000 to develop programs to address water quality and salinity under the Murray River salinity strategy with matching commonwealth funds; and \$2.49 million to maintain and upgrade walking trails as part of a five-year \$6.2 million program.

In summary, the Environment and Heritage portfolio faces a challenging and exciting year with a wide range of initiatives being planned. We are the custodians of a unique and varied natural heritage, and our clean and healthy environment is indeed an asset that we cannot afford to undervalue. The successful achievement of the portfolio outcomes is therefore critical to the achievement of this state's social, economic and environmental wellbeing.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I refer members to page 15 of the Estimates Statement, volume 2, part 10, of the Portfolio Statements. Does the member for Kaurna wish to make an opening statement?

**Mr HILL:** I will make a few general comments and indicate the process that I intend to go through today. I made some general comments in my second reading speech on the bill, so I will not go through that again. Today, I intend to go through each of the output classes in turn and raise issues that come out of them, and then ask particular questions about issues that have been raised with me within those output classes by members of the community. I note that the minister has commented on the change of output classes. I am disappointed that there are no Davenport initiatives output class, minister. I should have thought that would indicate a new direction as well.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We did not want to take the whole time of the committee.

**Mr HILL:** That is right. After I have gone through the individual output classes, I want to go through the general budget relating to the expenditure and income lines, and I have a number of general questions covering the whole portfolio. I also indicate that I will be asking questions relating to volunteering. The leader, who represents the opposition in this area, is unavailable and he has asked that I ask some questions on his behalf—so I am a volunteer in that sense. I also indicate that the timetable that the minister has outlined is acceptable to the opposition. I make the one proviso that, as the shadow minister for recreation and sport is in the building, if we get through the environment and volunteering sections early, we could then go on to that section.

I refer to page 10.5 and the highlights for 2000-01. The first highlight to which I want to refer is the second dot point and I might say, from the point of presentation (and I guess it goes to the Treasury documents), that it would be easier in future if those dot points had numbers next to them so that it would be easier to refer to a particular dot point. I refer to the second dot point, which is to do with the partnership model

with local government. Will the minister expand on where that got to in the last year and where he is intending to go in the next 12 months in terms of partnerships with local government? I ask that question in the context of a letter signed by Jeff Tate, the City Manager of the City of Onkaparinga regarding the EPA, a copy of which was sent to me. I think a copy was also sent to Mr Newland. The first paragraph of the letter states:

It has come to my attention that on several occasions in the past few weeks residents of the City of Onkaparinga have been referred to Council with complaints in relation to which the Environment Protection Agency is the responsible authority for investigation and response. These referrals to Council have been by EPA Officers. On one occasion a resident was advised by an officer of the EPA to contact her Councillor in an effort to persuade Council to take on these responsibilities.

Clearly, there is an overlap between council and EPA responsibilities. I know that you have a program to effectively outsource some of those responsibilities, in a formal sense, to council but, obviously, in the case of the City of Onkaparinga, that agreement had not been reached. I know there are a number of issues about which the council complains and is concerned and which the EPA does not have the resources to address. I refer to such things as smoke from chimneys and that kind of low-level domestic complaints about noise or pollution from neighbouring houses, and so on. Most people go to the councils with these problems but the council say that it is an EPA issue. They phone the EPA, which says, 'We cannot deal with it; go to the council.' It is a circular kind of matter. What has the minister done this year in relation to this and what is he planning to do in the coming year?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Early in 1999, the EPA commenced discussions with the Local Government Association in relation to developing a local government EPA partnership. It established a trial so that we could look at whether there was a better way to provide a service to the general community. Ultimately, that should be the aim of local government and the EPA—to try to resolve some of these domestic issues. As the member would be aware, local government has a quite extensive network of contacts within its own general community. We saw some advantage in at least trying to get some of those issues resolved more quickly at the local level rather than at state level. So, a trial partnership was set up with the City of Adelaide, the Adelaide Hills council and the Port Adelaide-Enfield council, and that commenced in November 2000. As part of this trial, the participating councils are responding to all the environmental nuisance complaints arising from domestic and non-licensed activities within their area. The best example of that would be air-conditioning noise which is a classic domestic issue.

The trial will help facilitate—in those councils, at least—a clear understanding of the roles, responsibilities and obligations of the various parties with respect to the administration and enforcement of the act. It will also develop a cooperative approach to the management of environmental harm and nuisance complaints in South Australia. We also think that it will provide a cost-effective use of resources. In support of the trial partnership, at the authority level the EPA has delegated the necessary powers and functions to the participating councils. It has also funded training for council officers in relation to the act, noise measurement and the investigation methods. The EPA provides support to the councils in relation to the administration and enforcement of the act. EPA officers have made a number of joint inspections

with council officers to assist in the resolution of complaints and to further train the council officers.

The trial program is consistent with the recommendation of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee's report on environment protection in South Australia in that it recommended that any division of the environmental responsibilities between the Environment Protection Agency and local government should occur on a licence versus a non-licence basis. A strategic framework for the future conduct of the EPA/local government relationship in the area of shared functional interests will be developed using the experience gained during the trial period. The way I read that is that they will examine the trial and see whether it cannot be adopted more broadly throughout other local government areas. The Local Government Association and the Environment Protection Agency have formed a joint working group to ascertain how local and state government can, in partnership, provide a more effective and efficient environment protection service to local communities. The joint working group has let three consultancies, which have been funded by the EPA and the local government research and development scheme.

So we have taken the first step of trying to get some of these issues handled more quickly at the local level. We are continuing to monitor those trials. From memory, they are year-long trials, so they must finish in November 2001. We will have a look to see how successful those trials have been on the ground. For the honourable member's own information, and he might want to pass this back to the City of Onkaparinga, if it is concerned about getting a quick resolution for its local constituents, the easiest way to do that is to have local government handle these issues. All it has to do is write a letter to the EPA saying that it wishes to take over those duties, and the EPA will facilitate that. It is simply a matter of one letter, one stamp and one envelope from the City of Onkaparinga and the people who live in the City of Onkaparinga can then have those issues dealt with quickly and efficiently through their local council. We are encouraging councils to take up that offer, because we think—just as the parliamentary committee thought—that there is some sense in having the matters handled locally where that service is available.

**Mr HILL:** By way of supplementary question, will the return reply from the minister's department include a cheque for the cost of providing those services?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Certainly we have assisted in relation to the three trials. So, if the City of Onkaparinga wants to talk to the EPA about that, the door is open; the City of Onkaparinga should talk to the EPA about it. However, the parliamentary committee itself has recognised that non-licence activities are probably best handled at the local level. We need to encourage local government to do that. I do not think a state government will have the people on the ground to handle every air-conditioning complaint. There is some sense in getting local government across the line on those sorts of issues.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to the next dot point, which is the Mount Lofty Watershed Protection Office. In my second reading speech, I referred to the target for last year, which talked about a strategy being implemented this year. I compared that with the highlight which was an office, and the minister has a target for this year as well in relation to that area. I draw the minister's attention to a press release he put out on 2 April, wherein he said that the amount of money to be spent on the catchment was to be increased from

\$28 million to a total of \$36.5 million as part of the watershed protection strategy, and that is over five years. Where has that extra money come from; how much is in the budget for this year; and what is planned for each of the five years as part of that five-year strategy?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Some of the moneys in the \$36 million are tied in to other agencies, so it is a whole of government approach; for example, I understand about \$9 million is involved with SA Water projects that have been coordinated in the area. In the 2001-02 budget, there is around \$1.9 million, plus a small amount of carry over. Some of it is across the whole of government project in some agencies. Minister Armitage is before the committee tomorrow, so the honourable member might want to take up the details of that in relation to SA Water's commitment.

The Mount Lofty Watershed Protection Office was established as a coordinating working group. Obviously, the Mount Lofty Ranges water catchment is important to the state, and the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment risk assessment framework has been developed by the water protection office and adopted as a standard by the water monitoring coordinating subcommittee of the state's water policy group. It is all fed into a state water policy area so there is an overarching view of what is happening in the catchment. Baseline data collection and assessment projects have been initiated to support the framework, including a subcatchment land status database project and a subcatchment water quality index project, and the framework and baseline data will provide direction for strategic investment in future programs. The office is getting the baseline data right, and seeing exactly what is happening and why it is happening. To some extent, that will influence strategic investment in future programs in the area.

There are also research projects with regard to pathogens designed to provide a greater resolution of the understanding of the scale and source of pathogens—indeed, the honourable member might know them as cryptosporidiums and giardia—and the threat that they do or do not provide to our drinking water supply. This field research project is established in three subcatchments in the Mount Lofty Ranges. It is also a joint initiative of the CRC for water quality, the EPA and SA Water with the field research element project being managed by the Water Protection Office. The office is also project managing pesticide use in the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed, and that is a joint initiative of the EPA, SA Water, PIRSA and the Catchment Water Monitoring Management Board. There are 65 pest education courses, involving some 600 land-holder and industry participants; there are eight pesticide environment and safety television segments; and there are pesticide environment and safety displays at retail outlets with video brochures and various demonstrations.

I refer to the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed domestic waste water system audit project, which is again a joint project, involving naturally a risk assessment of the on-site septic treatment systems. As the member is probably aware, a large number of homes in the Adelaide Hills are still on septic systems and they are doing an audit of that to make sure they are conforming or working the way they should. There is also an operation and licence compliance review of all the licensed STED and sewage treatment works schemes in the watershed, and that has been completed. There is an advisory and contributing role to the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed amendment, PAR and there is the provision 65 development application assessments to local government. The dairy effluent system audit is under way, and that

includes a progressive upgrade of the dairy effluent systems right across the watershed, with generally pretty good cooperation from the dairy industry in that matter.

There are also investigation and compliance operations under the EP Act, which include things such as illegal waste disposal sites, bore drilling waste disposal and substantial involvement in the resolution of chemical spray drift issues. We launched the 'state of the health of the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment' from a water quality perspective in April 2001, and you referred to the press release. A five brochure series about water quality in the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed has also been developed. The office is also negotiating integrated land management and water quality protection components in a redeveloped property management and planning course package to be delivered through the various soil boards, and that is all about land-holder education and the role they can play. The office also has a project leading to the development of integrated resource management in the Mount Lofty Ranges. Again, that is a joint project. It has also been involved with the Myponga catchment watercourse restoration project—year 1 on-ground works. Eight land-holders have been engaged in riparian zone works and a 3.5 kilometres riparian zone has been secured, with 11 land-holders being committed to year 2 on-ground works. Program management plans are under way there. That gives a range of the work they are involved in.

**Mr HILL:** I refer now to the highlights relating to Chem Collect programs and to a press release put out by the Australian Bureau of Statistics on 29 November 2000 under the headline 'More hazardous waste ending up in household bins', which states:

There has been a big increase over the past four years in the number of households disposing of their hazardous waste via their garbage bins, rather than through central collection points [the survey] revealed today.

The press release suggests:

The proportion of households that put waste—such as garden chemicals, paint products, metal and oven cleaners, fluorescent tubes, car and household batteries, motor oil and pharmaceuticals . . . has jumped from 62 per cent in 1996 to 85 per cent in 2000.

Is the minister aware of any particular problem in South Australia in relation to waste disposal and can he give the statistics for South Australia?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, I have not seen the statistics for South Australia. I have not seen that press release either, from memory, so I am not aware of the South Australian statistics for that issue. I can tell you that six farm chemical and hazardous waste collections have been held between 1 May 2000 and 31 May 2001 (so every second month there has been some collection) from 17 rural and metropolitan council areas. Some 1 100 people delivered a total of 114 000 kilograms of chemicals to the collection point. That raises the size of the issue: 114 000 kilograms of chemicals is a significant amount. The total cost to the department was about \$211 000, which included salary costs. We covered the following areas: Adelaide Hills Council, District Council of Mount Barker, Barossa, City of Onkaparinga, District Council of Yankalilla, City of Victor Harbor, Alexandrina Council, District Council of Barunga West, District Council of Copper Coast, District Council of Yorke Peninsula, Southern Mallee District Council, District Council of Karoonda East Murray, Kangaroo Island Council, District Council of Naracoorte Lucindale, Wattle Range Council, City of Mount Gambier and District Council of Grant.

We also have the Dry Creek hazardous waste depot, which provides the facility for urban disposal and which is open on a regular basis. I think you will find that there were provisions in the draft EPP on waste management that went out for discussion to try to encourage councils to provide a more regular service at the local level. That is not finalised yet. That is a draft EPP, so we are still working through on the public consultation process there. I do not have that in front of me, but I am sure that some issues were raised in the consultation process about trying to get a more regular urban collection.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** My question is in relation to the Environment and Heritage portfolio, output class 3, heritage conservation, covered in the Portfolio Statements, page 10.14. Output class 3 includes the protection, restoration and conservation of historic and culturally significant sites, objects and structures. Referring to the targets on page 10.14, will you please tell the committee what financial contribution the government has made in this budget to repair and maintain more of South Australia's heritage and properties?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As the member for Bragg will appreciate, some 2 100 places are listed on the State Heritage Register, representing our rich and varied heritage. These places range from lighthouses to statues and from the Festival Centre to private homes. Many state heritage places are in private ownership and money is available from the State Heritage Fund for the funding projects that are consistent with the objectives of the Heritage Act. Over recent years applications from the owners of heritage listed places to undertake conservation work on their properties have outstripped the available funding, resulting in the accumulation of a considerable backlog of applications. After consultation with the State Heritage Authority the government has announced in the 2001-02 state budget an additional \$1.25 million over the next four years to be directed towards the conservation of places on the State Heritage Register. Some \$500 000 of this funding will be provided in 2001-02, aimed principally at addressing the heritage issues in relation to the heritage properties listed, and \$250 000 will be provided in each of the following three years.

I should highlight to the committee that funding from section 7 revenue under the Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act, which averages \$250 000 year, depending on the retail sales, will continue to be provided to the State Heritage Fund, as has been case in the past; so this will be an increase next year of \$500 000 and in each year \$250 000. This initiative constitutes the most significant injection of money into the State Heritage Fund for well over a decade by any state government. We are very pleased to be able to put the money into the Heritage Fund and also bring to the committee's notice that money within DAIS has also been provided to heritage works on some of the publicly owned buildings. From memory, that is handled through Minister Lawson through the DAIS area.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** My next question is in relation to output class 2, national parks and wildlife, covered in the Portfolio Statement at page 10.9. Listed as a highlight is the establishment of an Office for Coast and Marine. On behalf of my colleague the member for Flinders, will the minister advise what resources are being provided and what progress is being made towards implementing the state's marine and estuarine strategy?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In November 2000 the government established the Office for Coast and Marine to provide a greater focus for delivering on the government's commit-

ments in the marine and estuarine strategy. In addition to supporting the Coast Protection Board, implementing the coastal works program and coordinating the various coast care programs, the office also provides advice on the coastal development proposals through the Coast Protection Board to the Development Assessment Commission and local councils. The office also conducts research and provides a monitoring and evaluation service on coastal erosion, planning and conservation. The Office for Coast and Marine is focusing on developing a policy framework for marine planning and the commitment in the marine estuarine strategy to identifying recommended areas for a system of marine protected areas.

This policy framework for marine planning and marine protected areas has been actively progressed, and in February 2001 the government adopted a marine planning framework for the future management of the state's marine waters. This framework proposes the development of marine plans on a statewide basis to establish a zoning system integrating and coordinating the management of multi use areas, both existing and proposed. The aim in each zone is to encourage a range of compatible activities, each with different assigned priorities, and to provide all parties with some certainty of marine resource allocation. Areas of importance for habitat marine biodiversity protection will be identified through this process, as will areas of commercial and/or recreational importance.

The 2001-02 state budget allocated an extra \$900 000 over the next three years to progress the implementation of the marine estuarine strategy, particularly the development of marine protected areas. The implementation of the marine planning framework is commencing with the preparation of a marine plan for the mid and upper Spencer Gulf in 2001-02. This area is seen as having sufficient complexity to service a pilot project to assist in the development of subsequent refinement of the marine planning framework. The timing of the subsequent marine plans will be determined from, I guess, the lessons that were learned through doing the pilot plan and the areas of importance to the habitat and biodiversity conservation identified in the marine plans will then be examined in more detail for suitability as marine protected areas.

Therefore, the marine planning program will foreshadow and also help to form the marine protected area program and be an integral part of that. In order that the marine protected areas program can progress through an informed and comprehensive consultation process, the government is considering its policy framework for this representative system. This will include the testing of these policies in development of pilot marine protected areas in the 2001-02 year.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** My next question is in relation to National Parks and Wildlife, output class 2, Portfolio Statement, page 10.9. The statement indicates that a target this year is to progress marine protected areas of South Australia. On behalf of my colleague the member for Flinders, can the minister indicate what resources are provided for this initiative and what level of community consultation will occur prior to marine protected areas being designated?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In 1998, the South Australian government released its marine and estuarine strategy which outlines its commitment to developing a representative system of marine protected areas. The 2001-02 state budget allocated an extra \$900 000 over the next three years to

progress the implementation of the marine estuarine strategy, including the development of marine protected areas. In order that the marine protected areas program can progress through an informed and comprehensive consultation process (as I mentioned earlier in my answer to the previous question), the government is considering its policy framework for this representative area. This will include the testing of the policy and development of a pilot marine protected area in the next year.

The identification of suitable areas to establish a representative system of marine protected areas will involve extensive public consultation, and the establishment of any areas will be done in full realisation of the economic and social consequences of protecting our unique marine environment. I think anyone who has been following the Victorian example and debate about marine protected areas would realise that this process needs to be worked through in concert with the community through a very transparent public consultation process, because there are many interest groups with varied views on marine protected areas, and it is important that we bring the community with us when we talk about marine protected areas. We do not want a repeat of the Victorian experience here, so community consultation will have to play a key part.

Certainly, a public participation program for marine protected areas has been developed to fully inform and help engage the community in the development of both marine plans and marine protected areas, and we look forward to working with the community in the development of those marine protected areas in due course.

**Mr HILL:** I refer again to point 10.5 and to the highlight relating to the smoky vehicle program. I also refer to an article from the *Advertiser* of 11 June this year which was fairly critical of the EPA's activities in this area and which states in part:

The Environment Protection Agency is reporting fewer people for driving polluting cars than in previous years, blaming a lack of staff. With less than a month to go this financial year, the EPA has reported 166 people for driving smoky vehicles compared to 358 in 1999-2000.

We all know that the EPA has limited resources, but can the minister say what kind of priority the EPA will give to smoky vehicle detection in the next financial year and what resources are in the budget to ensure that this is followed up?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Certainly, the smoky vehicle program is continuing, to my knowledge at the same level of resources, so no fewer resources are proposed over the next 12 months than over the past 12 months. There is no reason why fewer vehicles have been reported. We had a look at that article when the matter was raised. We obviously asked questions such as, 'Why is that?' It is difficult to put a finger on a reason as to why fewer were reported. To some degree, it is a matter of chance as to whether or not the officer comes across a smoky vehicle during his daily travels. To some degree, some chance is involved as to whether or not they discover a smoky vehicle or whether or not it is referred to the agency.

The EPA smoky vehicle program continues to provide support to the mandatory requirements specified in the Road Traffic Act, which is administered by SA Police and Transport SA. We understand that Transport SA is currently looking at the smoky vehicles program to see whether there is any reason behind those figures. The resources are certainly there, as far as our agency is concerned. I think we probably have to go back four or five years to see how the

figures have varied. They may have varied by that much in previous years—but I have not yet asked for that brief.

**Mr HILL:** I refer now to the targets for 2001-02. The first of those targets is the air quality index for Adelaide. I also refer to the highlight for 2000-01 which is 'implemented the air in EPM'. Can the minister give the committee some details of those programs? In particular, can he indicate whether or not smell is a factor to be taken into account in the air quality index? Also, where will the monitoring take place, and which sites will be monitored?

I refer to his answer to a question on notice and a reply to question No. 16 in relation to a number of foundries where problems with air pollution had occurred. In the case of Castalloy, 200 people had complained; in the case of Hensley Industries, I think 115; and Mount Barker Products, 50. There are some key points in the landscape where air pollution is a problem.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I wanted to check whether odour was one of the criteria in relation to the air quality index. I have given an answer to the House previously in question time on the air quality index. The air quality index has been developed by EPAs in other states, namely, New South Wales and Victoria. The air quality index is a way of providing the community with information about the air quality in the city.

The data collected by the air quality monitoring equipment at the various locations are processed electronically and then summarised as an air quality index, which is published in the media on a daily or twice daily basis. Depending on how sophisticated the equipment is, it could be put on the internet or on radio stations so that people can keep track of what is happening with air quality.

A network of ambient air monitoring stations has been established in Adelaide, and they are capable of measuring concentrations of the various pollutants of interest in assessing air quality. From memory, in metropolitan Adelaide, basically from Onkaparinga through to Gawler, we have 15 sites that monitor air. The establishment of this network is part of our requirement under NEPA to which the member referred in his question. This network also allows the development of an air quality index for Adelaide based on these NEPA standards. I am advised that a national workshop will be held in November, and I understand that the issue of odour will be discussed in relation to air quality. I understand that they are trying to get some uniformity with the states about how they measure this air quality issue, and that will provide some guidance about whether we need to include odour as a criterion in the index. However, my understanding of it as we speak today is that odour is not an issue. While unpleasant, odour does not necessarily represent health risk; and the air quality index is more a guide to health risk than necessarily the unpleasantness of it. However, having visited some of the areas to which the member refers, I know the issue. I was Minister for Industry and Trade when the Mount Barker foundry issue arose, so I am aware of the issues.

The EPA is trialing an air quality index for Adelaide and will make that available to the media once the in-house testing has been completed. We had it publicly displayed on a trial basis, to some extent, with an air monitoring machine in Rundle Mall during World Environment Day. The index will be published on our environmental reporting web site, together with other relevant information on air quality. The air quality index for Adelaide will be derived in the same way as used in Melbourne; that is, there will be a five-grade scale from very poor to very good and colours will be used to represent different grades of air quality. Generally the air

quality in Adelaide is fairly good. However, at times, it can deteriorate, particularly during dust storms and in summer when ozone concentrations rise.

There can also be localised problems in some areas. For instance, with our wind conditions, quite often the Adelaide smog (if it forms) is picked up by the wind and dumped throughout Elizabeth and the Barossa. So, that can create some issues for people. The additional cost of providing an air quality index is around \$11 000, and that is through available funding. I have just been given some information in relation to monitoring sites. The continuing work of upgrading Adelaide's air quality monitoring network will include the construction of a new monitoring station and facility at Port Noarlunga, which might be of interest to the member. The exact location has not yet been determined.

The EPA aims to begin installation of a new monitoring site by the end of this year. It will begin operation in early 2002. Other sites where monitoring equipment will be installed include Netley, Hope Valley, Elizabeth, Northfield and Kensington. Monitoring is being conducted at Gawler on an exploratory basis. The station at Port Noarlunga will monitor a large range of air pollutants, including ozone and oxides of nitrogen. The data collected from the station will provide information on how to better manage air quality in Adelaide's large and complex airshed from Gawler to Port Noarlunga. Once the monitoring site is available, as I said, it will be on the EPA web site.

**Mr HILL:** I refer now to the target relating to the integrated waste strategy, and I also refer to a question and answer provided in Estimates Committee B last week when Minister Laidlaw was talking about planning permission given to landfill sites. When asked a question about Kalbeeba in the northern suburbs, the minister commented that, while the government had a strategy to limit—have one, I think—the number of sites in the northern suburbs, in fact there is a proliferation of them. She makes the point that it is the right of developers and the legal profession to test the limit of what their clients may wish to pursue in relation to Kalbeeba pursuing its rights to have that dump. Is there a problem with the integrated waste strategy in terms of the range of landfill sites which are in the process of being developed and approved; and what can the government do to limit the number of sites so that there is some sort of rationality in the process?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The key thing about waste is trying to reduce the amount that, ultimately, goes to landfill, which is why we have released our waste EPP. It looks at ways of reducing the amount going to landfill long-term, which, to me, seems to be the key point. The planning issues to which Minister Laidlaw refers, obviously are best dealt with by planning, but we have put out a draft EPP in relation to waste. In that particular EPP, we have looked at restricting the type of material that, ultimately, can go to landfill and we have also looked at trying to change community behaviour, over time, so that industries can develop, because what does not go to landfill provides an opportunity for a recycling industry to develop.

Again we are trying to bring the community with us by grandfathering certain actions, if you like, or putting time frames on certain actions, which gives the business community time to change its behaviours and to think up other ways of either packaging materials or using other materials for packaging, or whatever, and reduce landfill. Certainly landfill will be an ongoing issue for government long term. The increasing cost of landfill, of course, will

mean that some products, which used to be uneconomical to recycle because it was cheaper to dump them, will be cheaper to recycle and therefore will produce a market to recycle them.

The fact that we have put out the discussion paper and are trying to put together the waste EPP is our portfolio's contribution to trying to develop the integrated waste strategy across government. We acknowledge that there are some issues with some of the landfill sites, but again they are being appropriately managed through the various agencies.

**Mr HILL:** This is really a supplementary question; the point I make is that, if you have a range of landfill sites all competing for business and the amount of business is shrinking, either some of them will go out of business and then we will have semi-filled landfill sites on the landscape, or they may undertake practices which are not in the best interest of the environment or may be illegal practices in, for example, an effort to get more waste into their sites so that they can increase throughput. It seems to me that there is an inherent danger if you have a strategy to reduce landfill and you have a lot of landfill sites competing for the available business. I think that is an unstable economic environment which will have consequences for the environment. The minister has a target of 70 per cent, which I agree is an admirable target. Why not include that as one of the minister's output descriptors in terms of measuring how the department is going? For instance, this year it is 50 per cent, next year we are aiming for 55 per cent and so on.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It is not a performance measure of government per se. That 70 per cent target is a performance measure for the whole community. Certainly government policy helps drive it, but government policy is not the sole driver. Of course, we would monitor it. Landfill sites are licensed, therefore they are subject to monitoring and, indeed, some of the changes we are putting forward through the EPP are as a result of their monitoring sites. We have found that, in certain circumstances, not everything has been going as well as it could. We have tried to address some of those issues by changing the way in which the levy was administered to try to bring in some tighter measurement. There were concerns with that.

In relation to having a number of sites, you have to balance that off against the danger of having only one site, which creates a monopoly. Then you have an issue with rates being charged and all those sort of issues. As the market shrinks, people will make a judgment about that and if they decide to leave the landfill, then there is a system in place, as I understand it, where a rehabilitation plan will need to be developed. Landfill sites all around the state are now being properly rehabilitated and managed. I think the Lynton dump at Mitcham is one—

*Mr Hill interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What if they go bankrupt? I am not sure what the procedure is. I might ask Mr Allan Holmes whether he knows what the procedure is. I am advised that there is a section under the act where we ask for bonds in relation to the landfill, so that we can try to protect against that.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I am interested in the issue of our coastal waters and our metropolitan beaches. I would like to ask the minister a question, under the Environment and Heritage portfolio, about environmental protection. It is Portfolio Statement, page 10.5. I am particularly interested in this because, clearly, the government and everybody in Adelaide recognises that you cannot have a city on a beach,

as we have, without carefully managing the beach and the protection of it. I have been interested in comparisons between Adelaide's situation and that of Alexandria in Egypt and Tel Aviv in Israel. I lived in both countries during 1993, and both have similar problems with extensive beaches and large populations living on the beach. I noted the minister's plan for the long-term protection of our metropolitan coastline and I wonder if he could outline the objectives of the Adelaide Coastal Waters Study referred to on page 10.5 of the Portfolio Statement. I am sure that many of my constituents in Waite would be interested to know what we are doing.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I notice that the honourable member mentioned coastal areas of other countries and how they compare to Adelaide. Every coastline is different because of the nature of the climate, the nature of storm events, the depth of the ocean floor and the amount of seagrass: all those sorts of issues mean that the government of the day in those countries needs to adopt different management strategies for each coast. There was some media comment recently about a Danish system—if I recall—that one of the radio stations was proposing might be used for Adelaide. In actual fact, there is a whole range of issues that may mean that that particular system will not work on our coast, whereas it may well work on the Gold Coast or some of the eastern states' coastline, because each coastline is quite unique in the way that storm events, the seagrasses and the tidal movements combine to put certain pressures on the coastal environment.

So, it is not quite as simple as some of those in the media would have us believe. That is why we have gone down the path of having the Adelaide Coastal Waters Study. The coastal waters and ecosystem adjacent to metropolitan Adelaide have been severely impacted over time by industrial sewage and stormwater discharges. This has, in part, resulted in loss of seagrass: the department estimates that some 4 000 hectares of seagrass may have been lost over the last 30 years. What that then means is that you have a significant increase in sand movement because the seagrass is not holding the sand in place. It also means that, with more sand movement, there is more sand within the water and that is thrown against the reefs and, therefore, you get more degradation of the reef system. A good example of that is if you look at the Noarlunga reef: one side has suffered more degradation, partly due to sand.

You have issues of algal blooms and also of water quality in general. Many of these issues we think are linked and, therefore, how you manage one issue can certainly impact on the other issues that we have raised. Our understanding of how different components of the ecosystem of Adelaide interact is very limited and, therefore, attempting to manage the system effectively without a better understanding can present some difficulties, and there is a risk that we could make decisions that may need to be revisited because we do not necessarily have a full understanding of the issues. So, we have decided that we will undertake an Adelaide Coastal Water Study. The aim of the study is to develop some effective and scientifically based tools that can be used with some confidence for the sustainable management of what is a very complex ecosystem.

The study is supported by a number of key stakeholders who have pledged \$2.1 million to fund the work, so a substantial body of work is being planned. Those involved are, obviously, our agencies through the EPA, Transport SA, the Patawalonga, Onkaparinga and Torrens Catchment Water



Management Boards, the Coast Protection Board, TXU Torrens Island, Mobil Refining Australia, SA Water, the Local Government Association, the SA Fishing Industry Council and the Conservation Council. So, a diverse group of people is helping with this study.

The study will be in three stages. The first stage will involve the preparation of detailed specifications for the research or investigative components stage of the study. Stage two consists of undertaking a large number of interlink research studies predominantly undertaken by South Australian-based research organisations. Stage three will entail the synthesis of research and investigative work into a suite of tools that can be used by managers and regulators, including the partners in the study, to ensure that decisions that are made are ecologically sustainable.

The decision to proceed to stages two and three will depend on what stage one tells us and the availability of sufficient funds to undertake the work. The CSIRO Environment Projects Office was selected through an open tender process to project manage the study, and CSIRO has had considerable experience in project managing large and complex ecological studies of this type. The cost of undertaking stage one is about \$120 000 and it was commenced in 2001 and should be completed by November this year.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I move on to the issue of national parks and wildlife and ask the minister a question about Brownhill Creek. The minister is probably not surprised to hear me asking about Brownhill Creek, because I have been badgering the poor minister, along with the Minister for Water Resources, about this for some time. I should declare an interest because I live about 400 metres from the creek in Mitcham, and it is a treasured asset to us in Waite. A lot of my constituents are very concerned about it. My question relates to Portfolio Statements, budget paper 5, page 10.9. I note and draw to the attention of the committee that the minister kindly took action some time ago to get a management plan in place for Brownhill Creek, and a lot of good work has been done by his department. I wish I had been able to get as much from the Minister for Water Resources—I am still after him for some money in terms of the Patawalonga catchment board and fixing up the woody weeds. But, once the management plan is finished, there will, no doubt, be opportunities to revisit that with the Minister for Water Resources. Could the minister explain to the committee what the future funding plans are over the next three years for rehabilitation of Brownhill Creek, including plans and works, so that I can inform my constituents?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I take the opportunity to congratulate the member for Waite. He has been very passionate in his representations to both me as Minister for the Environment and also the Minister for Water Resources in relation to Brownhill Creek. The member for Waite and I took the opportunity to visit Brownhill Creek and walk over it so that he could make representations to me about the various issues that confront the local residents in relation to it. I congratulate also the local community. There was a very good rotary project of the Mitcham Rotary Club, if my memory serves me right. Certainly, there was a very strong rotary and community presence doing some work within the Brownhill Creek area.

So, as a result of the member for Waite's good work in that area, we have started to develop a management plan for Brownhill Creek. It is currently under development. As anticipated, the draft plan will be available for public comment in October 2001. To assist in the identification of

the values and issues of the park, a community reference group has been established consisting of the City of Mitcham, the Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Board, the Friends of Brownhill Creek and the local residents association. Highlights of the plan will include the recommendation for the development of a cooperative management framework between National Parks and Wildlife SA, the City of Mitcham and the catchment board.

In the interim, National Parks and Wildlife SA is working with the council and the catchment board to develop agreed strategies for addressing both the weed and recreation management in the park. Options for resourcing rehabilitation of the creek and the upgrade of the road will be considered once the priorities for future management have been identified through the management planning process.

I know that woody weed removal is a concern to all those who visit Brownhill Creek and that has continued using funds from the Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Board for contractors. It is also being undertaken through a prisoner work program, which is a joint initiative of National Parks and Wildlife and the Department for Correctional Services, utilising money from the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands, Yurrebilla and district operating budgets. As I mentioned earlier, the management plan will identify a management framework between council and the management board and increased funding opportunities, which the member is obviously chasing. They will be identified through the various partnerships raised in the plan.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I thank the minister for that reply and appreciate the work that he has done on that issue. I move on to the issue of National Parks and Wildlife on Eyre Peninsula because a lot of my constituents are interested in what is going on state-wide, not just in our own patch, and particularly in the area of biodiversity and protection of natural wildlife. The member for Flinders, my colleague, has asked me to raise this with the minister.

I refer to output class 2, National Parks and Wildlife at Portfolio Statements, budget paper 5, page 10.9, which deals with the Ark on Eyre project to enable conservation of threatened species and deals with the involvement of the community to get that project to full fruition. Could the minister tell us what resources have been provided and what outcomes are sought in respect of the Ark on Eyre project, in particular, the involvement of local groups such as bird groups and community groups in the success of the project?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The Ark on Eyre program aims to establish recovery programs for priority populations of threatened flora and fauna populations across the Eyre Peninsula. Lincoln National Park, Coffin Bay National Park and the Venus Bay Conservation Park are focus areas for the program development.

The recovery efforts for bilbies, brush-tailed bettongs and stick-nest rats have already been successful or are well under way on Eyre Peninsula and its offshore islands. This program will continue to be expanded over the next year, which I think will please the member for Waite and, indeed, the member for Flinders. Locally threatened populations of Mallee fowl, yellow-tailed black cockatoos and several species of threatened plants have recently been added to this regional focus. The program intends to reintroduce brush-tailed bettongs, Mallee fowls and tamar wallabies to the Lincoln National Park in 2001-02.

Education and increased awareness has enabled community groups to become more proactive in biodiversity conservation. This has enabled many community groups to

access a broad range of funding sources, either independently or in partnership with government agencies. In addition, corporate sponsorship and other fundraising efforts have expanded the Ark on Eyre concept to ensure that the various projects continue. Membership in one community group—the Friends of the Southern Eyre Peninsula—has grown from 30 to 50 families in 12 months as a direct result of the Ark on Eyre projects. I think that is a good example of a growing interest in matters environmental throughout the broader community.

There are 28 community groups and six regional schools that are involved in the biodiversity projects to date. This, I think, is unprecedented involvement for this particular region in biodiversity conservation. Activities include on-ground works, fencing, baiting, monitoring, survey and revegetation activities.

The Port Lincoln Bird Club and the Southern Eyre Bird Group are strongly supportive and have been involved in the yellow-tailed black cockatoo and the southern emu wren recovery program and will be involved in the bush stone-curlew program about to get under way in the Venus Bay Conservation Park. Hundreds of volunteers are now involved in the Ark on Eyre, and it is a credit to the Eyre Peninsula community that it has embraced this program. I think it is a good example of how the agency has tried to get a lot closer to the community and involve the community in various programs and, certainly, the Ark on Eyre project has been a huge success in that regard.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to the target for 2001-02: implement changes arising from amendment of the Environment Protection Act 1993. Can the minister advise when the amended act will be introduced into parliament, and how much money has been allocated in this year's budget for its implementation?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In relation to the Environment Protection Act, that process commenced in 1999 and the inquiry into environment protection of South Australia by the ERD also commenced in 1999. I will not go through the reasons for the review because I think members of the committee are well aware of them. Various discussion papers have been released and I am advised that the initial drafting instructions are likely to be considered by the authority during July. Assuming that they sign off on them, they will then be referred to me for consideration. About \$20 000 has been allocated in the 2001-02 budget for consultation purposes.

**Mr HILL:** What is the cost for the implementation of legislative change?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am not sure what you mean because it all happens within the chamber.

**Mr HILL:** As a supplementary question, will the minister advise if there are any implications for the budget of changing the legislation and is there an allocation for those additional costs?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As I said, the EPA is expecting to consider drafting instructions in July and \$20 000 has been allocated to this process in the 2001-02 budget.

**Mr HILL:** I will leave it at that. The point is that there does not seem to be any money for putting in new infrastructure if that is what you are going to do. If the new act is introduced, which says that you have to do a different range of things or have a different structure or duties, presumably that will cost money. That is the question that I am asking the minister.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** If cabinet and then parliament sign off on an act that requires different duties or structures, I as the minister would have to follow what parliament requires of us in restructuring our finances to reflect whatever act the parliament delivers. All I am saying is that we are still working through the process. I understand that the authority level will be considering drafting instructions in July and \$20 000 has been allocated to work through the process. A judgment will then be made as to what else needs to be done once parliament has dealt with it.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to output classes 1, 2 and 3. I note that output class 1 has \$9.26 million (last year it was \$9.8 million); output class 2 has \$11.25 million (last year it was \$4.46 million); and output class 3 has \$5 million (last year it was \$6.21 million and the year before it was \$9.288 million). The total budget is perhaps even greater than that but there are variations between the lines. Can the minister explain why those variations have occurred?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In relation to your second question, in an earlier statement in the House you stated that there was a minor reduction for output 1.1—Environment protection strategies—from the 2000-01 budget of \$9.8 million to the 2001-02 budget of \$9.26 million (I think it is on page 10.26 of the 2001-02 Portfolio Statement and page 10.25 of the 2000-01 Portfolio Statement). The response to the question is complex and, to put it in context, it needs to be emphasised that budget estimates are based on the best available information as at the end of March and well in advance of the end of the financial year.

The Department for Environment and Heritage provides an indicative estimation of the output costs in the 2000-01 budget papers, which was affected by the transitional nature of the budget transfers between DEH and the departments of water resources and industry and trade—which are not concluded until well into the new financial year 2001-02. So, there are a whole heap of transfers that need to be done as a result of the change in portfolio structure. The complexity of the budget adjustments between portfolios was highlighted in the 2000-01 portfolio statements on pages 10.41 and 10.44. In particular, your attention is drawn to page 10.41 of last year's Portfolio Statement, which stated:

The numbers reflected in the financial statement should also be considered transitional as discussions are continuing between the relevant departments to determine the appropriate level of resources to be transferred with the functions. The allocations outlined in the output net expenditure summary should be treated as indicative as the figuring is based on broad cost methodologies for overheads and the transitional nature of the budget transfers between the respective portfolios following restructuring.

Accordingly, the actual allocation to individual outputs within the environment protection output class in 2000-01 Budget Papers is not entirely consistent with 2001-02 Budget Papers.

The 2000-01 budget expenditure for the environment protection output class does not alter when the numbers are adjusted for consistency. However, the split between the individual output does with output 1.1 having a re-based budget of some \$7.7 million, output 1.2 being \$6.17 million, and output 1.3 recast to \$6.8 million. The format of the budget papers does not provide this level of detail for the 2000-01 budget. A table summarising changes has been prepared and I will give it to the chair for distribution for the member's information. When the expenditure profile is adjusted for consistency, environment protection (output 1.1) has an increased budget from 2000-01 primarily because the expenditure of \$3.4 million is included for the national action

plan for salinity and water quality and increased expenditure of \$0.3 million is included for waste packaging covenant. This is partially offset by the coast and marine management output (output 2.2), which has a budget of some \$2 million, being moved from the environment protection output class to the national parks and wildlife output class. Coast and marine is a major area of emphasis and the government has projected expenditure of about \$7.2 million in the 2001-02 budget.

The movement of the coast and marine output to the new output class national parks and wildlife reflects the structural changes that have occurred within DEH in the 2000-01 year to achieve a single focus for the conservation of terrestrial, marine and cultural landscapes of the state, to group relevant agency programs under a clearly recognisable banner, that is, national parks and wildlife, and to group services utilising similar professional skills and service delivery mechanisms. If this expenditure were still included in the environment protection output class (output 1.1—Environment protection), the change in expenditure would be a growth of \$5.2 million. Clearly, this represents a major commitment to environment protection.

Outputs 1.2 and 1.3, namely 'environment protection' and 'environment protection compliance services', have been subject to a number of changes. The reduction in expenditure of around \$2 million against output class 1.3, 'environment protection monitoring and evaluation', and commensurate increase against output 1.2 'environment protection compliance services', reflects internal restructures associated with the Mount Lofty watershed office and some \$2 million being allocated to the investigation enforcement functions. The 2000-01 expected result for output 1.2 'environment protection and compliance services' has increased by \$6.2 million compared to a rebased 2000-01 budget. This is due to a carry-over from 1999-2000 of over \$3.5 million and the aforementioned transfer between the outputs of \$2 million associated with the Mount Lofty watershed office.

The subsequent reduction of \$1.2 million in the 2000-01 budget compared with the 2001-02 budget is because of an improvement in the level of what is projected to carry over the \$1 million (approximately), a \$2.5 million reduction between years, offset by an increase in expenditure of the EPA's regional presence, \$4 million, and the Chem Collect initiative, \$2 million, an indicative allocation to the output class of approximately \$0.5 million to provide for cost pressures and enterprise bargaining. I hope that clarifies the matter for the honourable member.

**Mr HILL:** I appreciate the minister's explanation, because it highlights the difficulty these budget papers present for anybody trying to work out what is going on from one year to another, especially when that is overlaid with a reorganisation of the department. Each of the four years I have been sitting here asking questions, there has been a reorganisation of the minister's department and a substantial change in the budget papers in the middle of it. I am not criticising the minister for it; it is just a fact of life. It is difficult to understand what is going on.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is why we have a full day of estimates committees—so that we can clarify what is going on.

**Mr HILL:** That is right, and I appreciate the answer. I refer to page 10.25, output class 1. Output revenue for the coming budget is estimated at \$4 million compared with output revenue for the previous budget of \$265 000. Can the

minister explain that huge variation between last year and this year?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What were the lines?

**Mr HILL:** The minister may have answered it in his previous reply. With regard to the output revenue, there is a \$4 million line in this year's budget, and last year there was \$265 000. It is just a huge difference.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We will have to look at that and provide the honourable member with a response.

**Mr HILL:** As a follow-up question, the total of net expenses for this year for output class 1 is \$12.21 million and the net expenses for last year totalled \$13.59 million. Does this not mean a reduction of government effort over the course of that 12 months?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** If the honourable member looks at a previous answer I gave, he will see that late in that answer I talked about the difference in projected carry-overs between the two years. There is a difference of about \$2.5 million in carry-overs. It is really just a carry-over difference that creates that issue. That is clarified, and the honourable member can refer to it in *Hansard*.

**Mrs MAYWALD:** Page 10.5 of the Portfolio Statements makes reference to the Environment Protection Agency establishing a greater presence in regional areas of South Australia. What is envisaged?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** On our various visits to the member for Chaffey's electorate with our community cabinets, the issue has always been raised of greater presence of the EPA in regional areas to service not only her electorate but other electorates nearby. We are pleased to be able to say that we have allocated \$360 000 per year to provide a greater regional presence. Of course, the EPA is keen to improve its performance in regional South Australia, as well as meeting its responsibilities still within the metropolitan area. We have already established an office in Mount Gambier and, of course, the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment, and we are now seeking to establish at least a third office. A number of the regions that would benefit from a regional presence are now being considered. The Murray Bridge council has certainly raised the issue of being considered for an office there. Indeed, a high number of local environmental issues are associated with the River Murray and the surrounding areas; and at Murray Bridge, in particular, a piggery and abattoir licences and dairy effluent are all major issues confronting the community that need to be dealt with.

Importantly, if it goes at Murray Bridge (and that decision has yet to be taken) we are looking to see the best way that we could also expand the office's role into the Riverland area, using Murray Bridge as a launching pad or a base so that they can go into other areas in the Riverland and provide services. With a strong growing rural economy—and the member for Chaffey would acknowledge that the Riverland area has been experiencing reasonably good economic times of late—issues such as gas guns and the like need to be managed. So, a stronger regional presence—whether it be at Murray Bridge or elsewhere—will assist in helping those rural councils and communities deal with those issues within their community.

We are pleased to say that \$360 000 extra per year will be available for a regional presence. We still have not yet decided the format of where that will be, although we will do so pretty soon. One of our priorities is to try to get some greater regional presence of the EPA through the Murray Bridge/Riverland area, because we are aware that the community has to manage significant issues in that area. We

recognise that there needs to be an EPA presence somewhere within the area.

**Mrs MAYWALD:** Salinity concerns all of us in South Australia, and the Portfolio Statements (page 10.23) refer to the commencement of initiatives associated with the national action plan for salinity and water quality. Will the minister outline the government funding commitments and the areas of priority that are to be tackled under this national action plan?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As the member has a strong interest in this issue and has followed it very closely, she would no doubt be aware that on 8 June this year the state and commonwealth governments signed the first bilateral agreement under the national action plan for salinity and water quality. Under this agreement the state and commonwealth have each committed \$93 million until June 2007 towards action to address the effects of salinity on agricultural production, biodiversity infrastructure and to improve water quality in critical areas such as the River Murray and the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed. The program focuses heavily on a regional and community-based approach, which I know the honourable member would support. Regional groups have been established in each of the priority regions—that is, the lower Murray, the South-East, Mount Lofty Ranges, Kangaroo Island and the northern agricultural districts—and are developing integrated national resource management plans that will form the basis of investment strategies to tackle salinity and water quality issues.

In addition, the national action plan funding will be provided early in 2001-02 in advance of the regional plans for actions which are clearly a state or regional priority and which are at the implementation stage. Within this context the government is strongly committed to actions to tackle salinity, an insidious problem that has degraded approximately 410 000 hectares of land within this state, as well as threatening water quality in the Murray River and other watercourses. Priority salinity programs and actions to be funded early in 2001-02 include the following:

- investigations of salt interception works such as Chowilla ground water control scheme to be accelerated and negotiations with the Murray-Darling Basin Commission to be progressed to determine appropriate funding arrangements and allocation of salinity credits, at an estimated cost this next year of about \$1 million;
- the protection and enhancement of the highly significant wetland complex in the upper South-East as part of the upper South-East dry land salinity and flood management scheme, at an estimated cost for the next year of \$3 million;
- salinity mapping of targeted areas using aerial electromagnetic survey techniques as an important component of regional salinity planning, at an estimated cost for the next year of \$3.8 million;
- existing on-ground works relating to salinity and water quality in the Mount Lofty Ranges, Kangaroo Island and northern agricultural districts region are to be accelerated, at an estimated cost over the next year of \$2 million; and
- a range of support mechanisms including salt action teams, information management and research and development to be introduced at an estimated cost of \$4 million.

The foregoing actions will closely link with the strategic policy frameworks provided through the South Australian Murray River salinity strategy and the state dry land salinity

strategy. In addition to the foregoing, regional natural resource management plans, when completed at the end of 2001, will provide the basis for a broad range of actions to address salinity and water quality issues in priority national action plan areas.

**Mrs MAYWALD:** My next question follows on from the second question and it is in relation to the integrated natural resource management. I refer to output class 8, covered in Portfolio Statement, page 10.23. Output class 2 of the Portfolio Statements makes reference to the management, conservation and sustainable use of the state's resources. Recently the government released a draft integrated natural resource management bill for public consultation, which bill has been received with mixed response from the community. Will the minister advise the House of the outcome of that consultation and whether resources have been committed to this initiative?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Since the government approved the public consultation process on the draft integrated natural resource management (INRM) bill on 17 February, nine regional INRM consultation meetings have been held at Mannum, Padthaway, Kingscote, Mount Barker, Wudinna, Balaklava, Berri, Port Augusta and Urrbrae. The objects of the sessions were to provide information and clarification about the draft INRM bill and allow the community to contribute thoughts and ideas about how the draft bill could be improved. During the consultation period between mid February and the end of March and the period that has followed, about 138 written submissions have been received. These submissions were in the main largely supportive of the approach proposed by the draft bill.

As part of the consultation process, comments and issues that have been raised include those concerning expanding the scope of the bill to specifically include reference to coastal marine and estuarine areas; areas of geological value; clarification of the relationship with other natural resource management acts; the criteria for the membership of the INRM groups; and clarification of the relationship of the state natural resource management plan and the regional natural resource management plans. So, there has been a long and reasonably intense consultation process, and the government agencies are now looking at all the issues raised with a view to bringing the bill back to the various ministers for further consideration.

**Mr HILL:** I want now to turn in output class 11 to four or five issues that have been raised with me by members of the public. The first relates to the recycling of plastic waste products; that is, containers for soft drinks, strawberries, biscuits and those kinds of things. A constituent contacted me saying she is very frustrated that not all these plastic containers have appropriate recycling codes, so she does not know how to deal with them. Will the government consider introducing legislation to ensure that all plastic containers in South Australia are suitably labelled and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What do you mean by 'suitably labelled'?

**Mr HILL:** Labelled with the recycling code—the type of plastic—so you know what to do with it when recycling.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** If you send me a copy of the letter I am happy to consider it.

**Mr HILL:** I did.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Send me another copy: I am happy to further consider it. If you have sent me a copy of it, I would have responded to it already.

**Mr HILL:** I wrote:

I write on behalf of my constituent. . . Mrs W is a committed recycler and finds it frustrating that not all plastic containers have appropriate recycling codes. Some items are well identified, others merely say 'recyclable', while other items have no identifying marks whatsoever. I would appreciate your advice regarding laws, regulations and standards that might apply and what impediments, if any, prevent suitable identification of all plastic packages.

You kindly wrote back and said:

Thank you for your letter. . . To assist with Mrs W's inquiry, I have included a fact sheet sourced from the resources recovery and recycling information directory produced by the Waste Management Committee in 2000. I trust that this fact sheet will assist Mrs W's understanding of the plastic identification code numbering system.

Her comment to me is that she understood the problem; now she wants to know what the solution is. She is very committed to recycling, but she cannot do it because the appropriate coding is not on all the containers. There may well be interstate or international problems.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We are happy to have another look at the practicalities of that. In some senses the debate is similar to some issues in relation to the container deposit legislation, in that a lot of the product would be imported, so niche markets and cost to product sorts of issues arise. We are happy to look at it to see how practical that is, so if you send me Mrs W's letter again I will reconsider the issue and see what practicalities are in place that need to be worked through. My experience is that it will not be a simple matter.

**Mr HILL:** I appreciate the minister's answer on behalf of Mrs W. I refer now to West Lakes and the scare that happened earlier this year in relation to contamination in the West Lakes area. I have in front of me a letter signed by Julieanne Cheek on behalf of the West Lakes Residents Consultative Committee. The letter was a response to the draft cabinet submission on the management of cadmium contamination at West Lakes. The note states in part:

The Committee therefore requests that the EPA expand its investigation in the West Lakes affected areas to include the analysis of hexavalent chromium, PAHs and dioxins. In addition, the Committee feels that the issue of airborne dust contamination has not been dealt with adequately at this stage. Hence the Committee requests a protracted airborne monitoring program be instigated. This should include, in addition to cadmium, the other pollutants previously identified. The Committee also notes that clear evidence exists in the Council report of contamination of the ground water. The Committee therefore requests that the EPA instigate a monitoring program of the aquifer over a protracted period of time.

Can you tell the committee whether the EPA has acted on those concerns, and whether you are satisfied that all has been done that ought to be done in order to assure the citizens of West Lakes that their health and environment are not in danger?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have not seen that letter; I do not know whether it is a letter to me or the agency.

**Mr HILL:** I am not sure. I can give you a copy of the letter which is headed, 'West Lakes Residents Consultative Committee response to the draft cabinet submission on management of cadmium contamination at West Lakes'. I am not sure where it has been circulated.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I think the process should be that you forward it through and I will look at it and give a reply.

**Mr HILL:** I now refer to another pollution issue in the western suburbs in relation to the Hensley foundry, which I understand is owned by a US company. I have been contacted by local residents who are concerned about air pollution coming from that particular foundry. They have told me that they believe the technology in the foundry is 50 to 60 years old and that something like 140 people are working there.

There has been a local meeting of 200-plus residents who have complained about the smell, in particular, coming from the foundry.

The EPA has issued orders for the foundry to close doors and windows to reduce odour levels by December this year. Hensley Industries has appealed those orders, I understand, to the ERD court. In the past year or so, I understand that half the management team from Hensley has gone; and a number of skilled workers who dealt with some of these issues were sacked some years ago. I also understand that a Japanese company was looking at buying the company but, once it became aware of the residents' concerns, it pulled out. The residents who came to see me raised a lot of issues about the way in which this issue is being handled.

How satisfied is the minister with the way in which it has been handled by the EPA? I also understand from the residents that United States laws would not allow the process which is being used at Hensley to operate in the United States.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As the member points out, the matter is before a court. I do not know whether it is wise for us to be discussing a matter that is before a court, other than to say that I know the EPA is certainly aware of the issue and I think it has put in a genuine effort to try to manage and resolve the issues. The company, of course—regardless of who owns it—has a democratic right to appeal to the court and have the court hear the matter. That is the process through which it is going. It is a difficult issue that all governments face in trying to manage odour and noise issues when residential development follows industrial development. The government will continue to work through all the issues with both the company and the community to try to find the middle ground in the solutions. I do not know that I can add much more, given that the matter is currently before the court.

**Mr HILL:** I now refer to an issue that is happening at Kuitpo Forest. Thick correspondence was sent to me by Gary and Rosemary Goland from Meadows about the noise from the sawmill at Kuitpo and their concerns about the lack of action by the EPA in relation to the abatement of that noise. Is the minister aware of the issue and can he tell the committee what action he has taken to respond to their concerns?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that the agency has been negotiating with the family concerned in relation to an agreement on a process that will be used to measure the noise emitted by that particular enterprise. The advice to me is that there is some disagreement about the process that should be used. The agency advises me that it is proposing to use what it terms 'very standard measuring procedures' for noise. The family concerned may not necessarily agree with that process, but the agency is still trying to negotiate with them to reach some common ground on the way forward in relation to how the noise will be measured.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to an article in the *Hills and Valley Messenger* on 14 June 2000 under the headline, 'Weed sprays killing frogs'. The expert in the case was Professor Michael Tyler. He was talking about the spraying of footpaths with a particular spray which he believed would get into the water supply and into frogs. I asked the minister a question on this issue some time later and in response you said:

I am advised that the Mitcham Council uses only Roundup Bioactive, a 'frog friendly' herbicide with reduced surfactant as it is the surfactant that has the most effect on frogs.

I have sent a copy of that answer to Mr Tyler. He said in response to me later last year:

Sadly, the minister's response failed to advise you that the information that Roundup Bioactive is frog friendly comes from the manufacturer Monsanto. The chemical was approved for use in Australia without any experimental work being undertaken on Australian species.

Could the minister again take up this issue and have another look at this chemical because, according to Professor Tyler, your advice is inaccurate?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Given that the honourable member has had that for over a year, it is surprising that he has sat on it for a year and has not forwarded it through so that I could immediately deal with the matter.

**Mr HILL:** I apologise for not sending it forward, but I am doing it now.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That response must be, I would guess, eight months old.

**Mr HILL:** I am not sure when you responded.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Mike Tyler is a constituent of Davenport—and I know that Davenport is of keen interest to the member for Kaurna. Mike Tyler is renowned throughout the world for his knowledge of frogs and if he has some issues with my response then I am pleased the honourable member has raised them with me. I personally will contact Mike Tyler and quiz him on what the issue is. That was advice to me at the time. Now that you have raised the issue, eight months later, we will take it up with Mike Tyler to see if we can clarify exactly what the circumstances are.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I would like to ask a question about grant funding to Friends of Parks which is output class 2: National Parks and Wildlife, Portfolio Statements, page 10.09. I have discussed this matter with my colleague the member for Flinders who advised me that Friends of Parks received grant funding from the South Australian government. As parks are an important issue to my constituents, as well as to those of the member for Flinders, I ask the minister to provide an update of what community benefit is derived from these groups.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I know that both the honourable member and the member for Flinders have a very keen interest in and support Friends of Parks. The Friends of Parks scheme in South Australia is indeed the country's largest voluntary support network for parks. I think that is a great credit to South Australia and to that particular group, which now has over 5 000 volunteers. In fact, I thought it was closer to 6 000 volunteers but my brief tells me 5 000—so we will trust 5 000. There are now some 107 friends groups within the parks. Parks that receive assistance from friends range from the metropolitan parks such as Scott Creek Conservation Park to the vast landscapes of the Simpson Desert.

Friends of Parks undertake a range of activities, including revegetation programs, weed management, heritage sites, erosion controls, signage, history, administrative and clerical, interpretation, wildlife, education and publicity projects. Statistics for the year 2000 show that these volunteers contributed some 40 000 days of work, which is equivalent to around \$5 million in value of time through some 700 projects. That really is a fantastic result for the Friends of Parks and it outlines their real commitment to our parks system year in year out. The friends are supported by a Community Liaison Unit of National Parks and Wildlife through individual park offices. Under the parks agenda program, which was launched in June 1997 and which aims to promote an increased community involvement in the parks, grants made to Friends of Parks groups by National Parks and Wildlife SA were doubled from \$30 000 to \$60 000 per

annum. These grants are available upon application by the group. About another 2 000 volunteers contribute through the national parks and wildlife consultative committees, camp ground hosts, overseas students and volunteers with the biological surveys and the various other programs that exist within the agency.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I now move on to the formation of the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands—Yurrebilla—which appears under output class 2, National Parks and Wildlife Portfolio Statement, page 10.9. I have been most interested in this project, and the minister has been kind enough to ask me to chair the stakeholder group involved in the matter, a task which I have enjoyed. I have been assisted in that by officers of the department, who are very professional, and the whole thing has progressed remarkably well. Can the minister indicate what progress we have made now that the park has been announced, where we are at present with this initiative, and can he elaborate on his vision for the future, including any ongoing financial commitment now that we are out of the starting gates and well on the way to establishing this terrific parkland?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In commencing the answer, I commend the member for Waite for the excellent job he is doing as chair of our community consultation group (Stakeholder Management Group, as we call it). The group meets bimonthly and is looking at some very difficult issues in relation to trying to juggle comments in relation to the biodiversity importance of our parks as against the recreational use of our parks. Some of the recreational user groups on the Stakeholder Management Group include Bike SA, Walk SA, and Horse SA. They all have particular views on certain issues and representation from other groups who have very strong biodiversity interests creates some strong debate. The group needs to be carefully managed, and the member for Waite is doing a very good job managing the Stakeholder Management Group, and I certainly thank him for taking on the role of chair.

Members will recall that in March this year I had much pleasure in launching the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands—Yurrebilla—at the Belair National Park. I take the opportunity again to thank the officers involved, because they have been meeting fortnightly with me and I know it is a big commitment of their time, but certainly the end result has justified that level of involvement. The 20-year vision is for future generations to have a second generation of parklands connected by both recreational trails and/or biodiversity links throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges and beyond. The naming of the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands—Yurrebilla—and the management of it as one parkland will ensure that recreational user activities are balanced with conservation and biodiversity interests, a matter on which I have commented previously.

The government land committed to the parklands includes National Parks and Wildlife SA reserves, water reserves, forest reserves and Planning SA metropolitan open space land. The lands which have gone into the core announcement total in excess of 45 000 hectares, stretching from Aldinga Scrub Conservation Park in the south to Para Wirra Recreation Park in the north. I thought it was around 40 000 hectares, but my brief says '45 000'. The government steering committee coordinates the agency input to the parklands. This is led by National Parks and Wildlife and is comprised of key representatives from SA Water, the Department of Water Resources, Forestry SA and Planning SA.

Important issues which need to be taken into account when managing the parklands include developing consistent policies for fire, recreation and biodiversity, and developing joint programs across agencies. A five year plan is currently being developed for the parklands. The plan will recognise the core role and responsibilities of each agency and will facilitate a range of complementary and collaborative programs. In 2000-01, some \$260 000 was allocated to this particular parklands strategy. In the coming year, I am pleased to advise the member for Waite that we are allocating \$500 000 to implement a range of projects. These projects will include: the development of a zoning plan to assign core values and principles to apply to each individual property within the broader framework; integrated fire planning across lands such as Para Wirra Recreation Park, Mount Crawford Forest and South Para Reservoir; ongoing funding to National Parks and Wildlife and the Department of Correctional Services prisoner work programs for woody weed removal and trail management programs; funding to support community based biodiversity conservation programs; and addition of land to the parks in the Mount Lofty Ranges.

I am pleased to say that the first formal addition to the Yurrebilla park will be announced this week in relation to Scott Creek Conservation Park: we will be adding some land in there, and I know that the chair will have an interest in that, given that it is in his local electorate. Some 98 hectares of native vegetation is being added to the 625 hectare Scott Creek Conservation Park. They are the first formal additions as such. The first addition we announced was that the Blackwood Forest (in the electorate of Davenport) would become part of the parklands to maintain this area as open space for the community. I am sure that the member for Waite and the chair will recall that Blackwood Forest has been an ongoing issue of some debate in the Mitcham hills for about 25 years. As the local member I was very pleased to announce that Blackwood Forest would become part of the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands and would be permanent open space for the community to enjoy.

Local government and the National Trust have also been invited to submit nominations for any land that they may wish to commit for the parklands' framework. Local government has been asked whether they want to bring reserves under the management of the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands; and the National Trust, which has land throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges, has also been asked whether it wishes to bring its lands under that particular framework. Private landowners will, by invitation, be invited to nominate areas such as heritage agreements, sanctuaries and wildlife refuges in the future.

I believe that the Greater Mount Lofty Parklands is a very positive policy setting a 20-year vision, and I look forward to spending my time helping to deliver that particular project over the next 20 years. To have a second generation parkland around Adelaide helps again to badge Adelaide as 'the city in a park'. It is another one of the great projects which the government has undertaken and I give credit to former ministers who went to the 1997 election with that particular policy.

*[Sitting suspended from 1.04 to 2 p.m.]*

**Mr HILL:** Prior to the luncheon adjournment, I was going through a number of issues in relation to the EPA and output class 1. My next question is in relation to the announcement made by the minister on 5 January 2001 in a press release

headed 'Plans to cut waste water in the Murray River'. In that press release, he indicated that a draft policy was being looked at to consider providing that houseboats should keep on board all the grey water that they would otherwise spill into the Murray. Can the minister tell us where that policy is at and whether there is any allocation in this budget to implement that policy?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Certainly, there are some allocations within the budget to deal with the water policy, and that houseboat issue is tied up with that policy. In relation to the houseboat issue, there have been representations from houseboat groups with respect to possible filtering systems that may achieve the same purpose. Rather than having to store all the water on board, you may be able to use filtering systems to develop the water to an appropriate standard for release into the river. The houseboat industry raised some issues in relation to how you modify existing houseboats to suddenly store that amount of water and those sorts of things.

In relation to the houseboat issue, my understanding is that the houseboat industry groups were going to make some representations on filtering systems to see how practical they are in relation to adoption for their houseboats. But there is a bit of an issue that governments will have to look at in relation to the modern-day houseboat. Some of them have spas and dishwashers, etc. Those can use more aggressive chemical agents in them, and that does create some issues.

In relation to the actual water policy, I am advised that we are currently assessing the submissions, and over the next six weeks the agency should be referring any proposed amendments to the authority for its consideration. So, we have had the public consultation document, the agency has considered the submissions and in the next six or eight weeks it should be referring any proposed amendments to the EPA for consideration. It will go through the normal process from there.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to the recent action against Mobil for the spillage that occurred a couple of years ago and the \$250 000 fine that was imposed. There was some discussion in the media as to whether or not that was adequate. I also understand that Mobil paid \$1.1 million to clean up the spilt oil. Did it in fact cover all the state clean-up costs in relation to that episode, or was there some cost to government in the clean-up of the spill on the southern beaches?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You are saying that if there is any cost to the whole of government we will have to do a whole of government—

**Mr HILL:** In terms of cleaning up.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes. We will have to do a whole of government request and come back to you.

**Mr HILL:** Perhaps I can put the question in a different way. Did Mobil's \$1.1 million cover government expenses as well as its own cleaning up expenses?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You will have to refer that question to the Minister for Transport because it is that agency that went through that process: you will have to refer that to Minister Laidlaw.

Can I clarify for the member an issue that he raised in a question previously? The issue in a previous question was in relation to the increase in revenue for output 1.1 and it appeared that there was a discrepancy between years of \$4 200 000 or \$4 260 000, or something like that. I am advised that, primarily, that reflects the inclusion in the 2001-02 budget figuring of the commonwealth's notional matching allocation to the DEH programs under the national action plan for salinity and water quality; so, it is the revenue

stream from the commonwealth for the national action plan. Other major elements of the increase are the full year impacts of the solid waste levies and the progressive introduction of the weighbridges in councils receiving more than 10 000 tonnes at their landfills. So, there is some slightly greater collection of waste levies.

In relation to the former—which is the national action plan figures—the budget figures reflect the assumed continuation of the current process whereby all commonwealth funds for major initiatives—for example, the Natural Heritage Trust—are channelled through a common South Australian government secretariat which is serviced by DEH, the Department of Water Resources and PIRSA and are subsequently then distributed to the respective agencies. So, there is a common secretariat for the Department of Water Resources, DEH and PIRSA that administers the NHT bid and allocation, and the money goes to that. We assume that the national action plan money that will come from the commonwealth will go through a similar process. Because the national action plan is a new program this year and did not exist last year, the revenues coming in for the national action plan reflect that increase. That is why there is such a big difference.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to the Highbury dump. I understand that a closure plan was submitted to the EPA on, I think, 28 February this year. I understand that it has yet to be acted upon. Can the minister explain the hold-up, and is there a process in place to allow that closure to occur?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that there was an extensive community consultation process and detailed environmental investigations. There was a plan submitted on 28 February which is being reviewed by EPA officers and discussed with representatives of East Waste with a view to finalising the implementation program to be incorporated in the environmental licence to be issued for the period beyond 31 July 2001.

**Mr HILL:** My final question in relation to the EPA concerns the board of the EPA. I made some comments earlier about the fact that there was a vacancy on the EPA board. Has the minister yet appointed a woman to the EPA and, if not, when will that occur?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have.

**Mr HILL:** Will you tell us who it is?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, I will. Anne Harvey is Deputy Chief Executive of the Department for Environment and Heritage and Trevor Fletcher from the City of Onkaparinga is the local government representative selected from a panel of three put forward by the Local Government Association.

**Mr HILL:** Does that mean that you have added an extra position, or has somebody resigned from the board? Has Mr Newland been replaced?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, Ms Harvey replaced Mr Newland. Under the act the public sector position can be nominated at different times.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to output class 2.1, which is the national parks area. The first issue is the highlight for 2000-01 which is: 'Released the Coorong Ramsar plan and announced extensions to Coorong National Park'. The minister will be aware of a dispute between Senator Hill on the one hand and Minister Brindal on the other hand. At least, they are the symbolic focus of the dispute between those who believe that adding fresh water to the Coorong will cause a change to the environment and damage the Coorong's Ramsar status and those who think that it is a sensible thing to do for the environment from a clean water point of view. Can the

minister say where he stands on this issue and what involvement he has in this issue?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I support the plan.

**Mr HILL:** Are you concerned about the changes to the Ramsar status of the site as a result of drainage water coming into it?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That issue has been worked through with the various offices and has been considered. We have looked at the management plan. It was released in December 2000 and looks at how we manage a wetland of international importance. It has an implementation task force, including a Ramsar project officer. The task force and the project officer are in the process of being appointed—or have just been appointed, one of the two. The project officer will be based at the new office of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife in Goolwa and provide and on-ground presence in this area of the lower lakes. We expect that the formal extension to the Coorong National Park will be formally proclaimed within the next eight to 10 weeks.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** My question is in relation to output class 2, national parks and wildlife in relation to Rocky River—Portfolio Statements, Budget Paper 5, page 10.9. The provision of visitor education and information services in national parks remains a target in output class 2. Could you advise the committee on the progress of development in the Rocky River precinct of Flinders Chase National Park under the Parks Agenda program as referred to, and I note in a paper that there is reference to day visitor facilities in relation to this area. Is provision for overnight stays contemplated as part of this \$7 million plan?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I thank the member for Bragg for his question. I know that his interest in tourism is strong, as is the interest of the chairman of the committee. The Parks Agenda program, which was launched by the government a number of years ago, committed an extra \$29.5 million, or roughly \$30 million, for parks and wildlife for the period 1997-98 to 2002-03. The Parks Agenda program, to date, has certainly produced significant achievements in the upgrade of services and facilities in key parks such as Cleland Conservation Park, Morialta Conservation Park, the Flinders Ranges National Park and the Innes National Park—where I was fortunate enough to open the new visitor centre—and the implementation of several significant biodiversity and conservation programs.

In 2001-02 the major Parks Agenda initiative is the \$7.615 development at the Rocky River precinct in the Flinders Chase National Park. This is in addition to the state government's investment of \$10 million for the strategic upgrade and improvement of tourism infrastructure generally across Kangaroo Island. So, the government has made a significant contribution to tourism infrastructure on Kangaroo Island since 1993. Rocky River in Flinders Chase National Park is an area of great importance for both biodiversity conservation and regional tourism. The Public Works Committee of parliament, as the member is no doubt aware, endorsed the Rocky River precinct development through its 144th report in December 2000. The total approved budget for the project is \$7.615 million over four financial years from 1999-2000 to 2002-03.

Construction of the Rocky River Visitors Centre is scheduled to commence in July 2001, with completion in early 2002, subject to the weather. Trying to build on Kangaroo Island in July is tricky and that end of the island is fairly remote and exposed to the weather. All going well, it should be completed by early 2002. Day visitor facilities and



camp ground ablutions are currently in the design phase and scheduled for completion in December 2001. Interpretation of the Rocky River site, the Flinders Chase National Park and an extensive walking trail system is currently under development and scheduled for completion around April 2002. From memory, three houses for staff accommodation are presently under construction and should be completed by August or September 2001. So, I am pleased to advise the committee that the Rocky River precinct development is currently on schedule and within budget. The Tandanya Wilderness Resort, a private development just outside the park, provides very comfortable facilities not only for backpackers but also for those seeking motel-type accommodation. It has an excellent restaurant and is a very good tourism facility. We had the pleasure of staying there when we visited the area in the last two or three months to have a look at the proposed site for the development.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I refer to the Portfolio Statements, output class 2—Botanic Gardens, at page 10.15, which lists as highlights a number of significant events. Can the minister provide the committee with a brief summary of each of these highlights before commenting on targets for 2001–02, including the proposed gardens master plan? I refer particularly to an area in which I have a special interest, that is, the development of the Wine Centre and how it might fit into the future promotion of our Botanic Gardens.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There have been a number of significant events in relation to the Botanic Gardens over the last 12 months. The Wollemi pine was planted in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens on 23 November. It is an extremely rare tree thought to have been extinct for many millions of years but was rediscovered in New South Wales, if my memory serves me right. The chair of the committee, the Hon. David Wotton, had the pleasure of planting one of these trees in the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens. The Wollemi pine was rediscovered in 1994 and represents an ancient group of plants that first appeared on the fossil record some 142 million years ago. Both trees were planted within protective cages.

Also, a Friends Naming Trail was launched at Wittunga, which was funded by the Friends of the Botanic Gardens. This took place so that people could follow more easily the plantings in the Wittunga Gardens at Blackwood and, as the local member and minister, we had the pleasure of launching that and following it through with the garden guides with an explanation of how it works. The International Rose Garden was opened by the Premier on 19 October and was well attended by the media and many guests. Again, the proceedings were followed through with a tour of the rose garden, and that occurred in conjunction with the International Rose Festival, with large numbers of people attending. That festival returns to Adelaide in 2002.

The member raised the question about the Wine Centre, and it is logical that it should be located in South Australia because we are, after all, the wine capital of Australia. We certainly see more use being made of that area with the synergy of wine and roses, and so on, and the Botanic Gardens will certainly become even more of a tourist attraction than they already are. WOMAdelaide staging an event there is an example. Some 26 000 people experienced the sights and sounds of WOMAdelaide in 2001 in Botanic Park. It was the first year that the event coordinators introduced a waste-free policy to the event, recycling over eight tonnes of rubbish on opening day, which signifies the success of WOMAdelaide as an event as well as positive action by

the organisers and agencies to try to make it waste free by recycling as much as possible. WOMAdelaide returns in 2003.

A master plan has been developed by the Botanic Gardens board. The gardens consist of four main sites: Adelaide, of course, which is the oldest and best known; Mount Lofty; Wittunga at Blackwood; and Beechwood at Stirling. I know that the member for Kaurana has a very strong interest in Beechwood. Whilst all those are show pieces in their own right, it is the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide that enjoys a very high reputation and there is a need to ensure that we are clear as to what the community expects from the gardens as we move forward. The development of a Botanic Gardens master plan is commencing as part of a comprehensive master planning process over the next 12 months or so.

I guess that will mean that the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide will continue to be one of the foremost botanic gardens in Australia and, importantly, bring the community with it. So, we are trying to develop a process indicating where we understand those who have an interest in matters botanic want to take the park. By going through this planning process, we think that we will not only see a proper plan for the park but also plan around the events that we think are central to the lifestyle of Adelaide as we know it. Over the next 12 months there will be a master planning process in relation to the Adelaide Botanic Gardens, and we look forward to developing what will be a positive and bright future for the gardens.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As a new resident of the City of Adelaide, particularly at that end of Adelaide, having spent some time in the last few months walking through the Botanic Gardens, I believe it is really one of the special parts of our city that does not get anywhere near the promotion as a tourist attraction that it probably should. As an aside, I have mentioned that fact to the Minister for Tourism in any case. It will be interesting to see how that whole area develops as the Wine Centre, the Botanic Gardens and everything else there are promoted as part of the North Terrace precinct. It is a very special area.

In relation to Portfolio Statement, output class 6, referring to Environment and geographic information and knowledge, at page 10.20, could you advise how this provision of environmental information and knowledge occurs? I note that the release of the web site for environmental reporting on line is highlighted. What data is now accessible to the general community, and are there plans to further expand this?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The environmental reporting web site was launched on 30 January 2001. It was developed to make the department's environmental information and data more transparent and accessible to the general public. The easier accessibility to information creates a more informed community and, importantly, that leads to greater confidence in accountability on the part of government. The increased availability of environmental data and information will focus community attention on the condition of the environment. In instances where the condition is not acceptable, the necessary actions for improvement and protection will be taken. So, the principle behind the environmental web site is that environmental information will be placed on the web site and it will give the government a chance to say, 'Here is our monitoring about certain information. Here is what it actually means and here is the government response.' So, rather than having knee-jerk reactions from certain sections of the community in relation to issues, by putting information on the web site we think that people from all different backgrounds will be

able to monitor it. There is different quality of information for different groups: high school students are directed in a certain area and PhD students might dig a bit deeper and find different information, depending on their level of knowledge and need for information of a certain standard.

So, the idea is that it will give the public a chance to monitor trends of what the government is monitoring. There will be a chance for government to explain what the trends mean, and people in the public—both professional and non-professional—will be able to comment on and make their own judgments about whether the government's interpretation is right. Ultimately, based on that information, the government will be able to say what its response is in a policy sense. That means that long term—and it is a long-term project—it will bring a more informed community to the environmental debate and take out some of the scare mongering that might occur if communities are not properly informed about certain issues. We are committed to providing environmental information on-line. I was pleased the department took on board the concept and has developed the web site.

The information and data on the environmental reporting web site is organised basically under seven major categories: air quality, waste management, parks and reserves, biodiversity, water quality, coastal marine and heritage. The information is interpreted and value added, providing an indication of the general trends for the various environmental issue. The information provided is diverse, ranging from air quality in the metropolitan region, water quality in the state's major rivers and streams, solid waste disposal landfill since 1993, and native vegetation clearing statistics. While the web site was developed primarily to provide access to environmental data and information by DEH, links are also provided to a wide range of environmental data and information held by either local government, other state bodies or federal government agencies.

An eighth category of information on the web site is our environmental data inventory. This is basically a catalogue of some 135 environmental data sets that are held by the state government agencies, and the inventory is organised into nine major categories and includes data sets as wide ranging as sea grass mapping, population projections, traffic volumes and soil landscape mapping. The inventory is intended for use as a first point of reference to locate environmental data. You would go to the web site, and you would be able to see under that index—if you want to call it that—what sort of information the government holds. So, at least you get some lead as to where to go. That inventory itself does not provide direct access to the actual data; rather, it provides details about the data so that users assess quickly whether a data set is likely to be useful for a particular purpose; then contact details are provided if users wish to contact the data custodians directly. It is really an information bank that refers you to the correct agency.

It is intended that the environmental reporting web site will become a major provider of the Department of the Environment's data and information. Additional data sets are being added to the site progressively, and options for expanding the web site are being explored, particularly regarding the provision of online access to environmental data. In addition, the environmental reporting web site will be used to present data and results from the forthcoming 2003 State of the Environment report of South Australia. The web site will provide an ideal facility for presenting an up-to-date summary of the condition of South Australia's environ-

ment, the pressures that are impacting upon it, and the various programs and initiatives that are being undertaken to address significant environmental problems and how effective these have been.

From a personal viewpoint, in four or five years it will be interesting to see just how much information is on there. There is no doubt that the community is hungry for environmental information, and we are trying to make a genuine attempt to say, 'Here is the information we have. To the best of our knowledge, this is what it means, and this is where we are heading trying to address it.' Anyone with any interest at all would be able to follow that argument and work through the web site. It is one of the more positive things we have done. In the long term it will be hugely beneficial to those in the community who wish to use it.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to page 10.9, the first target, which is to implement the 2001-02 parks agenda program in key parks. I understand that the minister has already answered a question about that. How many more years are left of the parks agenda, and what will be the forward costs for each of those years?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that the \$29.5 million parks agenda program which was announced in 1997 goes to 2002-03, and that involves \$4 million in capital and \$1.5 million in recurrent expenditure.

**Mr HILL:** I would like to turn now to questions to do with wilderness in output class 2.1. I understand from the Wilderness Protection Act annual report that the following parks have had assessments completed and reports produced: the Great Victoria Desert, the Yellabinna Mallee, Central Eyre Peninsula and Southern Eyre Peninsula. From the 1999-2000 report, I also understand that the following parks are having reports prepared: the Northern Eyre Peninsula Park, the Lake Gairdner National Park, the Far West Coast, the Eastern Mallee region and the channel country by geographic. Also, some 18 or so areas have been nominated for wilderness protection by the general public. Of those parks that have had their reports completed, has wilderness status been recommended, and when will the minister either approve or reject those recommendations?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Of the parks that the member mentioned—and I cannot remember them all—the Southern Eyre Peninsula park is the one that has come before me. The others might have come before previous ministers, but I would need to check that. In the southern Eyre Peninsula area, I am considering the Coffin Bay Conservation Park/Lincoln National Park area. That has gone through an extensive consultation process. We looked at the Wilderness Advisory Committee's recommendations and the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Committee recommendations, and we are in the process of working through what the government response to that may be. However, I would expect a response to that certainly this side of Christmas. So, that matter will be dealt with certainly this side of Christmas. I do not remember the other parks that the member mentioned coming before me. They might have involved previous ministers, so I will have to look at those reports and see what they recommended.

**Mr HILL:** Will the minister take on notice and give us some information about those parks?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, we can.

**Mr HILL:** In relation to the parks where plans are being prepared and where the public has put in applications (and I note that some of them go back to 1996), when are the reports likely to be finalised?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The reports or the plans?

**Mr HILL:** I guess there is a report first. As I understand it, someone makes an application and the Wilderness Assessment Committee considers the application and produces a report, which then goes to the minister. Then a plan would be produced if the minister decided to go ahead with it. Is that not the process?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that there are five wilderness protection areas in this state, all on Kangaroo Island. Reports on the wilderness values of other parts of the state have been completed, and the Wilderness Advisory Committee worked through them. There is the greater Victoria desert—or the Unnamed Conservation Park—Yellabinna region, which is the Yellabinna Regional Reserve and the Yumbarra Conservation Park/Pureba Conservation Park; the Central Eyre Peninsula, Bascombe Well Conservation Park, Hambidge Conservation Park and Hincks Conservation Park, and the one we just spoke about, namely, the Southern Eyre Peninsula Conservation Park.

I have mentioned that I am considering the southern Eyre Peninsula ones. Further areas have been under consideration by the committee and the reports are being prepared. These might have been the ones raised by members of the public to which you referred. These areas include Ngarkat Conservation Park, Billiatt Conservation Park, Danggali Conservation Park, Wahgunyah Conservation Park, Gammon Ranges and the Channel Country, which is the Coongie Lakes Paddock and Innamincka Regional Reserve. Management plans have been adopted for the Cape Bouger and Ravine des Casoars wilderness areas, and plans are in preparation for the Cape Torrens, Western River and Cape Gantheaume wilderness protection areas.

**Mr HILL:** That is the list of parks I read out at the beginning. My question is: when will you consider the report about whether or not they will be made wilderness areas?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I said earlier that I will have to go back and check, because some of those were presented to previous ministers. I will have to go back and see—

**Mr HILL:** I understood that part, but I am talking about the ones in prospect. A number of parks, which you just listed, are currently being considered by the wilderness committee.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It has not reported to me yet.

**Mr HILL:** My question is: when are they likely to report to you, and when will you be able to consider them?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will have to ask the committee.

**Mr HILL:** Will you do that?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am happy to ask the committee.

**Mr HILL:** Thank you. I take it, from looking at output class 2.1 and the performance indicator under 'wilderness protected areas', that it is not your intention to proclaim any wilderness protection areas this year, in that the number of hectares currently under protection is anticipated to stay the same this year as it was last year.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, that would be a wrong interpretation.

**Mr HILL:** Perhaps you will explain it to me.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am happy to explain it. You get the reports from the Wilderness Advisory Committee and the National Parks and Wildlife Committee and consider them. Ultimately a judgment is made and, if you decided to proclaim a wilderness area, those hectares under wilderness protection would then change. If you automatically include it in your budget papers or outputs, you have already prejudged the work of the committee.

**Mr HILL:** That is a meaningless indicator, then.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes and no. It will indicate next year in reflection whether or not you have nominated any. In other words, if this year we decide to proclaim wilderness protected areas, that will be reflected. All I am saying is that you would not prejudge it; you would work through the process first and make a decision. Your papers will ultimately reflect that in due course—otherwise, why have the process? You would just do it at budget time. We would argue that you work through the process.

**Mr HILL:** I do not dispute the process, but I make the point that the indicator does not tell you very much if it really makes sense only post facto; you have to look at next year to work out whether you have achieved your targets for the previous year.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** With all due respect, you spent the first two hours asking me about comparisons between last year's figures and this year's figures; that is exactly what the process is all about. One would be able to see quite clearly that, if we declare another 20 hectares or whatever it is, that would show and be reflected in the result.

**Mr HILL:** I draw the minister's attention to the first output class, which is the biological survey. You have a growth in that area because you have anticipated some—

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is purely a departmental decision. That is a ministerial decision that does not necessarily rely on the statutory advice of the Wilderness Advisory Committee. There is a different process. A biological survey is purely a budget commitment so I know for sure that we can sign off on that. From memory, the biological surveys have been going since 1985 or longer. You can commit to a biological survey, because it does not have to go through a process, whereas under the act a wilderness protection area has to go through a particular process. It may well be that that process does not deliver an outcome that reflects in a change in the papers. So, rather than prejudge the process, we have reflected the fact that that is the figure, and a comparison will be made next year.

**Mr HILL:** I will move on; I am not getting anywhere with this line. I make the point that some reports have been sitting not necessarily on this minister's desk but on the minister for the environment's desk for some years. These reports have not been dealt with and are not in the public arena. He mentioned one which is about to be considered, but several others have not been. There is a list of areas where reports have been requested by the public and another list of areas where the department or committee itself is looking at issues, and there has not been very much progress over a period of years. In relation to the wilderness committee's budget I understand that funding for the wilderness officer has been cut and that it is now a half time position. Is that correct?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that the budget for the wilderness officer is tied up in the park management planning budget, which is around \$200 000. It is all tied up in there. If resources are required to deal with those reports they will certainly be allocated to make sure those reports are or have been appropriately dealt with.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** My question relates to Morialta and the Gawler Ranges, which has to do with the environment and heritage portfolio output class 2—National parks and wildlife, Portfolio Statement, page 10.9. The minister would be aware that Morialta sits within the hills face, and that is a matter of vital interest to many residents living along the hills face zone, including many of my

constituents in the seat of Waite. I note that the Portfolio Statement refers to the continuation of the parks agenda on page 10.9. Will the minister advise the committee if this includes any further commitments for visitor infrastructure at places such as Morialta Conservation Park and the Gawler Ranges National Park?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As I mentioned earlier, the government has committed \$29.5 million since 1997-98 to 2002-03 for the parks agenda. That had four strategies to it. One is about pursuing excellence in park management and stewardship and another is involving the community in park management. Another strategy is about providing appropriate service to South Australians and visitors, and the fourth one is about developing a partnership through the relationship between the parks service and the community to optimise benefits to nature conservation. The parks agenda to date has produced significant achievements in the upgrading of services and facilities in key parks such as Cleland, Morialta, Flinders Ranges and Inniss. I have already given an answer about the \$7.615 million going into Rocky River.

The parks agenda is also funding the redevelopment of visitor facilities in the Morialta Conservation Park. The total project budget is \$1.2 million. For this work some \$942 000 was allocated from the 2000-01 parks agenda administration program, and \$250 000 has been allocated in 2001-02 to undertake the work. The overall emphasis of the redevelopment is on low key but quality visitor infrastructure to facilitate excellent bushwalking experiences at one of Adelaide's most scenic bush parks. The project brief for the Morialta precinct upgrade includes: improved parking facilities at four sites, including the old Morialta workshop area and the 'falls' car park; improved pedestrian access through quality walking trails and interpretation; retention of the former Morialta administration building as a volunteer centre and visiting ranger office; removal of the surplus workshop infrastructure and portable staff house, and rehabilitation of that area; provision of facilities for mobile food outlet and picnicking; and rebuilding toilet facilities at the 'falls' car park. Works at Morialta are on budget and scheduled for completion within the next six to eight weeks.

The honourable member has also asked whether the parks agenda will upgrade visitor facilities in the Gawler Ranges National Park, which members might recall was opened by the commonwealth environment minister in November 2000. I am pleased to advise that the government has provided additional funds to National Parks and Wildlife SA for the establishment and ongoing management of the state's newest national park. The state government has committed an additional \$600 000 over three years to manage the transition from a pastoral station to a national park, and an additional \$150 000 per annum to manage the park. That park comprises some 120 000 hectares and has been established to conserve unique ecosystems and to enhance tourism and regional development opportunities.

There is a high level of community support for the park, and that was certainly evident when the park was opened by Senator Hill. There was tremendous community support from the local towns because they do see some economic spin-off to their local communities from it. Of course, they wanted the area to be better protected and managed. National Parks and Wildlife has developed a public access for the park in consultation with the community reference group that has been established. This identifies and prioritises a network of four-wheel drive tracks and potential two-wheel drive roads. It is also working with the SA Tourism Commission, Eyre

Regional Development Board, Eyre Peninsula Tourism Association and local communities to prepare a recreation and tourism plan for the park. This plan is intended to develop linkages between the park and surrounding communities of Kimba, Wudinna, Minnipa and the nearby pastoral zone.

The provision of visitor infrastructure and services is a key priority for the park. National Parks and Wildlife SA, with the assistance of the community reference group, has identified a number of potential camp grounds and day visitor sites within the park. Concept plans for selected sites are currently being prepared to identify short-term development requirements. I have also applied for funding for the commonwealth's regional tourism program to upgrade Old Paney and Pondanna homesteads to provide heritage accommodation and to develop associated camp grounds, day visitor sites and selected walking trails. The proposal has been accepted as a final contender in the selection processes and we are awaiting the outcome of that decision.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I want to get back to the issue of Adelaide's metropolitan beaches, specifically relating to Portfolio Statement page 10.9. The condition of Adelaide's metropolitan beaches, as the minister would be aware from my earlier question, continues to be the subject of considerable public interest and media debate. Page 10.9 of the Portfolio Statement makes reference to interim coast protection works and the release of a draft strategy for the future protection of the coastline. Can the minister indicate what financial commitment has been made in this budget with a focus on our marine and coastal environment? I guess this question flows on from my earlier question about coastal waters.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There are two major initiatives for metropolitan Adelaide coast protection. The current metropolitan coast protection strategy maintains existing coastal protection standards. The projects include not only ongoing metropolitan Adelaide coast protection but also looking at trialling new technology that might be available to try to protect the coast. A new initiative is the metropolitan coast protection strategy review which is investigating alternative strategies to protect the coast. This will devise a staged strategy to protect coastal infrastructure, provide sandy beaches and maintain the value of the coast as an asset to South Australia.

The review requires considerable research and development, with a cost of some \$500 000 in 2001-02 and \$375 000 in 2002-03, with implementation and maintenance from 2003-04. Alternative methods of coast protection and improvements to the current strategy are being investigated, including major beach replenishment; a combination of beach replenishment, sand slowing structures and sand recycling; and the stabilisation of offshore sediments by retaining and restoring seagrass meadows. It is envisaged that the review of the metropolitan coast protection strategy will deliver staged coast protection for metropolitan Adelaide.

Stage 1, which will be over 10 to 20 years—so these things are long term—is aimed to ensure that businesses use the initiation of retaining recycling structure replacement or other strategies. In the longer-term strategy (greater than 20 years), it is really looking at the creation of a new coastline shape facilitating more sustainable and managed beaches. All these will require extensive community consultation, and the provision of information will occur through the period of research and development, as well as the implementation of a new stage strategy.

We are making the point that metropolitan Adelaide, in particular, has had a managed coastline for well over 30 years through sand replenishment and other programs. Strategies with the coast, I am advised, tend to take three to five years to see whether that strategy is working, because you need to get a fair sampling of the different storm events and different seasonal effects upon the metropolitan coast. So, putting up for one year and making a judgment is not very wise. They prefer to look at the changes made over three to five years. That is difficult for government because governments are in a four year cycle.

As a community we need to take a long-term view of how to manage our coast. That is why we have started to place more money into the coastal area, because it is an area that will have to be managed continually—and the approach we are taking is the longer-term view. Previous sections of the answer I have outlined are the foundation stone towards that.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I would like to move on to the issue of biodiversity. This issue has been raised with me by a number of constituents within Waite who are concerned about the loss of fauna and flora through the hills face and the broader Adelaide Hills as a consequence of devegetation and the impact of farming practice and urban development. Clearly, one of the first things we need to do is map out and determine what biodiversity exists at any point in time so that we can measure any denigration or improvement in that biodiversity.

In relation to the Portfolio Statements, page 10.10, can the minister explain what resources are being put into systematically recording South Australia's biodiversity? Output 2.1 on page 10.10 refers to biodiversity conservation services. Can the minister indicate to the committee what progress is being made in this area?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The biological survey of South Australia began in 1984. I think earlier I mentioned 1985 to the member for Kaurana, but it was 1984. I am pleased to say that it has now covered 70 per cent of the state. It has been one of those ongoing, intense programs within the agency. This has involved the sampling of some 15 000 vegetation quadrants, of which 4 000 have been sampled for vertebrates. Almost two decades ago, National Parks and Wildlife realised that there was a need for better knowledge to assist in conservation decision making. It was hoped that if a representative sample of these components of the total biodiversity were conserved then all the other associated living things had a better chance of being included in the long term.

The first major survey was a cooperative effort with Western Australia, and they sampled the entire 32 million hectares of the Nullarbor Plain, both in South Australia and Western Australia. Many of the techniques used in the first survey (and still used today) were tried for the first time in Australia at that time. It was an innovative step forward by the agency, both here and in Western Australia, to do all the Nullarbor Plain. Matters have moved on considerably from the early days and a very large biological survey database now contains data from standard surveys covering more than 120 separate areas of the state. From those early days on the Nullarbor there has been an increasingly complex requirement to keep the survey methods used as consistent as possible, while adapting to new technology that is available. This applies in both the area of field survey techniques and the management of critical databases on which the overall integrity of the survey depends.

The South Australian Museum and the Plant Biodiversity Centre, through the State Herbarium, have been major

partners in the biological survey program since its earliest days, and they contribute in two important areas: the acceptance and curation of the critically important voucher specimens of plants and animals that a professional biological survey process must collect; and the development of a standard and accepted taxonomy for the fauna and flora of South Australia.

There has been a nearly 20 per cent increase in the number of species of vertebrates known from this state over 15 years. This increase in our understanding can be expected to continue. Planning is under way for field work for the Eyre Peninsula biological survey, which will commence in spring 2001, and reports are being prepared for surveys in the Sandy Desert, the South-East, the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Pitjantjatjara Lands. The importance of the biological survey program was demonstrated by the fact that two recent park acquisitions—the Mokota Conservation Park near Burra and the Gawler Ranges National Park on Eyre Peninsula—were both identified as being of high conservation importance in the biological survey reports.

I had pleasure in releasing last year the biological survey reports on Kangaroo Island and the Murray-Mallee, and I look forward to releasing shortly a biological survey report on the Flinders Ranges. I also released two companion documents—*A List of Vertebrates of South Australia* and *Guidelines for Vertebrate Surveys in South Australia*—which are essential for people undertaking biological surveys within South Australia.

In addition to the biological surveys of South Australia, National Parks and Wildlife is preparing regional biodiversity plans. These plans provide a guide for the community and government on the biodiversity assets of the region, major threats and recommendations on priority management strategies for conservation. They provide information on the priority areas, vegetation types and species of the region, and a guide for strategic action to assist in maintaining the biodiversity for the future.

A regional biodiversity plan for the South-East was produced in 1999, and I launched the regional biodiversity plan for the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin in April this year. Plans for Kangaroo Island, the northern agricultural district and Eyre Peninsula have been prepared and are undergoing final editing prior to being published later this year. The member will be pleased to know that the development of a biodiversity plan for the Mount Lofty Ranges began in early 2001, and the first round of public workshops is being completed. The plan for the Mount Lofty Ranges is due to be completed in early 2002.

I am pleased to advise the House that Tony Robinson from the agency received a Public Service Medal in the 2001 New Year's Honours List. If my memory serves me correctly, Tony was involved in the very first survey in 1984 and has followed through that process, being one of the mainstays of the biological survey process. I was pleased to see his work and his commitment recognised with the Public Service Medal earlier this year.

**Mr HILL:** In relation to 2.1, Yumbarra Conservation Park, during estimates last week I asked the Minister for Minerals and Energy (Hon. Wayne Matthew) a question about Yumbarra. When he initially took responsibility for the portfolio, he said that the exploration of Yumbarra would be done as a test case. In answer to my question the other day he said:

... we are monitoring carefully the manner in which this work is undertaken to derive lessons from it. I expect that those lessons will be useful for other areas where such activity occurs in the future.

I took that to mean that this was less than a test case—less than an ideal example of exploration. Since then, I have been advised that the exploration process exposed a number of serious deficiencies. First, the baseline biological survey was fundamentally inadequate. The consultants who wrote the survey, *ecologia*, were chosen by the mining company and had previously worked for the company. They are based in Western Australia so have little expertise with South Australian conditions. The survey was for only five days in a dry period in December—not the best time to find many species. They admitted that their access to the exploration area was ‘extremely limited by both the terrain and the prevailing weather conditions’ and that ‘both flora and fauna sites are distributed less broadly within the total area than is desirable’.

In particular, the sandhill dunnart is an endangered species, possibly to be found in the area. It requires specific sorts of traps to be located. Unfortunately, *ecologia* did not set any of these traps. It appears that, especially initially, there was poor communication between the mining company and government regulators. The committee of government and community representatives overseeing the project has met only once and then only at the insistence of community representatives. They are due to meet again in October, most probably after initial drilling works have been completed.

Their expertise is clearly not being used to its full potential and communication with concerned members of the public is inadequate. Difficult terrain, rainfall, lack of time and trap types are all variables which should have been anticipated and easily overcome in a survey of this importance. When we are faced with this array of obstacles before the actual work even begins, it is difficult to have faith in the rest of the process. In fact, the calcrete sampling exploration is just reaching completion and it, too, has been plagued with difficulties. A number of reports have been rejected and redone because of technical inadequacies. Therefore, unnecessary tracks have been made. A generator was brought into the park against regulations. Not all camps have been adequately cleaned. These are just some of the problems that have occurred. Is the minister aware of these difficulties; and what action has he taken and will he take to protect the park during further exploration and/or drilling?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do not recall those matters having been raised with me previously. The CEO has had some discussions with the chair of the ministerial advisory committee, David Moyle, and maybe Mr Allan Holmes might want to enlighten the committee on what Mr Moyle thinks of the process.

**Mr HOLMES:** I had a conversation in passing with David Moyle last week, but he remarked on how well arrangements were going. When I quizzed him about the detail of whether there were any issues, he advised me to the contrary; that is, from his recent meeting, arrangements were satisfactory. So there is a disagreement or a disparity of views.

**Mr HILL:** Obviously, there are different views. I have had this information put to me by a source which I cannot name but which is close to the activity. Perhaps the minister or the department could take a closer look at this. The conditions Minister Matthew included in his answer to my question the other day indicated to me that it was not going as well as one might have expected.

I now turn to other national parks. I will ask the minister a series of questions about activities in parks and perhaps I can roll them all into one if he is happy for me to do that, otherwise I can ask several questions. Over the last couple of months, I have been contacted by a range of people about activities in parks. Mr Chris Hall sent me a copy of a letter which he had sent to the minister relating to orienteering in Kaiser Stuhl Conservation Park. In the letter he says:

Given that there is only around 3% native vegetation remaining in the Barossa Valley... and that Kaiser Stuhl consists of the only sizeable remnant... we have left, I find it unconscionable that any form of recreational sporting activities other than walking on the marked trails be permitted.

That is the first issue. The second issue concerns mountain bikes—and I asked the minister that question last time. The Conservation Council has written to me and said that it is very concerned by the State Mountain Bike Plan. The letter says:

We are very concerned by the strong push for riding in parks and are very concerned to note that a map within the plan shows parks where mountain bikes are used, giving the impression that these are places where they are/may become legal. Anstey Hill is a case in point.

Sally Tonkin has also sent me a copy of the letter she sent to the minister regarding feral horses in Coffin Bay and her suggestion that the horses should be placed on SA Water land adjacent to the Coffin Bay National Park.

Mr Forbes of Rostrevor has also sent me a copy of a letter, which, once again, was sent to the minister, about dumping of waste materials in Black Hill Conservation Park. The letter refers to:

... the continued dumping of waste materials in Black Hill Conservation Park and the lack of effort to control the invasion of olive trees into Morialta Conservation Park.

It continues:

Within Black Hill Conservation Park near the old quarries between 1 and 2 km east of Maryvale Road, and just north of Montacute Road, foreign waste materials such as timber and broken rock have been dumped. The most recent delivery that I have noticed was about May this year—a number of big timber logs not far inside the locked access gate. In principle, I don’t think outside waste should be allowed inside an area supposedly representing a natural bushland environment.

All the letters indicate things happening in national parks which seem to be inconsistent with national parks. Does the minister have a policy position about those particular items, or is he working towards a policy outcome and, if he is, can he tell the committee what that is?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Some of the issues the member raises are not in national parks. Kaiser Stuhl is a conservation park.

**Mr HILL:** National parks in the broader sense.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member is talking about any reserve under national parks.

**Mr HILL:** I am talking about national parks, which is the line we are dealing with, minister.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Are we talking about national parks, conservation parks, or any reserve under national parks?

**Mr HILL:** I am talking in the broader sense.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** So any reserve?

**Mr HILL:** Yes.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We have established that the question is about recreational pursuits in any reserve under national parks.

**Mr HILL:** No, I raised four issues and one was—

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes; one was mountain bike riding and one was orienteering—

**Mr HILL:** I said specifically Kaiser Stuhl in relation to orienteering, mountain bikes, and I mentioned Mount Anstey—

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am trying to establish—

**Mr HILL:** I am asking what your policy is. These activities are all in reserves, parks, conservation parks, or whatever, under your control.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That includes recreation parks.

**Mr HILL:** Yes, indeed.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member left out Scott Creek Conservation Park and horses—he could have wrapped five questions into one. The way in which I have always approached issues such as Scott Creek with the horses and Kaiser Stuhl with orienteering, is, in the first instance, to try to get the various groups involved to meet to see whether there is some common ground, or to see whether one group is prepared to change its view based on evidence or advice from the other group. In the case of Scott Creek, the President of Friends of the Park met with the Horse SA chair, Paul Mabarack, and departmental officers to talk through the issues. They could not resolve the issues. I intervened, and with the support of the Minister for Government Enterprises and some good work done by the officers, we secured the horse community's access to some SA Water land outside the park. Through a cooperative approach we were able to resolve that issue.

In relation to orienteering in Kaiser Stuhl, we undertook exactly the same process. We asked the orienteering group to meet with the friends group from Kaiser Stuhl to see whether there was some common ground, or whether one of the groups would change its mind having met with the other group. As I understand it, the orienteering group, having met with the friends group, now recognise some other issues within the park and have decided not to proceed with any application for Kaiser Stuhl.

In those one-off cases, I have always taken the view of, first, trying to get the local people to meet and to work through the issue, and as minister only intervene as a last resort. In relation to mountain bikes, I think this government of any government around Australia can hold its hand up and say, 'We are trying to do something with mountain bikes.' Over the last decade, mountain bikes have become a real issue for government in two areas. First, it is fantastic to see so many people being physically active. From a health viewpoint, apart from the occasional accident, it is good to see so many people being active—and there have been a lot of sales of mountain bikes.

From a management viewpoint within parks, it has become a real issue for us, because, in a sense, they are an off-road bike, and they create issues for our managers and safety issues for walkers and other people using the park, if they are not managed properly. We have put our hand up as a government and said, 'We will try to develop a state mountain bike plan which deals with the issue of mountain bikes.' We have tried to involve the mountain bike group, other recreational groups and the conservation groups in the development of a mountain bike plan.

We have allocated \$200 000 within our budget. I do not think it is under this line, but under recreation and sport. However, somewhere in my agency, \$200 000 has been allocated for the purchase of land specifically for a mountain bike park. We are trying to find land between Cleland and Belair, because those are the two parks that seem to be most

under threat, being close to the city. Land for a mountain bike park would allow us to channel people into that area and contain it more than we are doing at the moment.

So, as far as mountain biking is concerned, I am sensitive to both the mountain bike industry's need for somewhere to undertake its activity and I am also sensitive to the concerns of the conservation movement about possible damage to native vegetation and other sensitive areas. This mountain bike strategy is the first of its kind in Australia, so I think it is fair to say that this government has been proactive trying to manage that particular process.

In relation to the horses at Coffin Bay, there has been significant community consultation, and my understanding of the outcome of that is that the community—the Port Lincoln community and the Coffin Bay community—prefers that the horses remain managed as they are now. From memory, the Coffin Bay Pony Association on-sells some of the foals each year and the numbers are managed in that way. So, again, we have tried to find a local solution to the problem.

The rubbish issue is an issue that the departmental officer will have to take up and, obviously, continue to try to manage. Getting people not to dump rubbish in parks is a difficult issue as well.

So, on all those issues, as best we can, we have adopted a local outcome by working with local groups. Where it is a strategic issue—such as mountain bikes—which involves five or six parks, we have been proactive in finding solutions. These conflicts will continue, of course, but it is a matter of how to manage them. It is my view that we can best manage them at the local community level. Through our Greater Mount Lofty Park stakeholder group, which the member for Waite chairs, these issues have arisen from time to time and will be managed through that process as well. So, the groups are now talking and they are coming to a better understanding of each other's concerns which, in the long term, can only be of benefit.

**Mr HILL:** I thank the minister for that answer and I commend him on the initiative of purchasing land to deal with the mountain bike issue. I think that is a very sensible solution to the problem. I guess the bottom line has to be that it is sensible to have local solutions but, if the local solution compromises the environmental values of the national park, at some stage the minister may have to come in and impose another solution which may not be popular.

In relation to the Wahgunyah Conservation Reserve and the Nullarbor National Park, at the time that the Yumburra classification was changed, Minister Kotz, as a kind of trade-off, said that those two parks would have increased protection. I am not aware of any announcement that may have been made about increased protection. Can the minister indicate whether or not that has been provided or if it is intended to be provided?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I understand that the Wahgunyah Conservation Reserve will be proclaimed as a conservation park under the National Parks and Wildlife Act with no access for mining.

**Mr HILL:** Will be?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Will be; this is in progress and expected to be finalised by August this year, so that is eight to 10 weeks away. Similarly, the Nullarbor National Park is to be proclaimed and will exclude mining access. My understanding is that it might be a bit longer for the Nullarbor park but, certainly, Wahgunyah is expected to be finalised by August. My understanding is that the boundary issues are

being sorted out. So, we are still firmly dedicated to Minister Kotz's commitment.

**Mr HILL:** I now ask the minister questions that he expects me to ask about the fauna permit system. I have been inundated with faxes, letters and emails from people involved in that area raising two matters of concern. I imagine that the minister has received many more bits of correspondence than I have on the issue. The two issues of concern have been put to me by Sharon Blair from the Bird Care and Conservation Society and Mr Kevin Collins from Fauna Rescue. The first issue is to do with the licensing system which has recently been introduced: the bird group is concerned about the way that they are required to self-regulate and the difficulty they have in ensuring that individual members have the appropriate standard of accreditation.

The other issue which I think both groups are concerned about is the limitation on time that groups have within which to release birds or animals back into the wild. The view that they put to me is that what is required by the department is not best practice, that those groups have good experience in releasing animals and birds into the wild and that a more flexible approach should be adopted by the department. I assume that the minister has been talking to these groups: is he able to indicate whether there is a compromise situation to help them?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, certainly I have not had recent discussions with the Fauna Rescue groups. I met some groups from Fauna Rescue a year ago, I would think—it was a long time ago, and certainly not this side of Christmas. My understanding is that there is a difference of view, even amongst Fauna Rescue groups, as to the appropriate procedure. I understand that some sections of the Fauna Rescue community believe that the government processes are around the mark whereas others have obviously written to you suggesting that they are off the mark. I do not have a detailed briefing on the process with me today but I will get a brief to you on the reasons why the government has adopted its position in relation to the matter that you raised so that you can, I guess, consider both sides of the argument in due course.

**Mr HILL:** I turn to 2.2, relating to coastal issues. I have a disparate group of questions to put to the minister. The first question is in relation to the HMAS *Hobart*. I have been sent information by Jack Watkins, the Asbestos and Toxic Waste Liaison Officer of the Trades and Labor Council, expressing a great deal of concern about the sinking of the HMAS *Hobart* to create an artificial reef on the Fleurieu Peninsula. He states:

I have drawn your attention to the importance of having a fully licensed company to undertake the type of work required which is the part dismantling and alteration of the interior of the vessel, the removal of PCBs, heavy metals, lead ballast and the purging of fuel lines of up to 8 000 litres of oil.

His concern is particularly that the asbestos pipe lagging may become dislodged with the initial surge of 4 000 tonnes of water rushing through the hull of the HMAS *Hobart* as it is sunk. He is concerned about the fact that, when cleaning out asbestos, it is not all removed and some of it may be dislodged. Is this an issue which is within the minister's coastal responsibilities and can he give advice on the process through which the government will ensure that, if the HMAS *Hobart* is sunk, there will be no detriment to the environment?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will take that question on notice. It is really a tourism initiative and they have been talking to the EPA. It is not a regular occurrence; it is not

every day that we actually sink a HMAS *Hobart*, so I will have to seek advice as to exactly what steps are proposed. I know there are some issues surrounding the appropriate control of the environmental matters that the member has raised.

**Mrs MAYWALD:** I refer to the Portfolio Statements, page 10.9, output class 2—national parks. As next year is both the Year of the Outback and the International Year of Eco-Tourism, can the minister advise what initiatives are being planned for the Department of Environment and Heritage and how they will be coordinated with the SATC?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** A lot of work has been done by the SATC and National Parks in relation to the International Year of Eco-Tourism and the International Year of the Outback. As part of the International Year of Eco-Tourism, a directions document has been produced to identify the state's key visitor parks and strategic directions for tourism in parks. The International Year of Eco-tourism coincides with two important events in South Australia that will highlight tourism in national parks—the Year of the Outback and Encounter 2002.

Encounter 2002 will be of great importance to National Parks and Wildlife SA, as many of our islands and coastal parks reflect the historic voyages of Flinders and Baudin. National Parks and Wildlife SA is working with the Tourism Commission to commemorate the event. Initiatives include the construction of the Robert Brown Lookout and associated interpretive material on Matthew Flinders and botanist Robert Brown at Mount Brown Summit in Mount Brown Conservation Park (National Parks and Wildlife SA is contributing about \$15 000 to the tower construction), and proclamation of the Baudin Conservation Park and the Lesuer Conservation Park on Kangaroo Island. The 2002 Parks and Wildlife calendar will have Encounter 2002 as its theme.

The Year of the Outback will showcase more than 1 000 events and activities across Australia to celebrate our unique outback regions. National Parks and Wildlife SA has prepared a program of events designed to complement and support South Australia's contribution. A seasonal ranger will be allocated to assist visitors in the Lake Eyre National Park, and this will run in the April, July and September school holiday periods. This ranger will run a small interpretive program providing an insight into the natural systems of Lake Eyre and the Mound Springs Conservation Park.

Rangers will conduct two individual tours through the Simpson Desert Regional Reserve and Conservation Park in May and August 2002. This will consist of a group of up to 10 private vehicles in company with two vehicles in a tag-along tour. Participants will be introduced to a variety of different bird species found in remote desert areas. Expert ornithologists and rangers experienced in bird identification will accompany the tour to assist amateur bird watchers in bird identification and to interpret the desert environment.

Cultural tours of the Dalhousie Springs area at Witjira National Park will be conducted over peak school holiday periods. The local ranger will interpret the Aboriginal history and heritage of the Dalhousie Springs precinct, and Aboriginal elders will also conduct evening camp fire talks to visitors about the area's Aboriginal heritage.

In the Flinders Ranges National Park, the old Wilpena Station heritage site will be launched. Plans have been developed to provide a rich cultural experience, using the unique buildings and landscape of the old Wilpena Pound homestead to interpret the pastoral heritage of the Flinders Ranges. It is also proposed to expand the existing successful



Flinders Ranges seasonal events program to ensure that visitors have the opportunity to undertake tours and activities that highlight the rich natural and cultural heritage of the region. At least three major events will occur within the Flinders Ranges National Park, including 2002 Bicycles in the Bush, Wilpena under the Stars, and the Outback to Adelaide Bushwalk.

The new Gawler Ranges National Park will hold a park open day whereby a number of operators, surrounding neighbours and local tourism bodies will be invited to join park rangers on a tour of the park. It is also proposed to open heritage accommodation, as Old Paney Station and Pondanna Outstation are expected to be completed by mid 2002 to coincide with the Year of the Outback.

**Mrs MAYWALD:** My second question is in relation to output class 1.2, page 10.6 of the Portfolio Statements, which relates to environment improvement programs and EPA compliance and enforcement activities. In the Waikerie District Council area, effluent ponds are currently located on the flood plain and are subject to an EPA notice. What progress has been made in relation to negotiations with the council to have those effluent ponds relocated?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We do not have that briefing to hand so we will get that information for the member.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to a press release, a copy of which was given to me by the Friends of Seal Bay, regarding proposed aquaculture developments at that bay. They make a comment in their press release that the DAC hearing is overdue on the proposal and government agencies are apparently at odds over approving this development application in relation to environmental factors. Can the minister advise what his department's views are concerning this development, and what concerns it may have about the effect of aquaculture on the seal colony at that bay?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** When the agency provides comments to the DAC, those comments go direct to the DAC and do not necessarily go through the minister's office. If that matter is before the DAC, the agency would provide its advice and comments to the DAC for its consideration.

**Mr HILL:** As a supplementary question, are you saying that those comments cannot be made publicly available at this stage?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is not normally the procedure, as I understand it. I do not recall seeing the comments come through my office. I am advised that the normal procedure is that they would comment direct to DAC.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to my own electorate in relation to the cliff face at Witton Bluff and Aldinga. The minister may be aware—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HILL:** No, it is not pork-barrelling—it is not only Davenport that gets a look in here! I know the local council has been running a bit of a public campaign about the need for Witton Bluff to be secured. I think the council had advice that unless activity happened this season large sections of the cliff could fall off during this winter period. There are also concerns about the sea cliff at Aldinga. Can the minister outline what funding is in the budget to address issues such as this and whether the government is still committed to the 80/20 split of funding with the local councils?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** My understanding is—and I think this might have been reported in the member's local Messenger newspaper—that the government is in negotiations with the City of Onkaparinga in relation to Witton Bluff, in conjunction with the issue about rate offset and Mobil. We

have made an offer to the council to generously assist them with the costs of rehabilitation in relation to Witton Bluff as part of a package. If the package is rejected, then the funding arrangements will fall back to the normal local government-state government split in relation to coastal matters.

**Mr HILL:** How much money is in the current budget for that normal coastal work, and is the 80-20 split that I have mentioned still the going rate?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We have made provisions to actually fully fund to the value of about \$532 000 on the proviso that the offer is accepted as part of the full package, as put by the Treasurer to the City of Onkaparinga in relation to the Mobil rates issue. If the City of Onkaparinga does not sign off on that rates issue, ultimately it will fall back to the normal local government-state government split. Because we have the full amount in there, we certainly have it covered whether it is 80-20 or whatever, because we have actually allowed for 100 per cent.

We are actively encouraging the City of Onkaparinga to progress the matter of the rates for Mobil. As the local member, I hope you are actively encouraging that, because we know how big an employer Mobil is down south, and as shadow spokesman for the south, I am sure the honourable member would actively encourage the City of Onkaparinga to support such a large employer down in the south by signing off on what is a very generous government deal.

**Mr HILL:** I wish to ask a question about marine protected areas. The minister has already answered a question from a member opposite on that issue, but he referred to the Victorian example. I know that in Victoria the legislation to stop fishers from seeking damages for changes to their fishing entitlements was rejected by the upper house. Is the minister contemplating a scheme in South Australia that would involve compensation or the buy-out of licences of certain types of fishers?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In relation to marine protected areas, we are conscious of Western Australia's example of compensation, Victoria's experience and Tasmania's experience with MPAs. Through the marine managers forum we are developing a policy for cabinet consideration that discusses all those issues associated with marine protected areas. The government will be in a position to announce its policy or process once cabinet has had the chance to consider the submission when it is received. I am on public record as saying that I would expect the MPAs to be announced this side of Christmas, and nothing has changed in my time frame in relation to that. We are still working through the process with a view to having the marine protected area policy out before Christmas.

**Mr HILL:** The minister mentioned the Spencer Gulf plan in answer to a question from a member opposite and indicated that it is a pilot scheme to check out the way MPAs might work. Would one of the outcomes of that MPA be to protect the cuttlefish in the Spencer Gulf, particularly in the Whyalla area? I understand that a couple of years ago there was huge exploitation of that reserve and about 80 per cent of cuttlefish were fished out. The resource is very marginal at present. Will cuttlefish get on-going protection from any plan that involves Spencer Gulf?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that whether the cuttlefish area is zoned for conservation is part of the process that will be undertaken during the pilot marine program we are undertaking for that area. We are certainly aware of strong community interest in cuttlefish and arguments about

making that area a conservation zone. Those sorts of issues are debated as part of the process.

**Mr HILL:** I turn now to output class 2.4, native vegetation. I asked the minister a couple of questions during question time about amendments to the Native Vegetation Act that were proposed by the Native Vegetation Council. Is the minister any closer to being able to implement amendments to that act—amendments which the council said were needed? I will not go into the detail of that; I have already put that on the public record. I make an apology to the minister: I put out a press release which indicated that in October 1998 the Environment Minister, Iain Evans, commissioned a report. That is obviously not true. He was not the minister at that stage; it was his predecessor. So I apologise to him for that. Is the minister any closer to introducing the amendments to the Native Vegetation Act?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, I am.

**Mr HILL:** Could the minister amplify that answer and tell us how much closer he is to introducing them?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We still think we will have amendments to the Native Vegetation Act to the parliament before Christmas. We have worked through what is an interesting issue.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No. We think we should be able to get them through in the next session, all things going well. It is an interesting issue involving differing views, but we have worked through a pretty good process—

**Mr CLARKE:** What's Gunny's view?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Gunny's view is that you will probably stand as an Independent and have a very good chance. So the native vegetation matter has progressed a little closer, and I am still committed to trying to get that in this side of Christmas. Just on another matter, I will clarify an answer for the honourable member. The EPA has influence in the HMAS *Hobart* matter. The EPA needs to be satisfied in relation to the environmental matters involved with the issue. So the EPA does need to be involved in that process.

In relation to the member for Chaffey's question regarding the Waikerie effluent ponds, I advise the committee that an environment improvement program (EIP) under the EP act is being negotiated with the Loxton Waikerie council. It should be agreed to by August this year, so it is about eight to 10 weeks away. It will lead to the relocation of effluent ponds off the flood plain, and that means above the 1956 flood level. As I understand it, the negotiations indicate that council accepts the need to relocation them off the flood plain. That should be agreed by August 2001.

**Mr HILL:** I would like to ask a number of questions about the Native Vegetation Act and native vegetation issues. I was contacted the other day by a lady in relation to ETSA 'butchering' and removing a number of trees on Yungkunga Road between Mount Barker and Wistow. She told me that ETSA is coming by, not only lopping the tops of the trees but also removing the trees from that piece of road. I presume that the Native Vegetation Act does not cover trees in that area, but I am not 100 per cent certain. Can the minister throw any light on that?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** What area was it again?

**Mr HILL:** It is between Mount Barker and Wistow on Yungkunga Road.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do not know that road.

**Mr HILL:** I will write to you on that.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You write to me on that and I will give you a detailed response.

**Mr HILL:** I may have misunderstood; I will get the detail from her. It is not my territory, so I do not know. I refer now to the clearance of land on the Fleurieu Peninsula, a case regarding which went to court earlier this year. About 70 trees that were 50 years old were cleared, and the person who cleared the land faced a maximum penalty of only \$40 000, which valued each tree at about \$570, which is clearly far less than the true value of the mature tree. Is the minister concerned about the level of fines, and is that one of the things he will be looking at in the review of the Native Vegetation Act?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes and yes.

**Mr HILL:** I also refer to a contact I have had from Pam Kelly regarding the removal of trees. She said to me that yesterday on 17 April the Mount Pleasant Showground Committee organised the felling of a large gum tree. Mrs Kelly rang the Barossa Council to check it out. It made inquiries and found that the tree was leaning over and wind damaged. She then went down and inspected it and found that it was legitimate, and that the tree would probably have fallen over in the next heavy rainfall. She has discovered what she calls a 'loophole' in the legislation in that, if it is accepted that a tree is dangerous, it is legal to cut it down without having to get permission—which is reasonable enough—and only two people have to testify to a tree's condition. Mrs Kelly said that there are a couple of issues here. It needs only two unscrupulous people to testify to a tree's condition. It can be removed without being referred to the Native Vegetation Council. It can then be removed and cut up and the stump pulverised without any knowledge or any kind evidence. If a tree can be removed without permission, then it is not necessary for the tree to be replaced.

I guess Mrs Kelly is raising a concern that two people can pick out particular isolated trees and say there is something wrong with them. Is the minister aware of this problem and are there sufficient safeguards in the act to protect against that type of behaviour?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Again, you have not raised that issue with me before on behalf of Mrs Kelly, to my knowledge, so I am not sure of the exact circumstances. I guess we could sit here all afternoon and consider individual examples; I am not sure how they relate to each budget line we are talking about.

**Mr HILL:** They relate to the review of the act and resources you may require to implement that review.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You could come up with 1 000 examples about what may or may not be included in a possible act. If trees are, or are deemed to be, dangerous, then issues about speed of approval would become an issue because, obviously, if there is a danger to community, you would need speedy approval. There was a full public consultation process in relation to the Native Vegetation Act, and I know that one of the considerations there was proposed tightening of exemptions in order to avoid misuse. As to whether or not it gets down to the detail that Mrs Kelly raises, I do not have that briefing with me today. So, again, I would encourage the member to send that through and I will actively look at it to determine whether Mrs Kelly's issue needs to be addressed during consideration of the bill.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to a letter that was sent to the minister on 26 February this year by the Conservation Council, a copy of which was sent to me and various other people under the heading 'Prosecution for illegal clearance in Bonney's Scrub and the delay in the review of the native vegetation legislation'. In relation to Bonney's Camp, the letter states:

The obvious inefficiency of the NV act is cause for considerable alarm. There could be few cases with more grounds for prosecution than this, and if the Bonney's Camp clearance is left unchallenged it will send a very clear message to other land owners that illegal clearance is the easy way to go. It also devalues in the strongest terms the commitment of land holders who have given over half their land to heritage areas—in fact, it has caused some of these land holders to question whether the future of the Heritage Agreement is safe at all.

I think that in previous estimates the minister ruled out any prosecution in relation to the Bonney's Camp clearance, but has he looked at this issue and, as part of the review, will he ensure that the clearance that occurred illegally in that case will not be able to occur again without proper judicial review?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As part of the consideration of the Native Vegetation Act, they have looked at some of the major cases and issues that we have had, that being one of them, to see whether we can tighten up so that that sort of issue can be dealt with appropriately under the act. Certainly, part of the review was to look at those major cases to determine what the circumstances were and what amendments to the act are required to try to manage those sorts of issues better. That is one of the more high profile cases.

**Mr HILL:** It has been put to me that the Native Vegetation Council would be improved if it had a representative on it who had a knowledge and background in the South-East, from which about 60 per cent of the applications come. Has the minister considered that and does he think it is a good idea?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister does not get to nominate everyone on the Native Vegetation Council. From memory, there is a deputy's position from the South-East, so there is some input there, and if they need expert advice they can always call it in at their leisure. At the end of the day, we chose some people who we think had the appropriate skills. I think that Peter Dunn and the previous and current Native Vegetation Council have done a good job of what is always a difficult task, because they are trying to manage competing interests.

**Mr HILL:** Before I move on to the next category, I meant to ask the minister a question about Coongie Lakes; I asked the minister for minerals about it. I know there have been some discussions and he acknowledged that in answer to my question about the future of the Coongie Lakes area. I asked him whether or not he could guarantee that the control zone would be free from exploration and mining, and he gave an ambiguous answer to that question. The minister is looking a little perplexed. Can the minister give that undertaking? Under whatever scenario that may happen in the future in terms of the classification of the Coongie Lakes, will the government be able to rule out mining and exploration of that control zone area?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I think in fairness to my ministerial colleague, I might go away and see exactly what he said. I will take that question on notice. I know in my area the issue is still being considered, so I will have to check what the Minister for Minerals and Energy said and I will come back to you.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to animal welfare, class 2.5. The RSPCA has been running a campaign this year on the banning of tail docking. It has sent me much information and it has indicated to me that the Australian Capital Territory has moved in a bipartisan way to ban tail docking. It indicated to me that the Australian Veterinary Association is also opposed to the docking of dogs' tails. Can the minister indicate what

his government's position is in relation to this issue, and what action may be taken in the next 12 months in relation to it?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Recently, when I launched the Million Paws Walk for the RSPCA, I had an informal discussion with some representatives that day and I understand that they wish to present their case to me. I made a comment that I had not received many cards or letters about the issue. They responded by saying that they had 10 000 postcards on the issue that they will bring me at some stage. I am happy to wait and have them present their case to me. I understand that the Labor Party has adopted a position where it will ban tail docking, but we will wait to talk to the various groups and let them present their case.

**Mr HILL:** Are you talking about the Labor Party in South Australia? If so, that is not the case.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** So you are ruling it out.

**Mr HILL:** No, I said that we have not adopted a policy in relation to it. We are consulting as well. I indicated the bipartisan nature of the ACT position.

I refer to output class 3, which is heritage conservation, and the targets for 2001-02, in particular the one that states, 'continue to devolve management of some properties currently managed by Heritage SA.' Can the minister give detail of what that target means; what properties would be involved; and under what processes devolution would occur?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** If the agency thinks there is some benefit in the local community's or local council's managing a property, there is a process whereby we go through discussion with the local authority and put a plan in place for transition across. For example, Clayton Farm at Bordertown, from memory, has been transitioned across. Another example is a conservation plan being prepared for Kingston House and there are discussions on that with the City of Holdfast Bay. With Queen's Theatre, for instance, we might be able to find someone to take a lease over it, with proper management considerations in place. It is that sort of example. The Adelaide Gaol is another example. If we could find the right body, I guess, then there is some wisdom in having others take over the management. It is done only after an extensive process of consultation to ensure that the property is protected in the appropriate way.

**Mr HILL:** I refer the minister to the recent opening by him of the Nature Foundation's new headquarters in The Manse, next to the Entertainment Centre. I commend him for that; I thought that was a very good idea. Can the minister indicate how many heritage properties are held by the department and how they are currently used? You might want to take that question on notice.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We will have to take that question on notice because there are so many of them. A lot of them are in national parks, of course. That question will be very broad, so we will have to take it on notice and come back to you with a list of properties. Do you want a list of properties and what they are used for?

**Mr HILL:** I thought it was interesting what you did with the property at The Manse. It was a heritage building which was held by the department and which had not been well used prior to that; now it has a sensible use. It would be interesting to have an inventory of what we have got.

I now want to refer to the implications for South Australian heritage as a result of the decision by the commonwealth government to review national heritage items. As the minister knows, the commonwealth government will reduce the number of items held on the national heritage list by a considerable number. Clearly, that has implications for

South Australia. Can the minister explain what process the state government will have in relation to that and the financial implications of that?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am sure we had a briefing on that but we cannot lay our hands on it, so I will take the question on notice and I will write to the honourable member. I am sure I have had a briefing on that in the past fortnight.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to the proposed redevelopment of the Angas Street police station site. I noted some commentary in the press about it. It is a commonwealth project, therefore it is outside the state's planning laws to a large extent. That obviously has implications not only for planning but also for the heritage values of that area. The police station will be pulled down and the new federal courts will be built on the site. There was some commentary in the press about the scale of that building and the effect it would have on that local area, which is a heritage area to a large extent with Victoria Square and some of the older buildings in that area. It raises the issue of whether or not there needs to be a federal-state agreement about how the commonwealth imposes its buildings on a state, and whether it should take account of local heritage issues or planning controls. Has the government contemplated that and is there the opportunity for making progress on that?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have always found the commonwealth reasonably open to suggestions in relation to its investment into the state. I know that particular site was subject to lengthy negotiations—

*Mr Hill interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member mentions it is an improvement on what we have. There have been lengthy negotiations with the commonwealth about that site. I cannot think of another example where the commonwealth has caused issues in relation to a commonwealth building and heritage matters.

**Mr HILL:** I can indicate to the minister that a potential problem is the Army Barracks on King William Road. There was contemplation at one stage that the commonwealth would sell that land and anything could have happened on that site.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Selling commonwealth land is a different issue from putting a new building next to a heritage building. That is the only example of which I am aware. I think that the processes which are in place seem to work reasonably well. I am not aware of any proposals to change the processes.

**Mr HILL:** Some time ago I wrote to the minister about the Port Augusta Primary School. Has the government had a chance to consider the heritage value of that school and, if so, what does that report say?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am reasonably sure that is going to the heritage authority at its August meeting. I say 'reasonably sure', because I was going to Port Augusta and I read the briefing yesterday (which I have not brought with me), but I am sure it was going to the authority's meeting in August. If that is not right, I will have one of my officers contact the member to clarify it, but I am sure that is right.

**Mr HILL:** I now turn to output class 4, which is the section dealing with the Botanic Gardens. Before I ask my first question, I note that I indicated in my second reading contribution that the budget appeared to have been dropped from \$7.8 million to \$810 000, but I have since discovered that that was a typographical error. I had assumed that, since no-one from the Botanic Gardens had contacted me, it was not a real cut. I now refer to the first dot point under 'High-lights', which is the International Rose Garden. Can the

minister tell the committee how much that cost to establish, what the running costs are, and what income the Botanic Gardens receives from that garden?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We do not have the information on all the categories about which the member has asked, so we will take that on notice and forward it through.

**Mr HILL:** The minister might also want to take this question on notice. A number of events are named and the last dot point refers to:

Supported major events including the International Rose Garden, WOMAD and Cinema in the Gardens.

What are the costs and income in relation to each of those named events? How much does it cost to run WOMAD? What income goes to the Botanic Gardens?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The cost to the Botanic Gardens?

**Mr HILL:** I assume to the Botanic Gardens: it would pay some of that cost.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member is not asking the whole of government cost—

**Mr HILL:** No, just in relation to the Botanic Gardens.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As a venue manager, what is the cost to the Botanic Gardens and what is its revenue stream?

**Mr HILL:** Yes.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Again, I will have to take that question on notice.

**Mr HILL:** I think that the minister has already answered a question about the Botanic Gardens master plan. I may not have heard all the detail, but did the minister say in that answer how much that plan was going to cost over each of the years that it would take to implement? Will the minister do that? Does the minister have that information available?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that it is \$100 000 over the next 12 months.

**Mr HILL:** I will now ask a question about Beechwood Gardens. The minister foreshadowed my great interest in this.

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr HILL:** I did not say I was going to close them. I want to have them open so that people visit them.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The chair expresses some interest in this matter.

**Mr HILL:** Will he excuse himself from the chair?

**The CHAIRMAN:** No.

**Mr HILL:** Can the minister tell the committee how many days Beechwood Gardens was open this year; how many visitors attended; what was the cost of running the gardens; and what income the Botanic Gardens received from visitation, hiring, and so on?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We will forward that information to the member in due course.

**Mr HILL:** I will be delighted, thank you. One other point on the Botanic Gardens: I point out that under output 4.1, the performance indicator shows a reduction from last year to this year in terms of the total number of living accessions. Last year I think we had 23 500 and the estimated result was 22 500. Does that indicate that a disease has spread through the gardens, or is it as a result of some change in the gardens' plans?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** A member of the Botanic Gardens board is sitting on my left, but he cannot advise me why we have not achieved our target in relation to the total number of living accessions. We will ask that of the Botanic Gardens board and come back to the member.

**Mr HILL:** I turn to output class 6. I assume Mapland comes in under this category; would that be correct?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes.

**Mr HILL:** Some time ago I put a number of questions on the *Notice Paper* about Mapland which, as I am aware, have not yet been answered. It has been put to me that the government was looking at selling Mapland, or leasing the retail arm of Mapland, and I asked a series of questions. Will Mapland be outsourced, sold, or commercialised in some way? Can the minister indicate where we are in relation to that matter?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The advice to me is that it is still under active review. There are no plans to reduce the distribution of aerial photography maps. A review was undertaken of Mapland about whether there was a better way of its providing its services. I am advised that that matter is still under active review by the agency.

**Mr HILL:** I refer now to output class 7, under 'Highlights': 'converted 375 perpetual leases to freehold title'. Only a couple of days ago, I received a letter from Mr James from Wallaroo who wrote to the minister and John Meier (his local member) about some problems with having the Lands Titles Office transfer a lease into his name. I will not go into the details—and I can supply the minister with the information later—but is that program completed now or is it still proceeding?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, it is ongoing; that program is not complete. A number of applications are being processed through the system. Some of them are simple and some of them are very complex. The shack freeholding project is managed by the LMC, so the member may wish to further question Minister Armitage tomorrow on that, but certainly it is ongoing at this stage.

**Mr HILL:** In relation to the perpetual leases, I must say that I do not know a lot about them, but how many perpetual leases would the minister anticipate may well be converted to freehold over the next 12 months or the next number of years?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I could not project, but I can give the member some information on what has happened in the past. I am advised that perpetual leases have slowed to a trickle. Basically 16 600 perpetual leases remain in existence throughout the state. Since 1996 a total of some 6 369 perpetual leases have been converted to freehold title and 375 perpetual leases were converted to freehold title during the year 2000. So, since 1996, in five years, the figure is just under 6 400, and we had only 375 last year, so they have slowed considerably. One expects, because of the way that is trading at the moment, that many of them got in early, took up the offer, and only a few remain.

In relation to shack freeholding, which is a different issue, my brief tells me that the Land Management Corporation target was about 900 to be signed by 30 June 2000. That was surpassed in October 2000 and it is expected that by the completion of that particular program about 1 250 contracts would have been signed.

**Mr HILL:** I turn now to output class 8, and refer to the third dot point under 'targets', which relates to the development of a biodiversity and conservation act for South Australia. That has been in planning for some time now. Can the minister indicate where that is at and when the House can expect to see the legislation?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** My advice is that the department has done some work internally and across agencies in discussions at least, and the preparation of a possible act is still in its early days. The department is looking at a discussion paper at this stage. It is early days, so I would not necessarily commit to seeing that this side of Christmas.

**Mr HILL:** In relation to output 8.1, I note that the budget this year is \$2.6 million whereas last year it was \$729 000. That seems a rather large blowout. Can the minister indicate how and why that has occurred?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The first point to clarify is that it is not policy work just in my office. Some people misinterpret that as being policy work in the minister's office. It is policy work within the agency. It includes a new output of volunteer coordination. It is really the cost of the Environment Policy Office within DEH which has been shifted across from the output class environment protection. There is a shift there—it is one of those areas where there is a slight presentational issue. There has not been a fourfold cost in that area. It is the cost of the Environment Policy Office within DEH which has been shifted in part from the output class environment protection. So, rather than leave the cost in environment protection, they have looked at the way they have allocated their cost structure and they have shifted some of it across to a different output class.

**Mr HILL:** I would now like to go through a number of general questions which cover the whole portfolio.

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr HILL:** No, they are not trick questions: I just want some information. During the estimates last year I asked the minister if he could break down a particular output class into programs, and he did so for output class 3.1 and he gave me individual lines. For example, he said: fire, prescribed burning for ecological objectives—\$32 000; publicity and promotion—\$270 000; and so on. Is it possible to get a breakdown across all of the output classes of program details?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** When you say 'program', what do you mean?

**Mr HILL:** The difficulty I have in trying to follow the budget is that there is \$13 million here and \$15 million there for a range of outputs. I am trying to understand what you spend money on—what programs have money behind them? In relation to output 3.1, last year under the heading 'Activity Descriptions' there was: fauna management, kangaroos, koala, other—\$295 000; native vegetation, management heritage agreements of introduced species—\$4.726 million; and so on. You gave more detail of how much money was spent in each output class.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We can put these in broad categories for you. To what degree you break it down becomes the issue. I am happy for the agency to do some work putting these into broad categories for you and I will forward that.

**Mr HILL:** I will put questions on notice if I do not get enough information.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Then you will be able to detail exactly what you want.

**Mr HILL:** I want a feeling for where the money goes, and I do not get that from the papers. Can the minister also, across all output classes—in the environment sector, at least—give an indication of how much is spent on publicity, public relations and promotions and so on?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The Department for Environment and Heritage's spending on advertising and promotion needs to be considered in the context of a diverse range of public interest themes that the portfolio encompasses including environment, recreation, sport and racing, volunteers and the International Year of Volunteers. These themes are often thought of by the public as separate entities and, therefore, require specific advertising and promotional activities meaningful to the various target segments. During the

2000-01 financial year DEH spent around \$590 000 on advertising and promotion. The environment and heritage component of that was a touch over \$500 000 at \$503 000. Do you want a total sum or individual details?

**Mr HILL:** The total sum would be fine.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do not have that: I have not been given one total sum. I actually have \$503 000 as the total sum for environment and heritage. That is what the brief tells me.

**Mr HILL:** Can the minister tell us how much money was carried over from last year's budget into the current year? I guess you cannot tell us how much will be carried into the future, but how much money was carried over from 1999-2000 to 2000-01?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will ask Mr Janssan to answer this question.

**Mr JANSKAN:** In relation to the published 2000-01 budget, the reported figure for operating expenditure was \$149 million. Included in that figure was \$3 million of carry-over. In the 2000-01 estimated result, as published, it was \$156 million. An amount of \$11 million was carried over from the 1999-2000 budget and was reduced by \$4 million and brought into the figuring for the 2001-02 budget. So, in effect, \$3 million in 2000-01, a net figure of \$7 million in the estimated result for 2000-01, and \$4 million is built into the 2001-02 budget.

**Mr HILL:** I do not understand the term 'built in'; can you explain?

**Mr JANSKAN:** Incorporated in those figures are those amounts of carry-over. So, exclusive of carry-overs, if that is the figure that you are looking to work from, the 2000-01 budget would read \$146 million, the 2000-01 estimated result would be \$149 million and the 2001-02 figure would be \$161 million.

**Mr HILL:** Can the minister also give a global figure for the grants that were received from the commonwealth in the current year and are anticipated to be received next year?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There is a grant revenue figure of about \$22 million in our statement of financial performance on page 10.29. Does your question relate purely to commonwealth moneys?

**Mr HILL:** Where else would grants come from?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** From trusts, and those sorts of groups.

**Mr HILL:** My general question is what is the total amount for grants?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In regard to the total amount for grants received from any source, there is a figure in the operating revenue section for grant revenue in the 2001-02 budget of \$22.2 million, and the estimated result last year was about \$21 million. We are budgeting for a grant revenue of \$22.2 million.

**Mr HILL:** Would I be correct in assuming that most of that is commonwealth funding?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Certainly most of it is commonwealth money, yes.

**Mr HILL:** Can the minister also provide details of the investment funds of \$23.3 million? I know that some of those details are in the capital works book, but not all of them are there.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Are you talking about capital investment?

**Mr HILL:** Yes.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** For capital investment, \$23.3 million has been allocated in the 2001-02 financial

year. This crosses into recreation and sport: if you are talking about a whole of portfolio issue in relation to the \$23.3 million, you will have to bear with me because it is tied up with other sections of the portfolio. An amount of \$23.3 million has been allocated for capital investment in the 2001-02 financial year. A new initiative this year is the provision of funding for community and sporting recreation infrastructure, with some \$17 million being allocated over three years and \$7 million allocated for this purpose in 2001-02; a total of \$6 million for work in progress for the year 2001-02 financial year; and the major initiative to be undertaken with contributions from the ongoing parks agenda program involves the Rocky River precinct, on which I have given a detailed answer earlier in these estimates. The estimated investment in that project this year is \$5.7 million, with a total cost of just over \$7.6 million over four years. The 2001-02 budget estimate includes \$2.5 million, inclusive of carry-over from the 2000-01 financial year, relating to an approved amount of \$6.2 million for the upgrade of trails. A further \$7.7 million will be spent on minor works, including asset replacement and infrastructure upgrade.

In addition to the investment program, community investments of \$2.5 million have been provided to undertake implementation of a more sustainable method of protecting property and maintaining beach amenity on the metropolitan coast, and we detailed that in an earlier answer. The implementation strategy for the metropolitan coastline includes initiatives such as sand replenishing, and so on, which we mentioned earlier. There are more details in the investment summary on page 10.28 of the budget papers.

**Mr HILL:** The full-time equivalents are predicted to rise from 1 190 to 1 220: can the minister indicate where those extra 30 staff will be deployed?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The estimated full-time equivalents (FTEs) within the department number 1 190 as at 30 June 2000 and we have a budget figure of 1 220 FTEs as at 30 June 2001. The variance between the estimated result and the budget estimate of FTE positions primarily represents additional human resources associated with the new initiative announced by the government in the budget. So, there are four FTEs for the increased EPA regional presence; five FTEs will be involved in establishing a system of marine protected areas; three FTEs involved with the government's marine and estuarine strategy; three FTEs involved with initiatives in the Office of Volunteers, although they are working through an office plan at this stage and that number is not final; 12 involved in various other externally funded projects—which is where, I think, we get a grant for a specific project with a defined time line and someone is taken on for a short period, and there are a various number of those projects; and three involved in integrated natural resource management initiatives.

They virtually all relate to increased spending in the budget in those priority areas. The increase in budget spending reflects an increase in staff investment within the agency. It is not reflected in the papers, but an additional five personnel are involved in an air monitoring contract that the department is working on now. So, a further five would be added to those figures.

**Mr CLARKE:** In relation to the number of inspectors—who I understand would come under the EPA—involved with clean air, clean water and noise, will there be an increase in staffing levels in that area?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Certainly in the regions. An answer was given earlier to a very good question from the

member for Chaffey in relation to expanding the EPA's regional presence. We have allocated \$360 000 over four years, which from memory is \$1.44 million over the next four years, to expand the regional presence, because of the very strong economic growth. I am sure that the member for Ross Smith realises that there have been expanded industries in the Murray Bridge and Riverland area. That is one of the areas where we are looking at expanding the EPA's role. So, there certainly is money there for that. The investigation unit has been established within the operations branch of the EPA, the agency. The unit is involved with investigation of offences under the Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act as well as the EP act. The unit currently has three full-time investigators backed up with its own administrative support. An additional investigator is called in under contract as and when necessary. As I have said, we are looking at having another EPA presence within the regions. There are 92 authorised officers within the EPA and any of these can also be involved in an investigation.

**Mr CLARKE:** I take it that the 92 authorised officers are local government people in the main?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will ask Mr Holmes to comment on that.

**Mr CLARKE:** Before he does, I will explain my question so that I get full value out of my bracket of three. In the clean air exercise, for years there were only two inspectors to cover the whole state's public and private sectors. I do not know if that has been increased in recent years but one of my concerns in low-lying and flat areas of my electorate, such as Kilburn, near heavy industry, is that, when there are noxious smells and the like, people are told to phone the officer. It could be midnight when they smell the noxious odours and all they can do is leave a recorded message. Of course, by the time someone gets around to doing the inspection, the noxious smell has dissipated through the atmosphere due to wind changes, or whatever. So, identifying which company or industry was responsible for that noxious smell is almost impossible because you cannot get an officer out at the time the complaint is made, or in a timely fashion.

The other aspect is noise pollution. I know that the EPA was authorising councils in my area, such as the Port Adelaide Enfield Council, to take over some of that role. I wonder how many local government authorities have done that and whether, in fact, they are up to speed without being able to take over that responsibility. Presumably, they should be able to in the sense of doing it better than the EPA, given that, theoretically, they have more people on the ground to service the complaints. Will the minister comment on this?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The committee heard an answer earlier this morning about the local government trial project which involves the City of Port Adelaide/Enfield as one of the three councils, Adelaide Hills and Adelaide being the others. Their local council officers have been working with the EPA in taking over those responsibilities. They have had joint inspections, there has been training, and so on. Local government is already taking over that role as a trial in the honourable member's area. That trial finishes in November this year, having started last November. We will have a look at that leading up to November to see how successful that has been.

Earlier today, another answer was given about an air quality index and air monitoring. We are taking on an extra five staff in relation to air monitoring issues. We are developing an air quality index for Adelaide. From memory, there are 15 monitoring sites throughout Adelaide. Other sites where

monitoring equipment will be installed include Netley, Hope Valley, Elizabeth, Northfield and Kensington. We will be able to obviously keep track of local air quality in the district by regular monitoring.

**Mr CLARKE:** So, no extra human noses to detect the smells; is that what you are saying?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There are 92 authorised officers, with three in the investigation area. The honourable member's council area has an arrangement with the EPA whereby it is undertaking this work. I am not sure how many officers in the honourable member's council are under that arrangement, but he could certainly find out that quickly enough from his council. It would be beyond resources and community expectation for government to monitor every single business. Where issues have been raised with certain businesses, I know that monitoring has been requested, either through an order or through licence conditions. Of course, the problem with odour is that it comes and goes so quickly. I invite Mr Newland to comment on the odour issue.

**Mr NEWLAND:** The only thing I can add to what the minister has said is that, when we get complaints relating to emission of odours, we respond to those as quickly as we can. We cannot have air quality inspectors roving, as it were; we just do not have those sorts of resources. We are able to respond quickly to odour complaints, because we have a pretty good understanding as to where odours are likely to occur. Therefore, we are able to respond to those sorts of problems in a fairly quick manner.

**Mr CLARKE:** I refer to the recent public furore about the lackadaisical approach taken some PIRSA contractors with respect to fruit fly spraying. By way of example, the issue has been raised with me around the Adelaide Hills, and I have had a chance to look at the Adelaide Hills, and the issue of the local government contractors—

**An honourable member:** Within the Adelaide Hills?

**Mr CLARKE:** Yes, within the Adelaide Hills. A person from that area has approached me on this matter on a couple of occasions, and I have had a look at a few things. Local government contractors have not been particularly careful when they spray pesticides to kill weeds on the sides of roads. What sort of monitoring is your department—in particular, the EPA—taking to ensure that pesticides do not enter into our water supply, particularly in the water catchment area, given the growth of vineyards and the heavy pesticide spraying associated with that industry, and also the aerial spraying and the like that takes place with respect to other agricultural pursuits in that area? Are all our reservoirs and the like being monitored with respect to the level of pesticides and, if so, are they within acceptable ranges with respect to human consumption? Has any increase been recorded in the quantity of pesticides in our water supply? Along railway lines arsenic has been dumped—and this is not just in the Adelaide Hills but elsewhere—in the course of maintaining those tracks over many years. They were sprayed in a willy-nilly fashion, not just directly on the tracks but on the sides. One only has to look at the damage that has caused to the local environment. What, if any, studies are the agencies undertaking in this area on the use of pesticides?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The Environment Protection Authority has set up a subcommittee to look specifically at the issue of pesticides. From memory, it has done that in the last eight weeks or three months, because it is aware of the issues involved with pesticides. In an earlier answer to the committee, I gave details of the Watershed Protection Office that we established in Stirling in the middle of a catchment

to monitor and to try to improve practices, particularly agricultural practices. It has been involved in 65 pesticide education courses, involving some 600 landholders or industry participants throughout the area. In the past 12 months in Stirling we established a presence, of about 12 staff, specifically to deal with watershed issues and educate landholders and the public about the watershed with regard to what they should and should not use.

As I have said, we have run 65 pesticide education courses involving 600 landholder industry participants. There have also been eight pesticide environment/safety television segments run through Channel 9 to provide some broader education on pesticides. This all falls under a project called the Pesticide Use in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed project. It is a project specifically designed for the watershed and pesticide use. It involves the EPA, SA Water, PIRSA and the Catchment Water Management Board (CWMB). Also, there are pesticide environment and safety displays at retail outlets, as well as videos, brochures and demonstrations.

As far as pesticides go, I understand that PIRSA is doing a review in relation to the unfortunate issue in Unley the other month. Our agency, in conjunction with PIRSA and other agencies, has been fairly proactive. The authority itself established the subcommittee, and we have been running the Pesticide Use in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed project over the last 12 months, and that is an ongoing project. There is a quite good system in place in those areas.

**Mr CLARKE:** I want to pursue the pesticide issue further. The Minister for Primary Industries has had on his desk for at least two years a green paper on the use of pesticides. During the budget week when the budget was handed down, I asked that minister where it was, and he said he was asking that question himself. He had only just asked his department again to ascertain what he should be doing on it, some two years after the event. Does the minister's department get involved in that green paper and, if so, when can we expect to see a published result of what the government is going to do about the use of pesticides?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will refer that question to the Minister for Primary Industries.

**Mr CLARKE:** So environment is not involved?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** If he has the green paper, I will refer that to him. In fairness to him, the honourable member has already raised the point in question time. I understand from the honourable member that the minister was getting back to him on it. In fairness to my ministerial colleague, I will refer the question to him so that he can coordinate the answers and come back to the honourable member.

**Mr CLARKE:** Is your department involved with it?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, we are.

**Mr CLARKE:** So, can you say from your department's point of view where you are with the green paper?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The green paper is being handled by the Minister for Primary Industries.

**Mr HARVEY:** The green paper is being handled by the Minister for Primary Industries, and we are providing input through the EPA into the content of that green paper.

**Mr CLARKE:** So, it is all up to PIRSA?

**Mr HARVEY:** The Minister for Primary Industries is the lead minister on this piece of legislation but, because of the importance of the legislation from an EPA perspective, we are providing input to its content.

**Mr CLARKE:** Dealing with the concentration of pesticides in our reservoirs, has the level of pesticide readings

in our reservoirs increased? I presume there is ongoing monitoring?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** SA Water would monitor reservoirs. Minister Armitage is on tomorrow. We will refer that question to him and you might wish to raise it with him tomorrow. A process is in place for the monitoring of our water—particularly our drinking water. I am receiving regular notes in relation to the water monitoring, just to keep us abreast of levels of bacteria, etc. My understanding is that SA Water does the monitoring, so that is not in this portfolio.

**Mr CLARKE:** I can understand in one sense PIRSA being the lead advocate and the Minister for Primary Industries being the lead minister with respect to the green paper on the use of pesticides. It seems to me that we have a problem in that for some people in primary industries and the industry itself—farmers and the like—their belief in pesticides is such that they would happily eat them. I wonder about potential conflicts of interest within PIRSA and its close association with those who believe that pesticides are wonderful things in improving the growth or output of grains or whatever produce is grown. How close an eye does your department or the EPA keep? Is it at arm's length remove from the farming industry, or the lobby groups there who are happy to spray pesticides all over the place, in ensuring that what does take place is within acceptable limits as far as the environment is concerned?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that that is one of the reasons why the authority has taken the step to set up a subcommittee in relation to pesticides so that they can continue to take a close interest in the pesticides matter. The authority has taken action to set up its own subcommittee. The green paper is essentially a discussion document and the government agencies themselves get to comment on it. So, with respect to your comment about conflicts of interest or differences of view, or if the agency wishes to raise something, the green paper process allows them to raise something. So, I think the preparation of a green paper on pesticides by PIRSA is a positive initiative; I do not have such an issue with it as you do.

**Mr CLARKE:** So, SA Water does the monitoring of the level of pesticides within our reservoirs. Is that information automatically provided to the EPA or upon request by the EPA? If so, do you have the latest readings or a history of readings and, if so, what do those readings show?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You may want to clarify that question with Minister Armitage tomorrow. The EPA does not just get it automatically; it can get it at any time on request. A process is in place where the Department of Human Services—the Minister for Human Services too, I would suspect—Minister Armitage and I are notified immediately if there is a health issue. If there is a health issue a procedure is in place that provides for automatic notification. If the monitoring is done daily, automatically supplying that to a number of agencies would involve a huge cost. So, my advice is that the EPA can obtain the monitoring at any time it wishes, upon request. The relationship between human services and SA Water is outside my domain. You may want to ask Minister Armitage about how the process works in relation to health issues and water monitoring.

**Mr CLARKE:** Given that answer, that upon request the EPA can and does receive information on pesticide levels in our reservoirs, what does that information show?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** For which reservoir, and at what time?



**Mr CLARKE:** Let us take all the metropolitan reservoirs. What do the readings show as at the last reading that the EPA has information for, versus the history over the past five or seven years or for whatever period the EPA has records? It strikes me as a bit unusual that the level of pesticide readings in our water supply is not provided as a matter of course to the EPA, or that the EPA would not have a standing request for that information.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As soon as there is a health issue, an automatic process kicks into gear; that is the point I am making. A level of pesticide means what? One part every 20 million or 100 million? The government is concerned about the health of taxpayers. The primary concern with water is making sure we are delivering clean, healthy water, so levels of pesticide or any chemical in water becomes a matter of what part per million and how that relates to safety issues. I am trying to explain that a process is in place where if there is a health issue there is automatic notification at the most senior levels within government so that issues can be dealt with immediately or as quickly as possible.

I think the appropriate minister to answer this question is Minister Armitage, who I am sure will be more than happy to explain how that water monitoring system works. I am notified as minister if there is a health issue and, from memory, the ministers for health, water and government enterprises would all be notified automatically if there were a health issue. Even if there are levels that do not present a health issue, a system is in place where we are notified that x, y and z were found but they present no health issue. The Department of Human Services advises us that the situation presents no health issue or if it does present a health issue, there is immediate action. A very strict process is in place in relation to that. In fairness, you should take that up with Minister Armitage under his SA Water banner to talk that through.

**Mr CLARKE:** But at this stage your agency has no information as to whether there has been an increase or decrease in the level of pesticides recorded in our reservoirs? We will have to wait to see SA Water? Unless they are told something, the EPA does not see it as its responsibility to find that out? I can understand about a health emergency or something of this nature being automatically notified. However, I would have thought that you do not want to find out at five minutes to midnight that you have a problem on your hands. I would have thought it would be nice, as part of an ongoing history, to know whether in fact there is a tendency for an increase in pesticides to be found in our drinking water over a period of time, so that, even though at this stage it may not pose a potential danger to human consumption, you can at least then say that we have to take steps to address that steady increase in pesticides in our drinking water—so that you can do it in a programmed way—rather than finding out at five minutes to midnight that there are serious health issues and that you then have to take drastic steps.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will provide some more information for the honourable member. I am not quite sure under which budget line we are discussing this matter. There is a state water policy committee which provides cross-government coordination. Officers from my department sit on that water policy committee. There is a subcommittee that deals with water quality issues, and there have been no significant issues raised at this time. The most recent problem they had was about two years ago in relation to some spraying by forestry. That water policy subcommittee does oversee the water monitoring data. I think government has a

fairly good system in relation to water monitoring and action that needs to be taken from there.

#### **Additional Departmental Advisers:**

Mr P. Croft, Acting Director, Business Development.

Mr P. Fernee, Manager, Major Projects.

Ms C. Mex, Manager, Office for Volunteers.

Ms S. Greene, Ministerial Adviser.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Minister, is it your wish to make an opening statement in respect of this topic?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Volunteering is a significant way in which people can participate in their communities. It provides a way for individuals and groups to address the human, environmental and social needs of society. Volunteering involves the giving of our most precious commodity, that is our own time. More than 400 000 South Australians presently volunteer their time, energy and skills to a range of endeavours in the arts, community services, education, emergency services, sport and recreation, health, tourism and the environment. They contribute approximately 704 million hours of labour to the community through more than 5 000 voluntary organisations currently active across the state.

As a result of a volunteer summit and forum held by the government in 1999, a new ministerial portfolio or area of responsibility was created for volunteers, and the Office for Volunteers was established. The Office for Volunteers is a cross-government service team located within the Department for Environment and Heritage that supports and promotes volunteering. They do this by facilitating smooth implementation of government policy and programs for volunteering; developing legislative and policy initiatives that support volunteering; and establishing mechanisms of communication in order to work in partnership and consultation with the volunteer community.

By achieving these initiatives, the Office for Volunteers aims to strengthen the services and support for volunteers who help create a stronger community. The output 'Volunteer Coordination' is included in the output class 'Policy and Coordination'. A great deal has been achieved to support volunteering in South Australia in a short period, and some of the highlights this year include:

- The establishment of the office within the department.
- Releasing a draft discussion paper proposing new legislation to offer better protection to volunteers from possible civil liability action. This legislation is intended to protect volunteers against civil liability arising out of authorised activities while they are volunteering for duly constituted not-for-profit organisations. Over 20 public consultation sessions were held throughout the state in April and May. Public submissions are being analysed and recommendations will be forwarded in due course.
- Releasing a draft volunteer alliance that proposes a partnership between government and the volunteer sector—an arrangement that will provide great support to volunteering within the state.
- Permanently renaming the Adelaide Cup public holiday in May as the Adelaide Cup Carnival and Volunteers Day in recognition of our state's volunteers.
- Launching this year the community journalism program in cooperation with the University of South Australia and the Adelaide *Advertiser* to profile the voluntary sector weekly in the media.

Allocation of \$480 000 to support a program in 2001 for the International Year of Volunteers. The International Year of Volunteers is a major event for South Australia with 508 events being scheduled throughout the year; over 13 000 certificates of appreciation have been given to volunteers to date; over 200 stories have been reported in the media regarding the International Year of Volunteers activities since January and, due to this media coverage, several volunteer community groups have reported an increase in people interested in becoming volunteers for their organisations.

The 2001-02 state budget provides an additional \$1 million per annum for the establishment of a permanent Office for Volunteers in South Australia, recognising the invaluable support provided by the volunteers. The sum of \$6.2 million will be provided over four years to introduce specific new support and promotion services to develop and enhance the volunteer community, including the establishment of a permanent Office for Volunteers, similar to the current Office for the Ageing and the Office for the Status of Women. I am delighted that a permanent Office for Volunteers is to be initiated in the International Year of Volunteers and in the first state in Australia with a minister responsible for volunteers.

Other recent volunteering initiatives include:

- Funding to support training for 4 000 volunteers throughout South Australia;
- Launch of our community journalism program;
- Allocation of \$50 000 to support a state volunteering conference;
- Allocation of \$180 000 to the 100 Hours Program in conjunction with Business SA, where volunteer organisations can access up to 100 hours of support through volunteers from the corporate sector to assist their various organisations;
- Release of the Premier's volunteer certificates of achievement.

Funding in the 2001-02 budget will also provide for the establishment and maintenance of volunteer databases, and South Australia's new Office for Volunteers will provide enhanced support for community volunteer organisations throughout the state.

**Mr HILL:** I am asking questions on behalf of the leader, who is unavailable today. I have four questions to ask the minister. In relation to the insurance discussion paper, I understand that submissions closed on 25 May. Can the minister say what has been the response of volunteering organisations to the proposal contained in that paper to prohibit legal proceedings against individual volunteers and to transfer legal liability to the volunteers' parent organisation where that organisation is incorporated or is a state or local government body?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I would say generally positive. It is a complex area. Governments will have to address an issue in relation to insurance costs with the volunteer sector. There is no doubt that is an issue that is raising some concern within the community. I think, generally, people support the principle. We have had a careful look at what they have done in America in relation to volunteer protection legislation. There are a number of different models and examples in America and other countries.

We are still committed to the principle of volunteer protection legislation and we are working through all the comments that have been sent in. The general response, whether at the community consultation processes or at

community discussions as part of our community cabinets, has been supportive of the principle as set out in the volunteer protection legislation paper.

**Mr HILL:** Does the minister's plan include minimum standards for insurance? Before the minister answers that question, I relate a note that I picked up from the most recent newsletter of the Friends of the Onkaparinga Parks. One of the members wrote to say he was quitting the organisation because of problems with insurance and inadequate vehicle expenses paid to him. That is a slightly different issue. He broke his leg and put in a claim for loss of primary production income while he was incapacitated for six weeks. That was refused. He asked the question: what would happen if I was out of action for 20 weeks or 52 weeks? As a result of this, he feels he can no longer continue to volunteer because he is worried that if he has a further injury he may be out of work even longer. So, the question about minimum standards is pertinent.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is a different issue from the discussion paper. The issue of minimum standards for insurance for the volunteer sector is a totally different issue from the discussion paper. Some of the American states have tried to establish minimum criteria or uniformity in relation to what volunteer organisations need to provide by way of insurance. We have certainly downloaded that information and had a look at it, but it is not part of the discussion paper. That is a totally separate issue. Those sorts of issues that are filtering through are now common place.

In some volunteer organisations, it is not so much concern about the injuries that are occurring but, rather, concern about the cost of the insurance and trying to get some uniformity between the various organisations. That is an issue that the parliament will have to address long term; otherwise, organisations will either simply not insure or fold because they cannot afford the insurance. That issue was raised at the volunteer summit and forum. Since then we have been doing a lot of research to try to work out a policy solution, in part, not only for that issue but also for the issues raised in the discussion paper.

For example, I know that for Apex (which is a national organisation) the cost of insurance was about \$35 a head. Yesterday, I had discussions with a small group in the Port Augusta area. They had 10 members and the insurance cost was \$860, or \$85 or \$86 a head, for a small group of 10.

**Mr HILL:** A head!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It was \$860 or \$86 a head for a group of 10 people. Obviously, if they can attract more people, the cost per head comes down, but it has been 10 for a number of years. For that group the issue becomes, 'Why volunteer and do fundraising when the first \$1 000 goes to the insurers?' That becomes a real issue, particularly in regional South Australia, because there is not the volume of numbers to cover all the volunteer avenues. Quite often, the volunteers at the footy club are the same volunteers at Friends of Parks, Red Cross or Meals on Wheels. I remember meeting one lady who had nine badges down her coat from all the different organisations in which she was involved. If you worked out how much fundraising she would have to do to cover her insurance, it would be horrific. This is an issue which the parliament will have to address. I do not claim to have the answer today. All I am saying is that we are looking at innovative policy solutions to try to cap some of their costs, as best we can, so that we can protect the ethos of volunteering from being overrun by insurance costs.

**Mr HILL:** Just following on from that, I assume that, if Apex can get it at \$35 a head throughout Australia, then there must be some way of joining some of these smaller groups together so that they can take advantage of a cheaper rate.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, one would assume that there must be some way of doing that. The problem then arises of how we get all those groups together to agree on a uniform policy and uniform conditions, which would be an interesting task for someone considering that we are going from art groups to service clubs to footy clubs to heritage groups. However, that question has come to our mind; that is, is there some collective buying issue that we need to work through? Certainly since the summer we have done an enormous amount of research on the insurance issue, but the issue which the member raises about capping limits is a totally different issue from the one in the discussion paper.

**Mr HILL:** Earlier this year, I understand that the minister released a draft volunteer alliance paper for comment by 8 June 2001. The paper asked the question: who should sign this alliance on behalf of the volunteer community? Can the minister provide information on the answer to that question now that the submissions have been received?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, I cannot. We are still analysing the submissions in relation to that discussion paper and that issue. The government will respond to the submissions in due course, and that response will outline the government's policy. From memory, there were three options. One option was to have the minister's round table sign off on it, but some concerns were raised about having the minister's round table, which is appointed by the minister, signing off on an alliance with the minister. Another option was Volunteering SA, which is a long established group with an interest in volunteering. Another option was to form a body of peak organisations, including Volunteering SA, which would then form a volunteering state council which would not only sign the alliance but also undertake other duties as a state council. They are the three options on which we asked for comment, and, as I say, we are sifting through the responses now.

**Mr HILL:** Last December, I understand that Volunteering SA complained that, although an amount of \$550 000 had been allocated to volunteering, no money had been passed on by December 2000. What funds have been allocated to community organisations for the next financial year, and when will the cheques go out?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** When the member says 'community organisations'—

**Mr HILL:** Volunteering organisations.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I understand that Volunteering SA receives most of its funding from Human Services. We fund some programs. For instance, they did some training for us and we funded that as a one-off program. I think the member will find that that complaint about the \$550 000 was a printing error within the budget at the time, and a letter of explanation was sent to Volunteering SA when that was raised. I think the budget paper said '\$550 000 to Volunteering SA', whereas it should have said '\$550 000 to volunteering'. I think that was a printing error and we explained that to Volunteering SA at the time.

**Mr HILL:** I thank the minister for that answer and all the other answers today.

#### **Additional Departmental Advisers:**

Mr S. Forrest, Executive Director, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Mr P. Schwarz, Manager, Grants.

Ms C. Andrews, Ministerial Liaison and Communications Officer.

Mr J. Green, Manager, Finance.

Ms J. Hughes, Director, Policy and Special Projects.

Mr W. Battams, Director, SA Sports Institute.

Mr C. Paul, Manager, Business Services.

Mr R. Fletcher, Executive Adviser, Office of the Chief Executive, Department for Environment and Heritage.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have a short opening statement. The government's recreation and sport program is delivered through the Office for Recreation and Sport, a division of the Department for Environment and Heritage. The office works in partnership with a range of service providers to promote the development of and participation in recreation and sport. The aim is to make a positive impact on the social, health and economic well-being of the community through: providing a leadership role for the recreation and sport industry; establishing and promoting strategic alliances within the recreation and sport industry, commerce and all levels of government; ensuring the development of recreation and sport facilities, programs and services in a strategic manner; developing our athletes, coaches and support services to international standards; developing and assisting in the promotion and export of products and services of the recreation and sport industry; and promoting the social, physical and economic benefits of participation in recreation and sport activities.

The year 2000-01 has been a significant year in terms of recreation and sport in South Australia. Some of the highlights from the year include: achieving the highest level of Olympic and Paralympic team representation and attracting 20 000 bed nights for the local tourism industry through athletes and officials from visiting countries using Adelaide as a training base in preparation for the Olympic and Paralympic Games in Sydney; increasing funding for community recreation and sport facilities by \$1.1 million and funding grants to recreation and sporting clubs by some \$900 000; developing a strategy for state water safety; developing an integrated state mountain bike plan, which is a national first, in cooperation with Bicycle SA and other key stakeholders, to ensure coordinated, sustainable recreational opportunities; and completing stage one of the asset and risk management audit of trails.

With the release of the 2001-02 state budget, South Australians can again be assured that recreation and sport will continue to be a high priority for the state government. Sport and physical activity are an integral part of everyday life for South Australians, and the state budget for 2001-02 again reflects a strong commitment by the government to recreation and sport. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to advise the committee of a new funding program totalling \$17 million over the next three years to enable sport and recreation organisations across the state greater access to grants for facility development. This new community facility grant program will allow communities to plan for sport and recreation infrastructure to meet their needs, with \$7 million being provided in 2001-02.

As promised, some of this new funding program will be earmarked for improvements at the Adelaide Aquatic Centre. In addition, the 2001-02 budget provides up to \$1 million to help facilitate the development of a new Marion indoor aquatic centre. This latest injection of funds comes on top of the government's decision this year to double the funding to the community recreation and sport facilities program from

\$900 000 to approximately \$1.9 million, and to double the active club grant program from \$940 000 to approximately \$1.8 million. The new and existing programs, including the \$6 million per annum management development program, will result in the distribution of around \$17 million to an estimated 400 community based sport and recreational organisations in the year 2001-02.

Over the next three years the government's commitments total some \$47 million. Other features of the 2001-02 sport and recreation budget include: \$2.49 million to maintain and upgrade recreational trails, which is part of a \$6.2 million, five-year program; \$480 000 for the VacSwim program to increase awareness of water safety at our beaches, rivers and swimming facilities; the conduct of training seminars to assist country clubs and associations in improving and developing their management practices; the development of state and regional recreation sports development plans; the development of a risk management manual, complete with a training program, to keep the SA sport and recreation industry abreast of current practices; an initiative to develop mountain bike riding opportunities for off-road riding that is accessible and safe for all South Australians; and \$125 000 a year for the next four years to ensure South Australia's involvement in the next Commonwealth, Olympic and Paralympic Games. I think the committee will agree that the foregoing initiatives clearly demonstrate the state government's strong commitment to ensuring that South Australians of all ages can participate in and enjoy sport and recreation in all communities and at all levels.

The racing industry is an important contributor to the state economy. It generates income from employment and its image has raised the profile of South Australia as a tourist destination. The industry is also an important source of taxation revenue for the South Australian government. The 2000-01 Portfolio Statements included an output class racing industry development recognising the role of the Racing Industry Development Authority in establishing the organisational, financial and strategic framework for an efficient, viable and accountable racing industry in South Australia. The role of RIDA ceased following corporatisation of the thoroughbred, harness and greyhound controlling bodies in late 2000. The Department for Environment and Heritage has retained a policy role and this change has been represented by deleting the former output class and moving the output racing industry development services to the new recreation and sport racing output class.

The government of South Australia is continuing to provide support for the racing industry in this state. Key achievements over the last year include the introduction of legislation to provide for the corporatisation of the industry and also the introduction of legislation to regulate and license proprietary racing. These important foundations have paved the way for racing codes to develop sounder business practices and play a greater role in defining the future of their industry.

#### **Membership:**

Mr Wright substituted for Mr Hill.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the lead speaker for the opposition wish to make a statement?

**Mr WRIGHT:** No.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any questions?

**Mr WRIGHT:** I will start, if I may. I apologise for missing the minister's speech but, obviously, I will read it in

*Hansard.* I do not have the benefit of knowing what the minister said, but he may have, in fact, highlighted what I would like to first ask about a new sum of money that was announced in the budget for community sports and recreation infrastructure. Can the minister provide additional information about where money is going in respect of that new announcement that has been made by the government?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Some of the money will be negotiated with the Adelaide City Council in relation to the Adelaide Aquatic Centre and the balance will be used to provide more grants to community groups for sporting and recreation infrastructure. The level of interest in the regional recreation grant facility program, which was \$900 000 last year, went to about \$1.9 million. It was always substantially over-subscribed, which showed that there was a lot of demand in the community for more funding for community recreation and sporting facilities, so the provision of an extra \$7 million this year will assist community recreation sports groups get some of their projects across the line.

I give an example. Last year, from memory, under the regional recreation sports grant line we received around 70 to 80 applications, whereas this year we received 240 applications. From memory, last year—do not hold me to this—we made about 19 or 20 offers from the 70 or 80 applications. So you can see that, if you are only offering 20 grants but you are getting 240 applications, it is substantially over-subscribed. So, we are pleased to be able to achieve for the portfolio and for all of those community sporting organisations a significant increase in funding of \$7 million this year, \$5 million next year and \$5 million the year after.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Apart from the aquatic centre, is it possible to identify the types of projects that may receive money under this community sporting and recreation infrastructure heading, and how this might differ from the other fund that you referred to, which I think was the community recreation and sport facilities program? I am trying to get a handle on the types of projects that may get money under this particular funding line.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** They will be very similar projects, such as football clubs, netball clubs or tennis clubs that need clubrooms extended or new courts or new lights. That sort of thing will be funded, so it will not be dissimilar to the regional recreation facilities grants scheme, which had \$1.9 million. It is that sort of project that will substantially be funded from the new scheme.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Do guidelines currently exist with respect to the new funding line that was announced and, if not, are we going to be using the same guidelines for that other fund that you just referred to, the regional and recreational facilities grant?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, we are working through the process now as to the exact details of the guidelines and the information that we will need to send to the various stakeholder groups. So, if you ask me today whether they have finished and signed off, the answer is no, but we are certainly working on that. There will be some clear communication going out to the various groups as to what might or might not be included.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Will there be a ceiling on individual projects? That may still be in the process of being worked through so I am not going to ask for a specific figure, but I wonder whether there will be some form of ceiling for an individual project; and what will the approval process in government be for this particular program?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We are still working through the guidelines, so whether there is a ceiling or not is one of the issues that will need to be worked through. The process that we have used for the regional recreation facilities grants scheme is by application and then there is an internal committee that looks at whether they are eligible or not: some that apply are not eligible because they are not incorporated; they may not have returned previous acquittals if they have received a previous grant; or the project might have already started. There are a number of reasons why they are not eligible. Then a recommendation goes to the minister from that committee, usually with a ranking attached to it. As minister, I simply follow the ranking for the allocation of the money. That is the process currently used and I do not see a great difference in the process being used for the other grant scheme.

**Mr WRIGHT:** When will money start being made available through this program?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I would think there will be money available this side of Christmas.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Maybe you have already answered this, but how will this particular funding program differ from existing programs? It is my understanding that the range of programs obviously have guidelines—there are application forms and criteria and there are obviously budgets allocated that have specific requirements and so forth. I think there is about \$10 million, or thereabouts, prior to this announcement which was made available with grant money. How do you imagine this new money, \$7 million, will differ from existing programs?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** When you say there is \$10 million available—

**Mr WRIGHT:** In grant money.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Let us not get them confused. There is the management development program, which is about \$6 million; there is about \$2 million—\$1.9 million—for the regional recreation grant scheme; and then there is \$1.88 million for the active club. The active club is distributed \$40 000 per electorate and there is no change to that. The management development is \$6 million. It closely resembles the regional recreation grant scheme and, as I have said, we are working through the guidelines. There will certainly be an application process, and it will follow through standard procedures as to allocations, but we are still working through that process. It may well be that we simply combine it with the current system and say, 'That system works pretty well. We will keep some money aside for the Adelaide Aquatic Centre.' Everyone is familiar with the current program so we may even combine that, but we are still working through that process. I acknowledge that it will have to be done fairly quickly, because the stakeholders will want to know exactly how it works. The improvement is that we have won an extra \$7 million this year, and community recreation and sport groups have access to it.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I agree it is good that an additional \$7 million is going to recreation and sport. But I guess one could make the observation that this is \$7 million a few months before a state election and we do not seem to have a lot of detail about the program. It seems a little ironical that we have gone from \$10 million to \$17 million a few months before a state election with little detail about what the guidelines will be. From your answers, it seems that the money and the programs are very similar, if not identical, to the regional and recreational facilities grants. I hope, and

would like an assurance, that it will not be a pork-barrelling exercise.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Let us keep it in perspective. If there is one thing that I have been consistent about as Minister for Recreation and Sport, it is to try to get more money into the community level of recreation and sport. We have doubled the Active Club and regional recreation and sport amounts during my term as recreation and sports minister. We have now won \$17 million over the next three years for community recreation and sporting facilities during my time as sports minister. The fact that it is \$7 million this year and \$5 million for each of the following two years shows that it is not a pork-barrelling exercise. We have committed to \$5 million each year after this year.

We have highlighted that we have gone from about 80 applications last year to 240 applications that the agency has before it as we speak, and that indicates that the sport and recreation groups are becoming more aware of the grants that are available and are putting in applications. I am aware, through his various comments in previous reports, that the Auditor-General always has a close interest in grant programs. I can say that there will definitely be guidelines and a cabinet sign-off in relation to expenditures. I am aware of the obvious community interest, as well as the interest of the opposition, given the closeness of the election. I make the point that we are committed past the election: we have committed \$7 million this year and \$5 million and \$5 million, and that is \$47 million over the next three years.

**Mr WRIGHT:** \$17 million.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Altogether it is \$47 million. As you have admitted, we already have \$10 million included in the budget. So, \$10 million for each of the three years is \$30 million, plus \$17 million makes a total of \$47 million. The \$6 million from the winding up of the old Living Health (as it was known) came across to recreation and sport. So, the recreation and sport agency grant program has gone from virtually nothing to about \$47 million in a matter of about six years—and I am pleased with that result.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I refer to output class 5, page 10.16. On behalf of my colleague, the member for Flinders, with the renewed Life Be In It campaign to stem reported inactivity of a major proportion of the Australian population who are overweight, especially children, how do the regional sporting facilities and active club grants contribute to this concept of healthier children and adults in South Australia?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I guess this follows on from the member for Lee's question in relation to grants and grant programs. I mentioned in my answer to his question that we have doubled the regional recreation facilities grants and, indeed, the active club grants. With the regional recreation facilities grants there is generally a limit of about \$150 000. The member for Lee raised the question earlier about possible limits, and the maximum limit is \$150 000. They can be for a range of projects, and could include the upgrade or improvement of existing playing services or the upgrade of a multi-purpose sport and recreation facility. Indeed, scout halls have even been funded and, indeed, BMX tracks, skate parks and playgrounds are other examples.

Funding allocated throughout 2001 from the 1999-2000 round of grants was distributed to 19 organisations (I think I mentioned 22 earlier, but the figure is 19) located across the state; and 45 per cent of the grants allocated went to country and/or regional locations. I think there is confusion in some people's mind that when the word 'regional' is used it

automatically means country. Of course, that is not quite right: 'regional' simply means not a state level facility. So, 'regional' can be a metropolitan facility that is not used as a state level facility.

Examples of allocations are such things as \$50 000 to the Onkaparinga council to assist in the development of their youth park; \$13 500 allocated to the Port Lincoln Council for the development of a purpose-built disabled playground; about \$40 000 to the Mount Gambier Netball Association to replace flood lighting; and about \$45 000 to the McLaren Vale Hockey Club for improvements to its facility.

I guess they are fairly typical of the type of application when I say that we have gone from 80 to 240; it is a cross-section across the whole community where they are looking for more funding. To be exact, there were 248 applications for grants in the last round, and requests for \$9.26 million worth of grants, with projects totalling about \$27 million. In other words, if every project was funded, we would have to give out \$9 million worth of grants and we would get \$27 million worth of work out in the community. I think that illustrates that the regional recreation facility grants scheme, first, is desperately needed and, secondly, is very popular with the general community.

The Active Club program is the smaller grant amount, such as \$2 000, \$3 000 and \$4 000 that we get out on a basis of \$40 000 per electorate. There are three types of grants available: local initiative grants; minor capital works grants; and youth encompassing sport grants. They are usually handed out through the local members of parliament. Something like 427 organisations are successful in obtaining an active club grant from the funding rounds conducted in May and October 2000. These organisations are spread across the 47 electorates and represent some 51 different sport and recreation activities, ranging from scouting, kindy gym, orienteering through to football, tennis and lawn bowls. The types of projects being funded vary between organisations, but most in demand is assistance for minor equipment purchases, junior sport programs and clubroom development. I have a list of every successful application if the member wants me to read it but, given the closeness of the dinner break, we will not go down that path. The latest funding round of the active club program closed on 27 April 2001 and applications are currently being assessed. Allocations should be announced in the near future.

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

**Mr WRIGHT:** Before the dinner break, before members of the government asked a couple of questions, we were talking about the additional \$17 million that has been allocated over three years to the community sporting and recreational infrastructure, as it has been called in the budget. The sum of \$7 million has been provided in the first financial year, followed by \$5 million in the second year and \$5 million in the third year. The minister mentioned the increase in funding for the Active Club program from one to two, and the increase in regional and recreational facility grant from one to two. I am sure at the time that I acknowledged and congratulated the minister on that, and I echo that now. This additional \$7 million will be for the first financial year, and \$17 million will be for three years. Unfortunately, one must still be cynical of this money coming on stream so close to a state election. Over a financial year the grant money is increasing from approximately \$10 million to \$17 million, and that is a big increase. The minister made the

point that because this funding is over three years it should not be seen as a pork-barrelling exercise—although they may not have been the minister's exact words. That does not in any way allay my fears.

The minister could very well—and I hope this is not the case, because this will not be best for sport and recreation in South Australia—as a result of this new funding program, announce a range of projects and dump an additional \$7 million into the community prior to the next election. A big percentage of that money may be reliant on ongoing funding in years two and three to finish off the project. If we are lucky enough to be successful at the next election, quite clearly we will honour that money; we would have no choice but to do so. The shadow Treasurer has made the point that the minister's budget becomes our budget. So there is no question about that. In no way is the minister allaying my fears that this is not a pork-barrelling exercise or that this does not have the potential for dumping money into key Liberal electorates in the lead-up to the next election.

It also does nothing to allay my fears that a percentage of the \$5 million in years two and three will not simply be going into ongoing funding for programs that are announced. I am genuinely concerned, especially since, before the dinner break, the minister told me that at this stage he does not have guidelines or precise information about where and how this program will take place in the community. It may be an extension in part or it may be the total of the regional and recreational facilities grant. We need some confidence that this money will be used in the right areas, and that it will not simply be a pork-barrelling exercise in the lead-up to a state election where announcements are made about big ticket items going into certain areas which may be key marginal Liberal electorates.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do not know what I can say other than what I have already said to allay the honourable member's fears. The political process will deliver some cynicism depending on the individual's view. As I have said, we have now committed to an ongoing program—\$7 million, \$5 million and \$5 million. We would have loved to commit \$7 million, \$5 million and \$5 million earlier. However, unfortunately, we were paying extraordinary amounts in bank interest. We have always said that, once we got the debt under control, we would reinvest in community services. We reinvested in 200 new police and 200 new nurses, and now we have put money into community sporting infrastructure. Before the dinner break, I said that we are working through the issues of guidelines and so on, and I am comfortable in my own mind as to the knowledge of the issues that will be raised. I am aware of the honourable member's view, but I do not know what I can say to necessarily dampen the honourable member's cynicism given the process we are in.

**Mr WRIGHT:** One thing the minister could do is provide an assurance that he and his office will be totally removed from any decisions with regard to funding for this new additional \$7 million for the next financial year.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The way it works, and I have already explained that—

**Mr WRIGHT:** I know!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** But I will explain it again for you. The way it works is that the Office of Recreation and Sport has a committee that looks at the matter. It goes through and works out those who are eligible and ineligible, and it then ranks the projects in priority order according to their judgment. I then simply work down the list with the funding available. If one project drops out, I pick the next

project off the list in rank order. We are conscious of the issues, and at least for the three years that I have been minister that is the process that has been used. So I am removed, and my office is removed, from the process. A representative of my office does not sit on the assessment panel; that is all done by the officers. They usually invite one member of local government or someone representing local government and a community representative, unless those people themselves have a conflict of interest. If their organisations have applied, obviously they are not involved. That is the process that is being used. I have no intention of changing that process in relation to this regime, for the obvious reasons to which the honourable member is alluding.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I will just clarify that. Once a list is prepared by the Office of Recreation and Sport, that then comes to the minister. The minister mentioned the fact that, if someone drops out, there might be an elevation. However, from the description the minister gave me, at least since he has been minister—and I am not casting aspersions on anyone else in saying this—he follows religiously the list as it is put to him by the Office of Recreation and Sport, order by order, priority by priority. He does not elevate anybody for whatever reason or reasons, except if someone has dropped out, which may be because they have not been able to come up with the right requirements. The minister follows religiously the list that is provided to him by the Office of Recreation and Sport and, if that is correct, he will do so with this fund, as well.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is generally right. The ranking is prepared by the Office of Recreation and Sport. It ranks the projects one, two, three, four, five, six, and so on. Those projects then have a requested amount, whether it is \$50 000, \$100 000 or whatever. I then allocate amounts down. It may well be that you end up with \$20 000 left over, and the next one in order needs \$100 000, so I just go down and find the next one that I can fit in that might need \$20 000. The principle of trying to follow the rankings is the principle I adopt. Occasionally, one gets jumped over because the pool of money is not enough to fund that project. There is no point offering a project that needs \$150 000 the sum of \$20 000; it simply will not go ahead. Within those criteria, I certainly follow the rankings.

**Mr WRIGHT:** We would hope to see this money distributed evenly and widely and that it is not subject to a slant, whether it be geographical, electoral or whatever the case may be. I have expressed my cynicism about the allocation of this additional money four months out from the due date of the next state election.

Obviously, this will be a matter for people to watch closely to see the guidelines that are developed; how it fits in with the overall package of grant money; how similar or different it is; whether it lines up with one of the other particular funding lines—the regional and recreational facilities grant; when this money becomes available; and how it is spent. I think that those will all be important considerations to examine closely as this money does become available.

I now refer to a different but related area; as I understand, applications for the community recreation and sports facilities program for 2000-01 closed on 25 May 2001 and those for the active club program closed on 27 April. I think the minister may have mentioned the latter before the dinner break. When will these announcements be made and will the same timetable apply for the second round of funding? I think I am right in saying that for those particular grant programs

there are two rounds of funding per annum. I am interested to know, concerning those where the applications have closed, when the announcement will be and what the timetable is for the second round of funding later this year in respect of close of applications for the two particular funds and also when the announcement for those particular rounds will be made.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** My understanding is that, with the active clubs grants, the assessment process is virtually complete and I would expect the recommendations reasonably quickly—within seven days, I am told I should receive the active club grants list. It is my understanding that the assessment committee will have decided by the end of this week which of these applications are ineligible for the regional recreational facilities grants and then I should get a ranking by 6 July. Then it will be a matter of allocating the funds and they will be out. So, both of those will happen relatively quickly.

In relation to the \$1.8 million involved in the regional recreational facilities scheme for next year, we are late in getting out (and it is not the agency's fault, I might add; it is my fault) the grant applications this year because the government was considering changing one of the criteria. The agency had to wait for a policy decision from the government's party room which did not get to it until late, so it was late in getting it out. I think the normal process is that the application forms are put out in about October or November for the regional recreational facilities grant and they are normally announced just after Christmas. We will probably be reverting back to that normal time frame. We have put extra pressure on the agency this year—and that is something that the directors raised with me—because of that timing issue.

I should just explain what the issue was for the member's information. You might recall that the clubs that already have poker machines cannot obtain active club grant funds. An issue was raised in relation to whether clubs with poker machine licences should be able to get regional recreational facilities grants—the bigger ones. That arose because, I think from memory, the Marion Sports and Community Club, which had a poker machine licence, applied for a grant for development of clubhouse facilities, including a lift, meeting areas and dining and bar extension. They ended up receiving a grant of \$75 000 even though they had a poker machine licence.

That raised that policy question, so I had to take it to our party room to find out what they wanted to do. It got tied up over Christmas and we did not get the result out to the agency until about February, and that is why the regional recreation grants are later than we wanted. In the normal process, they would be out in October-November, which gives the agency the quieter Christmas time to try to assist them.

**Mr WRIGHT:** So, the timetable for the recreation and sports facilities program is probably around September-October, closing off announcements at about September?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We go back to the normal time.

**Mr WRIGHT:** And the next round after the current one that we are in?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Active club are normally in October and April.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I am presuming that the second round of funding is set for later in the year. I know that active club has two rounds.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is the only one. Active club is the only one that has two rounds; the regional recreation facility has only one round.

**Mr WRIGHT:** You have already explained to me the community recreation and sports facilities program, so I am happy with that. The active club program will follow through in this first and the second round as it normally would; there will be no juggling of any announcements pending an election or potential election?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There will be an October and an April round for the active club grant.

**Mr WRIGHT:** So, that will stay as it is; okay. Will the minister provide me with some additional information about the State Sports Facility Fund? You would be aware that I was (and I will come back to this tonight) concerned about a large percentage of that money for 1999-2000 being made available to the South Australian Soccer Federation for its underwriting arrangements. I am not too sure how this fund works. Could you give me some general information? For example, do organisations that may qualify for this apply? Are there criteria, guidelines or application forms as there are with other grant money that we have already talked about, or is it outside that procedure and the Office of Recreation and Sport makes its own decisions independent of that type of process?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There is no grant application form as such. Some \$500 000 a year is allocated out of the \$2.5 million that is allocated to the agency out of what is generally called the 'pokies money' and made available to our Sport and Recreation Fund. We allocate \$500 000 of that toward what we call the State Facilities Fund. When the agency negotiates such things as the management development program with our sport and recreation clients, they take the opportunity to raise issues that might be associated with their state level facilities and are capital works issues. During the year they are free to ring up or contact the office through the executive director at any time in relation to an issue that might arise, and they would then make application to the executive director, who then makes a recommendation up to the minister, and I consider it from there. Such grants would include the Adelaide Aquatic Centre timing equipment on which we paid out \$50 000 last year; the Adelaide Aquatic Centre diving facility, \$60 000; and Monarto Shooting Complex car park works, \$14 000.

You are never quite sure what the next application will be or whether or not there will be an issue with a state facility. For example, we have just been notified of a salt damp issue out at the velodrome. We will have to look at that; it is a state level facility. Issues have come up from time to time in relation to The Pines hockey stadium, the athletic stadium and the netball stadium. So, it is just cautious management. We allocate \$500 000, and all sports that have state level facilities are aware it is there and make application via the executive director who considers it and makes a recommendation up, and the minister decides from there. There is no annual pool but just a pool of money that is allocated every year. We have to report to the Economic and Finance Committee on that fund each year.

**Mr WRIGHT:** That is correct. This is where some information was recently reported to the Economic and Finance Committee by the Office of Recreation and Sport. From what you are saying and the information I have in front of me, which was presented to recreation and sport (and Simon may be able to confirm this), in 1999-2000 some \$411 144 was spent. I presume that, in that financial year, not

all the \$500 000 to which you referred was spent. That is the only way I can interpret it.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That may well be right.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I do not make a point about that, except just to establish the ground I am working on. What disturbed and surprised me was that, of that \$411 000 that was made available to these various organisations, some 86 per cent—or \$354 000—went to payments made pursuant to underwriting arrangements with the South Australian Soccer Federation (Hindmarsh Stadium) in a range of payments in August, September, November, December and February. It surprised me. I would have thought there would be a pretty healthy demand for what you are talking about in that fund. I am sure there would be; you would know better than I. Needless to say, the organisations that come to you also on occasions come to me. It just does not seem right to me that this fund appears to have been raided to pay for the loans of the Soccer Federation.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The question is?

**Mr WRIGHT:** Why was it that, in the year 1999-2000, 86 per cent of the money that came out of the State Sports Facilities Fund went to underwriting arrangements with the South Australian Soccer Federation? What about all the other venues and sports out there that I am sure would also have been making some demands for money?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** For 1999-2000 the expenditures were: for the Aquatic Centre timing equipment, \$50 000, and for the Santos Stadium minor works planning the figure was a touch over \$3 500. For 2000-01, the figures are: Monarto shooting complex, \$14 000; the Aquatic Centre timing equipment, \$50 000 (again); and Aquatic Centre diving facility, \$60 000.

*Mr Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The first ones were 1999-2000; the Santos Stadium minor works was just over \$3 500, and the Aquatic Centre timing equipment were both 1999-2000; then, in the next year, we had the Monarto Shooting Complex car park at \$14 000; Aquatic Centre timing equipment at \$50 000 and the Aquatic Centre diving facility at \$60 000. Let us understand that there is no surprise. Every year we have answered this question—usually for the benefit of the media—but it was clearly established—

**Mr WRIGHT:** Not about this fund, we have not.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, we have.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I never knew about it.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Usually what happens is that members on your side ring the media and say, 'We are going to ask questions in the Economic and Finance Committee on this subject.' We invite the media in, they ask one question and then get up and say, 'Outrage, outrage!' and that is the story of the day. That is the process that has been happening.

This fund was set up for state facilities. An agreement was made and it has always been made public that this fund, if needed, would be used to underwrite both the netball and soccer loans. Netball has generally paid its way; soccer, as all members know, has been an issue. We went to cabinet and this year financial arrangements have been put in place so that this fund is now free (as of this financial year, I understand) from the underwriting criteria for soccer.

That matter has now been fixed because we recognised that there was an issue if it continued at that level. We have looked at it and we have taken a policy decision, I guess, to satisfy that very point you make. There is nothing unusual in what we have done. It was put up-front; it was always one of the intended purposes right up-front.



**Mr WRIGHT:** I have never talked about this fund before because, to tell you the truth, I did not know a lot about it. The point you make about Economic and Finance may be true, but are you saying that no money from the State Sports Facility Fund in the future will be used for underwriting the SA Soccer Federation?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that is correct.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I think that is a very healthy direction to take because in 1999-2000—and I am only as good as the information in front of me—the amount spent was \$411 000, of which \$354 000 went to the Soccer Federation. That appears to me as if the fund has been raided to underwrite the Soccer Federation. The minister spoke about others—and I welcome them—which are outside this financial year.

I was somewhat surprised and disappointed—because I know the Premier talks about an open and accountable government—that, keeping in mind what I just highlighted, 86 per cent of \$411 000 was spent in 1999-2000 to underwrite arrangements with the South Australian Soccer Federation. In the same corresponding financial year the annual report (I guess prepared by the Office of Recreation and Sport for the minister) for 1999-2000 under ‘improving facilities’ states:

The State Facilities Fund was used to assist with minor works planning at Santos Stadium—

that is in this information—

upgrade of timing and diving equipment at Adelaide Aquatic Centre—

that is in this piece of information—

the Hutt Street croquet lawns—

that is not here, but it may be that it was in an earlier financial year or subsequently—

and relocation of the South Australian Rifle Association—

which may also have been in a previous financial year. It astounds me that when 86 per cent of this fund was spent out of the State Sports Facility Fund it does not get a guernsey in the annual report. That strikes me as guilt by omission. I wonder why, in fact, when so much money was spent—86 per cent of \$411 000 for this fund—it talks about the fund in the annual report, it highlights a number of examples but it does not talk about the particular area where 86 per cent of the funding went for the same financial year.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I think it is a fair point that the honourable member raises and we will look at improving the reporting in this financial year.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I take you to page 10.25, output class 5. Could you provide some information about 5.3, ‘facilities management’. I would be interested in a couple of things. We may have spoken briefly about this in estimates before, and I guess it is an area where government has responsibility for looking after certain venues. Could the minister explain some of the detail about the figures, for example—this may relate to the Olympics or something else—the output revenue for 2000-01, ‘estimated result’, is \$2.285 million yet the budget for 2001-02 is \$352 000—about a \$1.9 million difference.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Can the honourable member give me the numbers?

**Mr WRIGHT:** It is page 10.25, output class 5, 5.3, ‘facilities management’.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It is basically to do with a \$1.8 million one-off transfer in relation to the former Living Health reserves. The honourable member might recall that Living Health was established for an arts, health and recrea-

tion and sport focus—those three agencies. When it was wound up, from memory, it must have been about \$4 million or \$5 million in reserve. Our share was about \$1.8 million. The recreation and sport participation output shows a declining expenditure of \$1.8 million when comparing the 2001-02 budget with the 2000-01 estimated result, which is the output net expenditure summary on page 10.25. The reduction is primarily the result of allocating one-off Living Health reserves of \$1.8 million.

**Mr WRIGHT:** The earlier part to my question was in relation to the facilities that come under this particular area. I presume this is a range of facilities for which the government has responsibility.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Are you referring to the title of ‘facilities management’ which is covered under 5.3?

**Mr WRIGHT:** Yes.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That would be either facilities that we own and manage or facilities to which we might contribute and which are managed under contract. The athletics stadium has a board that has a memorandum of understanding with the agency. We have our own manager at the velodrome. Its those sorts of issues under ‘facilities management’. The difference between the \$2.285 million and \$352 000 which is a touch over \$1.8 million, is basically the 1.8 plus the interest.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I am not sure whether the Office of Venue Management is the minister’s responsibility.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Tourism. The way in which I read Minister Hall’s comments in *Hansard* the other day, it was tourism as from 1 July. Currently, it is under the Deputy Premier.

**Mr WRIGHT:** In relation to 5.4, ‘Racing industry advice’, the figure for expenses for 2000-01 is \$150 000; and then for the budget for 2001-02 it is \$365 000. I presume that part of that, if not all, may be related to the timing of the winding down of RIDA and the creation of the Office of Racing.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, that is right.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Now is a good chance to get the minister’s advice on another area in the budget about which I was not certain. On page 10.41 under ‘Outputs Net Expenditure Summary’, the last dot point states:

A number of carryover effects are the major influences in the Recreation, Sport and Racing output class.

Can the minister give me some more information about that?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Essentially it is grant moneys that have been committed but not claimed. So, it carries over. If a project is halfway through, then they have not finished it, so it is not claimed. We allocated—and I always get these figures back to front—\$6.2 million over five years for trails. There was a small amount of carryover in the trails area.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I am not asking for figures because I think that would be very difficult—but I will take them if the minister has them. However, when the minister talks about projects falling over, starting, or not continuing, what sort of dimension are we talking about?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As I mentioned earlier, one of the issues arose because of the delay in making that policy decision. In relation to the regional recreational facilities grant, the \$1.8 million for this financial year (which finishes in four days) is still there because we have not allocated it yet. Normally that would have been allocated. We find ourselves in a bit of an odd situation this year. Even as late as last month we allocated another grant from last year,

because one of the sporting organisations wrote to the agency saying that it could not accept our grant offer. Consequently we went to the next one on the list, which was the Port MacDonnell footy club and which was just offered \$45 000. Apart from this one-off year, it would be unusual for it to be more than—and do not hold me to this—\$100 000 or \$200 000-odd that is certainly committed but not yet claimed. We normally allocate them around Christmas time, and therefore most of them are well on the way come 30 June.

**Mr WRIGHT:** One question I was going to ask the minister earlier, which I know he and I have discussed in estimates previously and about which I think we have similar concerns—and local members would be aware of this happening in their own electorate—relates to difficulties that arise when the active club program sometimes goes to a particular group who may use a piece of physical infrastructure in the electorate, but, apart from that, has no resemblance to the electorate—and there are other inequities. I know it is difficult and I do not have a perfect solution. Last year I think we might have said that some thought would be given to trying to iron out some of those problems. What development has occurred?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The reason I laugh is that we could fill the rest of the estimates committee with issues concerning active club grants, because I know I have raised this matter from time to time with the agency. I have an issue in my electorate with Flinders University, which I strongly support, but having a university in your electorate concentrates a large number of sporting clubs in one area, when, in actual fact, the people come from all over the place. Not only do you get your normal community quota of sporting clubs, but in one area every university club is eligible for a grant (assuming they are incorporated), which, to some extent, disadvantages the other non-university clubs in the electorate.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** People at university vote, but not necessarily in your electorate. That is an interesting debate. What we did do, if I recall, to try to tidy up the process was to put in place a system whereby we write to MPs saying, 'These are the grant applications from your electorate; please advise if these are not right.' There is always the issue about where the sporting club resides. They will quite often write down the secretary's address and not necessarily the home ground or the home court where they play, and all those sorts of issues are involved. Writing to the member of parliament with a list of grant applications that they claim—'they' being the applicant—is in the relevant electorate at least gives the local MP a chance to say that that should go into the neighbouring electorate for whatever reasons.

We have at least now gone to that extent to tidy it up. From memory, we have put in the grant application form a requirement for the nominating organisation to nominate which electorate they are in to try to get them to feed it through their local MP even at the application stage. We have tried as much as we can to make it bulletproof but, no matter how you design the scheme, the issue of the home ground being one street within the electorate's boundary always arises. Flinders University is a perfect example because it is the boundary road. If it was on the other side of the road, it would all be in Mitchell. That does create an issue, but we think we have bulletproofed it as much as we can.

I cannot think of another way to clarify that process, because otherwise it becomes too bureaucratic. You would have to somehow work out postcodes of members to try to divide it up—it would just be a nightmare.

**Mr Clarke:** Leave it to the members' discretion.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Then the members could have a dispute over where the money might go.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I concur with the minister's thoughts; it is difficult to have a foolproof system. I have a similar problem with Westlakes, the waterways. Obviously many clubs revolve around the waterways (which is similar to the minister's problem with Flinders University), and although you support it, naturally enough, people come from far and wide. Is it always the case that the presentation of cheques from active club grants go via the member's office and he or she has the opportunity to present them; and can the minister guarantee that that will continue throughout this year and even early next year?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, that has certainly been the procedure. We have always tried to put them out through their local members. That is the procedure that we will continue to use with active club grants. On the odd occasion I have been at a community cabinet meeting and I will present it, but that has happened once, I think, to my knowledge. I am not planning to change the procedure, so local members, through the active club process, will still be able to present their grants as normal.

**Mr WRIGHT:** In the document that the Office for Recreation and Sport made available to the Economic and Finance Committee, under the Management and Development Program I note that \$100 000 was granted to the Office for Recreation and Sport. There may be good reason for that—it may be for administering this fund—but it seemed slightly odd to me that the Office for Recreation and Sport is deciding on the allocation of this money and \$100 000 goes to its own office.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** This question, I think, was raised in the Economic and Finance Committee, and the answer will be found in the transcript, I am sure, and I think it should match this answer. When Living Health had the program, a cost of administration was always charged to the fund. When Living Health transferred across, the department had no grant program to speak of, and suddenly inherited a \$6 million grant program. So, an allocation of, I think, \$80 000 to \$100 000—it might have been \$80 000 originally but it is now \$100 000—was made to administer basically the country athletes award scheme and this \$6 million grant scheme. The sum of \$100 000 out of \$6 million is not a big charge, and it is purely because the agency was not resourced to handle that grant scheme. When Living Health was wound up, \$6 million came across so we needed an officer to handle that. That is what the \$100 000 is for.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I presumed that is what it was for, and I am happy with that. I do not need to check the transcript of the Economic and Finance Committee. I think that is a good answer and I presumed that is what the money would be used for, and it is justifiable in the circumstances.

The matter of the criteria for the country athletes awards scheme has been raised with me by a few people. I was surprised that applicants must permanently reside 130 kilometres or more from the Adelaide GPO. How was that distance arrived at?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that the agency looked at what criteria they thought were appropriate. They tried to find a distance from Adelaide from which people living outside that distance or at that distance would not necessarily have regular access to metropolitan competition. The agency's judgment was that 130 kilometres was the appropriate distance. So it was done on advice from the

agency. It is arbitrary to some extent. Do you make it 100 kilometres, 150 kilometres or 200 kilometres? I guess they took the view that at around 130 kilometres not too many people will travel to metropolitan training and competition on a regular basis. Occasionally someone does if they are getting paid. I remember that Mike Redden, I think it was, used to travel from Orroroo on Thursday nights to train with North Adelaide many years ago, and Trevor Sims used to travel from a long way out, if I recall. But that type of athlete is few and far between and they are paid, of course. For anyone in a voluntary capacity, who is not involved in a paid pursuit, 130 kilometres would be just about the limit of how far they would travel into the city on a regular basis.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I do not know the right figure, either, but it struck me that 130 kilometres might be just a touch too far. I do not know how—or if at all, for that matter—other government departments or areas of responsibility determine something like that this, but I have received calls from people in various locations expressing their concern that 130 kilometres is too far and that they are being discriminated against because of the distance that has been set. They have asked me questions such as, ‘Who set that distance?’—I think you have answered that—and, ‘How was it determined that that would be the distance?’ They also say, ‘Irrespective of the answer, we feel that we are discriminated against.’ It is hard to argue against that, I suppose.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It is, but my experience in government is that it does not matter where you draw the line because that issue will be raised by the person just outside the line or just inside the line, depending on what the line is. If you put it at 80 kilometres, the person who is at 79 kilometres is going to raise that exact argument. It is simply a no-win situation.

**Mr CLARKE:** A country member’s allowance: what is that?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member for Ross Smith suggests that we could use the country members’ allowance in relation to members of parliament. I think I am right in saying that areas such as Mount Barker would then fall into country under that definition, and that would not necessarily be a bad thing, thinking that through for the member for Ross Smith. Maybe we could trial it in the Mount Barker and Stirling area for a year and see what the response is.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Could the minister advise me of the number of officers who attended the Olympics (including yourself and/or any staff who may have gone with you), their reason for going and the total cost?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games provided accreditation at no cost to the Director of the Sports Institute, the Executive Director of the Office of Recreation and Sport, the Minister for Recreation and Sport and their wives. The accreditation was shared between the three concerned—Mr Battams, Mr Forrest and myself—so none of us stayed for the duration of the Olympics. The air fare costs for the minister were \$897, for the executive director \$872 and for the director of the institute of sport \$489: the accommodation cost was \$6 002, and that was shared between the three people.

**Mr WRIGHT:** You have already given me the information with respect to that particular budget line, so I am aware of the finance, but could you provide me with details of staff members? For example, how many are in the unit for racing; what, generally, are their functions; and that type of thing?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It is funded for three full-time equivalents and, essentially, it provides the minister’s office

and the department with advice on racing matters. As you are aware, a lot of that function now rests with the industry. There are still some issues in relation to bookmakers, proprietary racing, nationalisation of the industry and those sorts of issues. So, it is simply a policy advice unit to the agency and to the minister’s office.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I know that the TAB is not your responsibility but, clearly, racing is. We have had discussions previously about where the TAB should sit, but, obviously, tonight is not the night for that. However, stake money is, of course, critical to the success of racing. I am interested in your views whether, in fact, current stake money levels in the three codes of racing are at risk in any way, shape or form of being reduced or whether, simply by maintaining their status quo, it could be jeopardised as a result of the government’s delay with respect to the sale of the South Australian TAB.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The government does not set the stake money, so it is a matter outside my criteria, as the member for Lee would know. Stake money is a matter that very much rests with the corporations, and so it is outside my ability to control.

**Mr WRIGHT:** You may not be able to control it, but, obviously, as a very important part of the role of the advice that you receive from the unit—with three full-time equivalents—you obviously must look at key issues. Whether or not they are within your control, advice is obviously provided about key issues. We all know that if stake money is not the key issue, it is one of the key issues. I am interested to know what advice that racing unit has provided in relation to this issue.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I asked the racing unit to do some work on the principle of a national stake money scheme. I spoke about that issue at the Australian Country Racing Conference at Mount Gambier. I must say that the Mount Gambier club and the South Australian racing fraternity in general put on a really good show for the national body and the attendees at the conference. I have previously raised the issue, and will continue to raise it, at national forums because I believe that as an industry racing needs to adopt a national stake money scheme. I probably do not have the smarts to work it out, but I know that there is an issue that they need to address as a national industry.

As an example, as a national code, Australian Rules Football has placed a cap on salary. I think that racing will have to head down a similar path where there will have to be some agreement between the eastern states—particularly Victoria and New South Wales—and the other states that their stake money will not be more than, to pick a figure, 20, 25 or 30 per cent of the other states. Otherwise, if they continue to have a large divergence between the eastern states and the other states, the best of the industry will be dragged to where the stake money is the highest—that is commercial and that is the market forces at work.

I have some concerns about whether the racing industry at a national level actually has a whole of industry focus on the protection of the smaller industry states in relation to stake money. So, the office did some work on that for me and spoke to other states to try to get some support for it. We will continue to raise that issue in the appropriate forums. I have raised it with people such as Andrew Harding of the Australian Racing Board and others because I believe long term that that is the issue for them.

One of the reasons that AFL football has taken off and remains strong is that it has introduced a system where it tries to maintain the teams at roughly the same strength through

manipulation of the draft and the salary cap and I think racing needs to adopt a similar policy. The stake money does not have to be the same in each state but a control mechanism needs to be put in place so that one state such as Victoria, which feeds its racing industry off poker machines, does not end up causing the industry in other states a lot of grief. So they have certainly done a little bit of work for me in that area. If the industry comes to us about stake money, they would naturally either come to me or Minister Armitage. They are in contact with their offices on a regular basis about a whole range of things and they know that if stake money becomes an issue for them they will need to contact either me or Michael Armitage's office.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Have you given any commitments to Cyber Raceway, or to anyone else, with respect to licence fees payable? If so, what commitments have been given?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** In relation to proprietary racing, the Gaming Supervisory Authority has advised of one application for a licence to operate under the Proprietary Racing Act. I understand that the applicant was TeleTrak Australia and the conditions under which TeleTrak would be granted a licence are outlined in the various acts. On 27 May, the Office for Racing received notification from TeleTrak of its intention to apply for a licence. TeleTrak is seeking direction as to the information it needs to provide to allow the development of an approved licensing agreement. I understand that it has had discussions with the Gaming Supervisory Authority because it is the first application. There was an announcement in the press relating to the change of ownership or management of Cyber Raceway.

**Mr WRIGHT:** So, you have not personally made any commitments to Cyber Raceway as to licence fees?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** To my knowledge, Cyber Raceway has not applied.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Has anyone made representation to you about licence fees?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have had no discussions with TeleTrak for some months. We had a briefing in relation to the Cyber Raceway issue so that I could get my head around what that meant so that if I was asked questions I would have a reasonable idea of what was happening. I understand that the gaming authority has had one application. Since they applied for a licence, I have had no request or communication with TeleTrak as to the licence conditions. I understand that it is just working through the process with the Gaming Supervisory Authority.

**Mr WRIGHT:** The member for Chaffey has not made any representations to you?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member for Chaffey and I have had a number of discussions about TeleTrak. She has a very keen interest in it and we went through some exhaustive negotiations and discussions during the passage of the bill about the amendments that were needed. You might recall that it was a long night in the House and we went through both areas. In fairness to the member for Chaffey, she raised some issues relating to licence fees for existing businesses and contracts in place. It is common knowledge that TeleTrak, from memory, had agreements with the Harness Racing Authority and the Greyhound Racing Authority.

There were concerns about the structure of licence fees for existing contracts because those contracts existed before the legislation went through as well as retrospectively setting licence fees and those sort of issues. The general nature of the discussions was that the licence fees needed to be realistic and not necessarily put those contracts at risk. If they apply,

and I understand that the greyhound and harness authorities have not applied, they would have to go through the normal process just as TeleTrak is doing now. But I have not talked to the harness or greyhound authorities for some months about whether or not they intend to apply. I am not sure what discussions they have had since the change of ownership with Cyber Raceway or what agreements they currently have in place with TeleTrak. I am not sure whether they have changed their agreements because I have very much left that to the authorities and TeleTrak or Cyber Raceway. As far as I am concerned, it is up to them to negotiate and they will go to the Gaming Supervisory Authority in due course.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I know we started with a pretty hard figure with Teletrak. We were talking about a \$25 million licence fee, but that figure seems to have well and truly gone. I was wondering whether the member for Chaffey had made any representation to the minister about what the licence fee should be and, if she had, what she asked for.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** With all due respect to the honourable member, I am not quite sure what budget line this falls under. I have been fairly flexible tonight on taking questions on all sorts of things that do not relate to the budget line. The budget line of about \$300 000 relates to policy advice I get from the Office of Racing, not from the member for Chaffey. In fairness, if they apply—and we do not know who will apply—they will have to go through the normal process that is applied to the Gaming Supervisory Authority.

**Mr WRIGHT:** In the budget, under 'Highlights' for 2000-01, we see 'assented to legislation to regulate and license proprietary racing'—on 18 January. We also have as a target 'to ascertain the impact of proprietary racing on the state's racing industry by monitoring racecourse licence and horse numbers'. There is reference to that in the budget, and there is further reference to that on page 10.19. It is not unreasonable to try to work through this and get a feel for what income it is estimated will be received by government from gambling turnover on proprietary racing, what the licences will be or that type of information. The minister can correct me if I am wrong, but it does not seem as though proprietary racing has moved on post the legislation. I well remember the discussion about licence fees during the debate when the legislation was before the parliament. At the time, the minister said that it would be his responsibility to strike a licence fee and that he could strike it at \$1 or whatever. Has the member for Chaffey made representation to the minister regarding what the price of licence fees should be, and if she has what is she asking for?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will repeat the answer. The honourable member has asked the question twice; I just refer him to my previous answer. When they apply, they will go through normal process; then the cabinet and ministry of the day will have to make a judgment about what licence fee will be needed, based on the business case. Given that there have been management changes at least to one of the companies, Cyber Raceway, I cannot tell the honourable member how that affects the proposal, because I have not been briefed by the two authorities in relation to what that change necessarily means to them on the ground. It is fluid to some degree. Commercial negotiations are fluid, and this is a new process for state government and, indeed, the industry. To some extent, everyone is feeling their way through the process. It took some time for the Gaming Supervisory Authority—and this not a criticism but an observation—to work out exactly what process it was going to ask the applicants to go through,

what questions it would need to ask and the nature of the application form.

My understanding still is that the Quarter Horse Association is still interested in proprietary racing, but I do not know whether it will do it through Teletrak or one of the other authorities; I cannot tell the honourable member what the latest negotiation is. If we followed the history of proprietary racing and Teletrak from day one to now, I would suggest that we would see that there have been 15 to 20 variations of the commerciality of it and how it was going to work. I have backed the legislation in; we have set up a framework-type legislation. There is an ability to charge a fee under the act. They will apply, and they will go through the application process and the government of the day will strike a fee. However, there is an issue before government involving the concept of trying to set a fee for a commercial relationship that is already in place prior to the legislation. That creates an issue, because if you set the fee too high you may, in effect, by pure weight of finance, render the contract null and void. That could happen by saying, 'The fee is so high, the contract is unworkable.'

I have always expressed some concern about that. In fairness to the member for Chaffey, I will not disclose every detail of our conversation. However, it is fair to say that there were some concerns about the weight of the fee sinking existing contracts, and I made it clear that it was not my intention to sink the existing contracts. I supported the concept of the legislation, and the government of the day would have to make some policy decision if and when they applied. At the end of the day, the authorities the contracts are with have not applied, so that decision is not before us.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Is that policy still to be formulated?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have not taken to cabinet a policy in relation to offsetting a fee in relation to a contract that is already in place with respect to proprietary racing. I have not taken that to cabinet, because the circumstances have not presented themselves to me. They might in theory, but they have not as yet presented themselves to me. Until those circumstances occur, I have not taken the policy to cabinet. I am aware that that is an issue with which I may well be dealing at some time in the future. We have to give some thought as to how we deal with that, because it is one complication in the process. Everyone writing a contract now knows what the legislation provides. There is potential for a fee, and they build that into their business case. I am aware of at least two contracts that were written prior to the legislation going through, and that presents us with a problem.

**Mr CLARKE:** As we all know, to varying degrees, a number of voluntary sporting clubs throughout the state have financial difficulties. They are not all having such difficulties; I am talking primarily of the ones I am aware of in my own electorate such as football clubs and the like. In terms of the management of a lot of incorporated clubs, they obviously vary from year to year, depending on who is on the board and what skill and expertise is available. Has the department ever thought about trying to put up a structured training program for boards of directors of sporting clubs in terms of their responsibilities or how to budget? I know this sounds almost basic in many respects. Again, I have experienced it with several clubs myself.

Depending on who the personalities are at any one time, one club can be well run. However, when those people move on, for whatever reason, the club can fall into a hole because not enough budgetary planning has been put into effect, they

have spent too much money on players, there has been money under the table or whatever else. Does the department have in place any structure to assist in the training of directors with regard to their responsibilities? Also, when clubs find themselves in difficulty, many of them will work through the issues with their local government authorities, which will get them to face some stark realities and take some tough decisions. It is very difficult for club directors who are personally associated with a number of people in the club who are perhaps on part payroll, part honorarium or whatever else, to cut their cloth to meet their expenses and to bite the bullet and do unpleasant things to people they know and like.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will not give the member for Ross Smith the full page 7 of 7 of the briefing note. What I will do is detail it for him in a letter so that he is aware of it; and if he wishes, I am happy to arrange a briefing for him from one of the officers of the department.

**Mr CLARKE:** That would be good.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We have a sensational training program for volunteer and sport and recreation groups. Since 1995 we have trained something like 10 000 people through our volunteer improvement program or our coaches program, and there is another one that escapes me. We run country seminars; and the club and association management program talks about creating a club, club planning, committee management, conducting meetings, financial management, sponsorship, fundraising and grants, marketing, promoting sport and recreation, event management, legal issues and risk management. So, since 1995, if my notes are right, we have trained a touch over 10 000 people. I will not hold the committee up with all the details, but we do have a very good range of programs, and I would be happy to have someone come out and brief the member, or put it in writing to him. If the honourable member wants to organise a night where he can bring in all his sporting clubs, we can come out and brief them on what we do.

**Mr CLARKE:** That would be good.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** As the fearless member for Ross Smith, if you want to organise all your sporting clubs and have an officer to come in and brief them on what is available, then we will do that. If the member watches the *Advertiser*—I am sure we normally write to all the MPs, saying be aware that these seminars are on—

**Mr CLARKE:** I usually read your letters avidly because I get so few of them. I cannot say that I have noticed them, although I am not saying that you have not written.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I will do a special one in big print for you and we will send it out. I will arrange for the office to contact you and arrange a briefing because there is a very good program. We are now trying to expand that program to other volunteer groups. It is such a good program for sport and recreation organisations that we think there are some modules that would apply equally to Neighbourhood Watch or Friends of Parks group, or whatever. The volunteer principles are the same, so we are now looking at whether or not there is some way in which we can expand that program out to other groups. We will be in touch on that.

**Mr CLARKE:** Thank you; that is very good.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Do you want to go into those other boundaries for that?

**Mr CLARKE:** I think it is one of these broad issues on which you need to invite people from a broad area, from the inner northern area and slightly to the west.

I refer now to the active clubs grants. This may be catered for by this new \$17 million over three years that you are

proposing in whatever the grant is (I have forgotten the title). When you can get \$3 000, \$4 000 or \$5 000, it can be useful in some areas. But, I am thinking of a soccer club in my own electorate which has a number of juniors, and the club literally does not have space and it needs a bigger building; and of course with club rooms, you have problems with local councils which are stretched as far as finances are concerned. If it was given \$5 000, it could fiddle around with perhaps making the cafeteria a bit better or whatever, but it might need a big chunk of money, say, \$20 000 plus whatever else it can raise itself. This is the age-old question of the department having to say, 'If we give one club \$20 000, that means that six clubs cannot get their \$3 000 or \$4 000.' I have often wondered whether or not it is better to give at least one club a significant amount of money with which it can do something meaningful, and then that rules it out perhaps from having another bite of the cherry for three or four years; it knows that up front when it makes the application. Has any thought been given to that type of approach in relation to the active clubs grants?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Not with active clubs so much, but certainly with the community facilities grants program, which is the new \$7 million or the regional recreation facilities grant program. We have always tried to encourage clubs to collocate to beef up the usage of the facility, if you like. That should be encouraged at every opportunity, because trying to build stand-alone facilities for one club becomes an issue. If there is a club that is looking for a grant, if they can find another club to come in with them and use the facility on a shared basis for whatever reason, that is of assistance; but the larger sums are in the regional recreational facilities grants. From memory, the active clubs grant cuts out at \$10 000, so everything above that falls into the regional recreational facilities grants. In theory they can get up to \$150 000 there, but the average is normally \$75 000 to \$80 000.

**Mr CLARKE:** I want to make another point with respect to government grants. The government has committed money to the grandstand at footy park.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I think that is in the Premier's area—the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

**Mr CLARKE:** To spend that sort of money where there are two successful AFL clubs operating as a monopoly, getting television rights or a share of them through the AFL, when so many other clubs are finding it difficult is really giving a big subsidy to the big end of town. It is not in your portfolio areas, but I am particularly concerned, as I know we all are, about the voluntary clubs. They have ongoing running costs with the repayment of debts incurred to councils to build clubrooms that they will never own because they are on council property. It is almost a rerun of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. They have the operating costs of ovals, green-keeping fees, payment to players under the table and things of this nature, yet time out of mind volunteers are using the stopwatch for time keeping, operating the bars and all the rest of it. They are getting exhausted from just trying to keep the clubs afloat. I must say that the \$17 million that you are promising will certainly be useful over the next three years. I imagine there will be many more applications—

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It is \$47 million over three years; there will be an extra \$17 million. If you add the \$2 million for active clubs to the \$2 million for regional recreation facilities grants, that is \$4 million. With the \$6 million for the management development programs that makes \$10 million, and that \$10 million a year for the next three years makes

\$30 million. Then add the \$17 million that we are announcing this year. So, the total of all the grant programs to recreation and sport is \$47 million. The active club program and the regional recreational facilities grants are at the community level. While funded through the states, the management development program has a strong community level component with it, and we have also now made the regional associations eligible to apply for the \$6 million. An example is the Whyalla Cricket Association which last year got \$6 000 or \$11 000 to run a program.

So, no longer is the \$6 million the privilege of the state associations. If you have the Kilburn Tennis Association (as distinct from club) or a regional association that wants to employ a junior development officer, umpires and a coach—all those sorts of issues—they can apply under the management development program at the association level. I have deliberately tried to drag the money closer to those local clubs.

**Mr CLARKE:** I think that is very good; for too long money has gone to the peak sporting bodies and not enough has got through to the rank and file and grassroots clubs, so I am pleased with that.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I was going to comment on this earlier. I was pleased to hear you say that the regional and recreational facilities grants are not just for regional areas. As I am sure you are, I am forever telling organisations that it is not just for regional areas. Maybe we should look at a different name, because that seems to be something that is constantly raised with me on a regular basis.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We changed that this year. It is probably an old habit of mine to call it 'regional' but on the application form it might read 'community' facility program now. I think we have changed that.

**Mr CLARKE:** Can local government access those grants that we have just talked about as well? For example, many kids do not necessarily want to access their recreation and sport through organised sporting clubs. They want to go to skate parks, BMX tracks and various other things which are very individualistic, and the responsibilities fall on councils. When I have approached local government in my area they have always been sympathetic, but it is one thing to be sympathetic and another thing to come up with the cash. Rightly, over the years they say that state governments have devolved a lot of their responsibilities down to local government and they cannot keep picking up all the costs. Will local government bodies likewise be able to put up their hand for these grants so that they can provide recreational facilities for people who want to participate in sport on an individualistic basis, whether it be walking or whatever, and you have to make way for tracks, where they do not want to do their recreational activities through an organised club?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is certainly available. I will give some examples; out of the 1999-2000 round, the Ceduna Council got over \$36 000 to construct an off-road recreational trail from Ceduna to Thevenard, which is about 3.2 kilometres, including drinking fountains and signage; Onkaparinga Council was assisted with the development of a youth park, including a range of skate and BMX facilities, with \$50 000; the Port Adelaide Enfield council refurbished the clubrooms and developed a new section for athletics at Iverson Reserve at \$75 000; and Port Lincoln Council developed a purpose built playground for disabled persons at \$13 500. So, there are some examples of councils that have received grants. On trail development, \$6.2 million is also available over five years as a separate program for recreation-

al trails. Certainly, councils can apply out of the regional or community facilities fund, not the active club. They can certainly apply for that.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I noticed that the community recreation and sports facilities program seems to be in two categories: community facilities grants and then regional facilities grants. So, I presume from what you said earlier with regard to regional facilities grants that it is not strictly a regional area: it can be a community area, so that is the case with category 2. It may still be worth while changing that name for category 2.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We will certainly look at that, because we are trying to make it simpler. Like you, I am

forever answering that question; that is why we tried to change it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote for proposed payments for the Department for Environment and Heritage and Administered Items for the Department for Environment and Heritage closed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9 p.m. the committee adjourned until Wednesday 27 June at 11 a.m.