

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 25 October 2006

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B**Chairman:**

Mr T. Koutsantonis

Members:

Ms. C.C. Fox
 Mr S.P. Griffiths
 Mr M. Pengilly
 Mr T. Piccolo
 Mr D.G. Pisoni
 Mr J.R. Rau

The committee met at 11 a.m.

Department for Environment and Heritage, \$125 535 000
 Administered Items for the Department for Environment
 and Heritage, \$3 606 000

Witness:

The Hon. G.E. Gago, Minister for Environment and
 Conservation, Minister for Mental Health and Substance
 Abuse, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr A. Holmes, Chief Executive, Department for Environ-
 ment and Heritage.

Mr R. Janssan, Director, Business Services, Department
 for Environment and Heritage.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open
 for examination and refer members to the Budget Statement,
 in particular, Appendix C, page C.2, and the Portfolio
 Statement, Volume 3, part 4, pages 12.1, 12.43 and 12.90 to
 12.99. In a moment, I will call on the Minister for Environ-
 ment and Conservation to make a statement of about 10
 minutes if she wishes. I will then afford the same courtesy to
 the lead speaker for the opposition to make a statement if he
 wishes, and we will then continue with questions.

Estimates committees are a relatively informal procedure
 and, as such, there is no need to stand to ask or answer
 questions. The committee will determine an approximate time
 for consideration of proposed payments to facilitate change
 of departmental advisers. I ask the minister and the lead
 speaker for the opposition to indicate whether they have
 agreed on a timetable for today's proceedings and, if so,
 could they provide me with a copy? Are you both agreed?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Yes.

The CHAIR: Changes to committee membership will be
 notified as they occur. Members should ensure that the chair
 is provided with a copy of a completed request to be dis-
 charged form. If the minister undertakes to supply informa-
 tion at a later date, it must be submitted to the committee
 secretary by no later than Friday 17 November 2006. There
 will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking
 questions, based on about three questions per member. A
 member who is not part of the committee may, at the
 discretion of the chair, ask a question. Questions must be

based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers and must
 be identifiable or referenced.

Members unable to complete their questions during the
 proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for
 inclusion in the assembly *Notice Paper*. 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
 into *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the
 house. All questions are to be directed to the minister, not the
 minister's advisers. The minister may then refer questions to
 advisers for a response. I also advise that, for the purposes
 of the committee, there will be some freedom allowed for
 television coverage by allowing a short period of filming
 from the northern gallery. I declare the lines open for
 examination.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I would like to make a brief
 opening statement. The 2006-07 budget continues to support
 initiatives that will consolidate South Australia's leadership
 in sustainable management of the environment. The environ-
 ment and conservation portfolio remains a priority over the
 forward estimates period, with net savings (that is, savings
 less initiative funding) of less than half a million dollars
 required of the portfolio—and I refer members to page 2.31
 of the Budget Statement to support this statement. Moreover,
 notwithstanding saving measures, portfolio agency expendi-
 ture in aggregate is increasing during 2006-07 relative to both
 the 2005-06 estimated result and the 2005-06 budget. In this
 regard, it is notable that collectively agency budgeted
 expenditure in 2006-07 will increase by \$31 million relative
 to the 2005-06 budget.

The Department for Environment and Heritage's (DEH)
 purpose is to conserve and restore our environment for all
 generations. DEH is responsible for environment policy,
 biodiversity conservation, heritage conservation, environ-
 mental sustainability and animal welfare; and as a custodian
 of information and knowledge about the state's environment.
 The department also manages the state's public land—land
 held in the conservation reserves system and as Crown lands.

Before outlining key aspects of the DEH budget for
 2006-07, I will first mention some of the significant devel-
 opments and milestones that DEH has achieved in the past year.
 Work has progressed to advance South Australia's Strategic
 Plan Target T3.8, Lose No Species. In February 2006 the
 government released the draft No Species Loss—A Bio-
 diversity Strategy for South Australia, (No Species Loss
 Strategy) for a four-month period of consultation. DEH is
 coordinating the development of the No Species Loss
 Strategy, which provides a whole of government approach to
 new and existing initiatives for the protection, conservation
 and sustainable use of South Australia's terrestrial, aquatic
 and marine biodiversity. The final No Species Loss strategy
 is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2006.

Definition and planning has commenced for four of the
 five biodiversity corridors that the government has committed
 to establishing by 2010 (South Australia's Strategic Plan
 Target 3.8.) The biodiversity corridors provide a bold vision
 for biodiversity conservation in South Australia, linking
 public and private lands across the state, to enable South
 Australian species and ecosystems to survive, evolve and
 adapt to environmental change. A draft action plan has been
 developed for the East Meets West corridor; a preliminary
 action plan for the Flinders-Olary Ranges Bounceback
 corridor has been developed; and the preparation of action
 plans for the Cape Borda to Barossa and the River Murray/

Coorong corridors are commencing. Preliminary planning for the fifth Arid Lands corridor will commence in 2007.

Purpose-specific legislation for achieving the establishment of 19 marine parks by 2010 (South Australia's Strategic Plan Target, T3.5) was drafted in 2005-06. The draft Marine Parks Bill contains provisions for the dedication, zoning and management of South Australia's marine parks, and the management of any displaced commercial fishing and/or aquaculture effort arising from their establishment. The draft Marine Parks Bill was released for public consultation on 1 September 2006 and will be reviewed in light of comments received before being introduced into parliament.

Major capital works are continuing at Belair National Park and the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide. An amount of \$7.46 million over six years, commenced in 2003-04, has been allocated to a major upgrade of visitor facilities at Belair National Park. In 2005-06 the upgrading of the Government Farm/Old Government House precinct was completed. Design plans for a major upgrade of the Belair National Park entrance have been completed, with construction expected to commence in late October 2006.

In 2004-05 the government allocated \$5 million over three years towards an estimated \$10 million of capital works for the 150th anniversary of the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide, from 2005-07. Works undertaken in 2005-06 as part of the garden's 150 program include:

- the construction of the Schomburgk Pavilion, at the rear of the Museum of Economic Botany, to provide a new central visitor facility housing the Botanic Shop, Cafe Fibonacci, a visitor information centre, public toilets and new entrances to the museum suitable for disabled access;
- the Italianate Garden at the Adelaide Botanic Gardens was redeveloped as a new feature garden showcasing plants from Mediterranean regions around the world, and providing interpretative and educational information on plants for use in sustainable landscapes;
- demolition of the Victorian House and Schomburgk Range of glasshouses commenced in June 2006 and was completed in July 2006. These buildings will be replaced by the new Amazon Waterlily Pavilion, construction of which is expected to be completed mid-2007.

Fire management continues to be a focus for the government. In 2005-06 DEH committed net expenditure of \$5.42 million towards planning and implementing fire management programs in parks throughout the state. DEH has entered into joint fire suppression arrangements with SA Water, and 12 additional fire crews were employed in 2005-06 under these arrangements. This additional crew supplemented the 15 seasonal crew employed by DEH and enhanced the fire suppression capabilities for the land managed by both agencies.

In 2006-07 joint fire suppression arrangements will be expanded with an additional 22 seasonal crew employed, bringing the total to 37 across the state. The seasonal crew will boost the DEH bushfire capacity to 391 brigade members across regional South Australia. This is an excellent example of agencies cooperatively working together to provide efficient use of resources, a safer community, and regional employment opportunities.

The proactive prescribed burning program being implemented by DEH continues to reduce fuel loads in parks and provide protection for life, property and the environment. Since 2003 DEH has successfully implemented 108 prescribed burns throughout the state, totalling an area of 3 936 hectares. DEH has also maintained or upgraded 5 180

kilometres of fire trails since 2003, to provide safe access for firefighters.

The planting of native trees, shrubs and associated understorey continued under the auspices of the Million Trees Program. The one-millionth tree was planted in July 2006, a year ahead of schedule. In addition, DEH achieved the following in 2005-06:

- co-management agreements were entered into between the state government and the traditional owners for the Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park and Ngaut Ngaut Conservation Park;
- Adelaide's Living Beaches: A Strategy for 2005-2025 was launched in November 2005, and the first stage of implementation commenced;
- the Australian Centre for Ancient DNA, a specialist facility to be used to investigate the genetic response of animals, plants and micro-organisms to environmental change, was completed;
- amendments to the Heritage Places Act 1993 were proclaimed and members of the new South Australian Heritage Council were appointed;
- the Adelaide Parklands Act 2005 was proclaimed;
- the 500 000-hectare Yellabinna Wilderness Protection Area was proclaimed.

In relation to the information presented in the Portfolio Statement of financial performance, page 12.28, an increase in budgeted expenditure of approximately \$3.869 million is shown for 2006-07, relative to the 2005-06 estimated result. In 2006-07 the agency will benefit from additional funding to progress a number of key government priorities. These initiatives include an additional 20 rangers, and \$7.349 million operating and investing expenditure has been allocated over four years (2006-1010) to create 20 additional full-time employee ranger positions. One of these rangers is to be allocated to DEH's two most popular metropolitan parks, Black Hill and Morialta, and the rest will be located throughout the state. The additional 20 ranger positions will assist with the management of DEH's expanded park and nature link corridor system.

An amount of \$5.7 million has been allocated over four years, commencing in 2006-07, to establish a River Murray forest comprising more than 2.5 million native trees and shrubs endemic to the area. This is an innovative new project which will reconnect patches of valuable ecosystems and sequester carbon. The aim is to produce multiple benefits from plantings—for example, rebuild biodiversity, reduce erosion of topsoil, and combat climate change by carbon sequestration.

In closing, the 2006-07 DEH budget builds on the department's recent achievements and supports the department's key objective to conserve and restore the environment by:

- conserving, valuing and celebrating South Australia's natural and cultural heritage;
- securing the future of South Australia's coastal and marine environments; and
- engaging the community and fostering debate on the environment.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Given that the shadow minister is not participating in this and that I am acting in his role, it is not my intention to make an introductory comment but rather just go straight into the questions. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.18, and the summary income statement. Can the minister provide details on what income is included in the 'other' budget line, and advise why this fell from a

budget figure of \$496 000 in 2005-06 to an estimated result of \$48 000 for 2005-06?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am advised that in 2005-06 there was a one-off transaction, a recharge of expenditure, incurred by DEH for part of the operations of the Office of Sustainability prior to its transfer from DEH to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. There was also a one-off budget payment, a reversion of the War Services Land Settlement Lease Scheme from the commonwealth through DEH administered items to the state government.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Supplementary to that question, I note that in the 2004-05 financial year the actual expenditure was \$733 000. Were there further one-off payments, and, therefore, is the \$38 000 in this year's budget more of the expected future income in this area?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will take that question on notice.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I again refer to page 12.18. Can the minister please provide details on why the grants and subsidies fell from a budget figure of \$942 000 to an estimated result in 2005-06 of \$26 000?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: This is a \$500 000 payment, and the change reflects the fact that we budgeted to make this to the commonwealth, and it was agreed that it would then revert back to the state of South Australia.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I have a further supplementary question. I understand the \$500 000, but that still leaves in excess of \$400 000 that is not allocated in the reduction in expenses.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I understand that part is a minor carryover from 2004-05.

Mr GRIFFITHS: A minor carryover in what area, though?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I do not have that level of detail; however, I will take that on notice.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.19, in the area of marine parks. Can the minister please indicate which marine parks will be dedicated in the 2006-07 target of two marine parks?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The intention is to proclaim the boundaries for all 19 marine parks during the 2006-07 year.

Mr PENGILLY: I refer to the same Budget Paper and the same line. Given that we are now at the end of October and will rise for seven or eight weeks over the Christmas and New Year period, there is still no legislation in the parliament. How will these 19 parks be outlined by 30 June 2007?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government has spent a great deal of time making sure that we get this right. The establishing of marine parks is an incredibly complex thing to achieve. There is a range of different vested interests in marine parks, and each of those clearly needs to be consulted with and considered in their planning. We have undertaken a quite arduous and extensive consultation process to make sure that all vested interests are considered. Indeed, we have some draft legislation for which we have agreed to extend the period of consultation, at the request of various interest groups. We also decided that we would enable the public to be involved in consultation on the establishment of the boundaries. Again, that has pushed out the time frame, somewhat. But, we are still confident that the boundaries will be declared for all 19 marine parks by the end of this financial year.

Mr PICCOLO: I refer to page 12.15 of the Portfolio Statement, which refers to initiatives completed in 2005-06 and to be undertaken in 2006-07 under the department's

public land fire management program. As we approach the high risk season, fire prevention and management are uppermost in people's minds in South Australia. What is the department's ongoing commitment to fire management?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The Department for Environment and Heritage (DEH) is committed to an effective ongoing fire management program. DEH has a number of officers dedicated to managing fire. These include: senior fire ecologist, senior fire management officer, senior fire research officer, senior fire planner, GIS project officer, fire training officer and six regional fire management officers. DEH has developed a fire management policy that sets out how DEH will manage fire in the state's reserve system to protect life, property and environmental assets.

Complementing the fire management policy is a set of procedures which guide DEH towards best practise fire management and safe operating practices. DEH has maintained and upgraded 5 180 kilometres of fire trails since 2003 to provide safe access for firefighters. Preparedness audits for the coming fire season have been undertaken and emergency response detail and information updated. Response plans that determine levels of response, communication plans, reserve details and suppression objectives have been developed. These response plans also include a response to SA Water managed lands. Existing fire equipment has been modified and additional equipment purchased to specifically manage fire in heavier fuels associated with native vegetation.

The proactive prescribed burning program being implemented by DEH continues to reduce fuel loads in parks and provides protection for life, property and the environment. DEH has significantly increased its capability to undertake prescribed burning. From 2003 until now, DEH has successfully implemented 117 prescribed burns throughout the state, totalling an area of 4 195 hectares. Sixty nine of these burns, totalling 510 hectares, have been in the Mount Lofty Ranges. Unfortunately, drought conditions across the state will limit further prescribed burning opportunities during this spring year. All prescribed burns are implemented to predetermined prescriptions and are subject to environmental assessment, detailed operational planning, and follow-up monitoring.

DEH continues to develop strong partnerships with other agencies to manage fire. In 2006-07, joint fire suppression arrangements with SA Water will be expanded, and an additional 22 seasonal crew will be employed, bringing the total jointly funded seasonal crew to 37 across the state. This arrangement represents an undertaking by DEH at the request of SA Water to respond to bushfires on SA Water managed lands. Of these crew, 31 will be located in the Mount Lofty Ranges, three in the Mid North at Mambray Creek and three in Port Lincoln. The seasonal crews will be available for response across the state.

Whilst not engaging in bushfire suppression activities, the crew will assist in prescribed burning operations and other fuel management programs on both SA Water and DEH managed lands. SA Water has committed annual recurrent funding of \$1.1 million for the ongoing employment of crews and up to \$2 million initially for the purchase of additional fire appliances. These additional seasonal crews will boost the DEH bushfire capability to 391 brigade members across regional South Australia. This is an excellent example of agencies working together cooperatively to provide efficient use of resources, a safer community and regional employment opportunities.

DEH also continues to build on its relationship with the Country Fire Service (CFS) and local communities in the

planning and development of fire management programs. These relationships have seen DEH staff integrate into CFS operational initiatives. This coming summer is shaping up to be a challenging season for bushfires, given the long-term weather forecast. The risk of fire in parks and reserves is high due to dry fuel loads. However, DEH staff are trained and well prepared, and will maintain ongoing vigilance throughout the summer. A training pathways structure has been developed to ensure that all DEH staff are trained and experienced to meet competency levels associated with roles they may be required to undertake while managing fire. A prescribed burning course has been developed by DEH and delivered to staff from DEH, CFS and Forestry SA. Since 2003 some 26 staff have received interstate specialist training relating to incident management and prescribed burning. Annual pre-season training is delivered to all DEH brigade members.

In relation to fire management planning, a number of fire management plans are being developed and are due for release in 2006. These fire management plans cover reserves in the Mount Lofty Hills Face Zone, the southern Mount Lofty Ranges, the south-western Fleurieu Peninsula, and so on. A planning framework has been developed for producing fire management plans. This enables a consistent approach to assessing the risk to life, property and the environment, hence determining management objectives. Fire management zones have been introduced in line with the recommendations outlined in the COAG National Inquiry on Bushfire Mitigation and Management. These zones clearly identify fuel management objectives. GIS skills and expertise have been developed and provide support for fire management in the production of maps, the management of spatial data, and the analysis of data to support decision making for fire management planning and supporting DEH and CFS with mapping associated with bushfire suppression.

DEH is also focused on bushfire research and monitoring. Policies and procedures for ecological burning have been developed, and flora and fauna data and information is being maintained and updated in a vital attributes database. The *Southern Australian Fire Hazard Assessment Guide* has been developed. This guide incorporates the outcomes and findings from the CSIRO's Project Vesta. Interim prescribed burning prescriptions for nine major South Australian fuel types have also been developed. A fire monitoring guideline has been prepared. This document sets standards for monitoring the impacts of prescribed burning. DEH has established links with a number of local and interstate universities and the Bushfire Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) to develop and conduct fire research in the state. A major long-term ecological research project has been developed with Flinders University to investigate the impact of fire frequency on reptiles, beetles and plants in Mallee reserves on central and northern Eyre Peninsula.

Mr PICCOLO: The minister in her opening remarks referred to the biodiversity corridors. Page 12.11 refers to the progress which has been made in relation to the establishment of five biodiversity corridors linking public and private lands across the state by 2010. Will the minister detail the progress that has been made to involve the community in the delivery of the biodiversity corridors; and how much funding is allocated to this initiative in 2006-07?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: A bold vision is required to ensure South Australia's biologically diverse ecosystems are conserved and managed to underpin the future health of South Australia. A significant degree of climate change

across South Australia now seems inevitable and will place additional stress on our natural resources. South Australia must collaborate with and, where possible, provide leadership to the rest of the country and the world to tackle these extraordinarily complex environmental dilemmas.

Target 3.4 of South Australia's Strategic Plan commits to having five well-established biodiversity corridors linking public and private lands across the state by 2010. South Australia's Strategic Plan also has an aspirational target of 'lose no species' (T3.8) and the NatureLinks biodiversity corridors are a significant means of furthering that goal.

NatureLinks and the creation of five large-scale biodiversity corridors is a bold vision, which is now being translated into onground initiatives through the engagement of community, business and government. Establishing the foundations for these biodiversity corridors requires strategic planning and actions on a large scale in preparation for delivery over extended time frames. The long-term intention is that in 100 years South Australia will have five landscape-scale areas of connected habitat, comprising a comprehensive system of core protected areas, buffered and linked by areas of land and sea managed for conservation. Four of the five proposed biodiversity corridors have been scoped and the detail has been clarified through planning processes involving local communities and stakeholders.

In relation to the East meets West corridor, which stretches from the Western Australia border to northern Eyre Peninsula, a draft East Meets West Corridor Plan was released for public consultation on 4 October 2006. The draft NatureLinks East Meets West Corridor Plan seeks to achieve positive outcomes for nature conservation, while at the same time enhancing sustainable land management and regional economic development. It provides a vision for an ecologically sustainable future by integrating proactive biodiversity management with regional development and natural resource management. In order to achieve this, government landholders and communities must work together to establish a vision, goals and high level targets, for which implementation can be achieved via a large range of inputs.

During the development of the draft NatureLinks East Meets West Corridor Plan, preliminary discussions were held with the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resource Management Board and staff, the Alinytjara Wilurara NRM Board and staff, the board of the Unnamed Conservation Park, and the West Parks Consultative Committee. These groups will continue to play a significant role in the finalisation and implementation of the NatureLinks East Meets West Corridor Plan during and after the wider public consultation process.

The Flinders-Olary Ranges Bounceback Corridor, which stretches from the southern Flinders to the Gammon Ranges, including the Olary Ranges, encompasses an expansion of a successful Bounceback program which has been running since 1992. Important populations of native plants and animals are found throughout the Flinders Ranges in national parks and private sanctuaries, pastoral properties and indigenous protected areas. By working together through the Bounceback program, the stakeholders have a much greater chance of restoring fragmented ecosystems, controlling pest plants and increasing the diversity of species in the Flinders Ranges. The well established companion projects and partnerships with government, local land-holders and other stakeholders has successfully managed total grazing pressures and predators on both public and private land for many years.

A preliminary action plan has been developed for the expansion of the Flinders/Olary Ranges Bounceback

Corridor, and initial discussions are occurring with the South Australian Arid Lands and northern Yorke NRM boards prior to the release of the draft action plan for public consultation.

The River Murray Coorong Corridor includes the River Murray and associated wetlands, flood plains and lower lakes, the Coorong areas and the Upper South-East wetlands. The draft vision identified for the River Murray Coorong Corridor is a reconnected, biologically functioning and resilient landscape, where fresh water flows from the rivers and wetlands to the sea and a community that cares is sustaining native species and their habitats.

Preliminary workshops with the government and NRM board staff and members have been held to discuss the vision and scope for the Cape Borda to Barossa Corridor, which covers much of Kangaroo Island, and the proposed Encounter Marine Protected Area and the Mount Lofty Ranges. Planning for the fifth biodiversity corridor, the Arid Lands Corridor, will commence in 2007. The budget applied to the establishment and implementation of NatureLinks corridors in 2006-07 has increased to \$1.08 million from \$250 000 in 2005-06.

Mr PISONI: I have a supplementary question to the member for Goyder's question. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3. In the minister's answer to the member for Goyder about marine parks, she said that groups were extensively consulted. Can the minister tell the committee which groups were consulted prior to the drafting of the proposed marine parks legislation and when the consultation occurred?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: A great deal of consultation occurred prior to the drafting of this bill. We went to great lengths to establish an Encounter Bay pilot project as our first marine park, which involved a reference committee being established for the purpose of key stakeholder involvement and consultation. I understand that that reference group was used extensively. The outcome of the Encounter Bay pilot project was considered to be extremely successful in enabling the different interest groups and stakeholders to work through the specific matters that arose, and it gave them an opportunity to have their say and balance out their different interests and inputs. The general feedback was that that was a very—

Mr PISONI: I have a point of order, Mr Chair. The question was about which groups were consulted, not what they were doing.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The reference committee involved a wide range of different industry and interest groups, such as conservation groups and the like. The former minister (Hon. John Hill) also established a special stakeholder group to assist with consultation in relation to the marine parks. The membership of that stakeholder group was, again, from a wide range of major industries and other interested stakeholder groups, such as conservation groups. Again, that was used for the purposes of consultation.

Mr PISONI: Can the minister name three major groups?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The Conservation Council, the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, and the South Australian Aquaculture Council.

Mr PISONI: I am happy to take the remainder on notice, if the minister wishes.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am happy to do so.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Again, referring to marine parks, I note in the minister's previous answer she referred to aquaculture. Because we all recognise the importance of aquaculture and the role it plays in our future economic viability, will the minister detail whether in the 19 marine parks proposed

aquaculture is being included for consideration for displaced effort?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The draft bill allows for the provision of displaced effort for aquaculture and commercial fisheries, wherever that is deemed to be necessary.

Mr GRIFFITHS: On marine parks, in a previous answer the minister referred to the fact that revision of the draft bill has gone out for further public consultation. When is she expecting the community will have some clarity on where the boundaries are for the proposed 19 marine parks?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The draft Marine Parks Bill was released on 1 September 2006 for a 13 week period of public consultation. DEH will then conduct targeted stakeholder discussions, public meetings and information sessions across the state to provide information on the purpose and intent of marine parks as well as discuss any matters relating to the bill. DEH will then undertake a significant community awareness campaign, including regional visits that will run parallel with the consultation on the draft bill and continue throughout 2006-07. We anticipate that the bill will then be progressed through parliament, after which the boundaries will be determined and the zoning will be established.

Mr PENGILLY: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.20. Are the Adelaide Botanical Gardens subject to the same water restrictions as metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will take that question on notice and bring back a response, hopefully by later today.

Ms FOX: I refer to page 12.10, referring to the nature conservation programs in this context. What is the Department for Environment and Heritage doing to tackle the drought?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The outlook for drought and the natural environment looks severe. Rainfall across the southern portion of South Australia is at levels equivalent to the 1982 and 1994 droughts—more severe than the 2002 drought, and we could have the lowest rainfall on record. All of this points to a drought that will have a severe impact on our natural environment and natural biodiversity. The Minister for Aquaculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. Rory McEwen) has been given lead responsibility for coordinating all matters relating to the drought. The environment and conservation portfolio will support that effort by aligning efforts to assist landholders to manage the impacts of drought on biodiversity. The Department for Environment and Heritage (DEH) is responsible for several areas that will be affected by drought, including fire management in parks and reserves, water and aquatic ecosystems management, abundant native species, feral animals, botanic gardens, the River Murray forest, the perpetual lease accelerated freeholding project and the one million trees program.

In 2004-05, the Italianate Garden at the Adelaide Botanic Gardens was redeveloped as a new feature garden, showcasing plants from the mediterranean regions around the world and providing interpretive and educational information on plants for use in sustainable landscapes. The Adelaide Wittunga Botanic Garden complied with water restrictions and, although the gardens are exempt, it was not used. Initiatives already under way this year include the commencement of the 2006-07 prescribed burning program, earlier than usual in September, due to prevailing dry conditions and the likelihood of an earlier and extended fire season this summer. The DEH is preparing for this potential issue and is working with the Country Fire Service to minimise the build up of fuel loads where possible and appropriate.

The PLF project office will continue to negotiate with lessees who contact them with any financial problems, including those due to drought. It is anticipated that the drought will impact on abundant native species such as little corellas and common wildlife such as kangaroos as well as ecosystems generally. DEH is investigating possible options and responses to address the environmental impacts of drought, particularly focusing on abundant native species, feral animal management and aquatic ecosystem management.

Mr PISONI: I have a supplementary question on the Botanic Gardens. Given the chance of an even worse outlook for the River Murray and rainfall for Adelaide and its water supply, are any strategies being put in place to preserve and protect some of the finest specimens in the Botanic Gardens?

The CHAIR: The minister was taking the first question on notice.

Mr PISONI: This is supplementary to the question asked by the member opposite.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The management of the gardens is certainly geared to ensuring the long-term survival of all our specimens, and the gardens are quite clearly managed to meet that end. At present, I have received no advice that the predicted drought this year will create any significant threat to any of our specimens. Obviously, if the drought continues in its severity, we will need to reassess the situation, and I understand that specimens are being monitored accordingly.

Mr PENGILLY: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, Marine Parks. Given the fact that the fishing industry has not been consulted properly, particularly the professional fishing industry, can the minister give some sort of idea of the amount of compensation that may or may not be paid to professional fishermen who may be dislocated from the areas proposed in the Encounter Marine Park? The reason for asking the question is that, at a recent meeting I attended, a fisherman told me that he had been handed a piece of paper and told that he would need to apply for compensation because he would not be fishing any more. He was most concerned about what amount of compensation he may be paid.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I challenge the member's opening comment in terms of the professional fishing industry not being consulted; in fact, it was consulted through its industry group, the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, which was involved throughout the process. So, it certainly has been consulted. The government's election policies and the Living Coast Strategy for South Australia 2004 provide for the protection of areas of ecological significance through the establishment of a system of multi-use marine park areas (MPAs). The South Australian Strategic Plan recognises this commitment with the inclusion of the target of 19 to be completed by 2010. The government is committed to preparing purpose-specific legislation for the dedicated zoning and management of South Australia's marine parks, as well as managing the effects of any displaced commercial fishing and all aquaculture effort.

Mr PENGILLY: On a point of order, my question relates to what figure, by way of dollars in compensation terms, will be paid to professional fishermen potentially put out of these areas.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: If the member had bothered to let me finish answering the question—

The CHAIR: Order! The member has no point of order. The minister is answering the question, and I imagine that she will get to it eventually.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: As I said, the government is committed to preparing purpose-specific legislation for the dedication, zoning and management of South Australia's marine parks, as well as managing the effects of any displaced commercial fishing and all aquaculture effort arising from their establishment. At this point, specific amounts have not been designated.

Mr PISONI: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.22, Income: Sale of Goods and Services. There is a budgeted amount of \$201 000 for the 2005-06 year, yet there is an estimated result of \$596 000. Can the minister explain the variance?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The documents look at only changes greater than \$500 000. For details of those matters that come under that sum, I am happy to take that question on notice.

Mr PICCOLO: Minister, in your opening remarks you alluded to the Urban Forest Million Trees program. As you would be aware, one of those programs is in my electorate—in fact, in my town. I draw the minister's attention to page 12.11 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, which refers to the continuation of the Million Trees program. I understand that the millionth tree was planted in the West Terrace Parklands, Park 23, by the Premier and his good wife the day after they were married. Will the minister please inform the committee of the progress of the Million Trees Program, whether it is achieving targets and what is planned for the current financial year?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The South Australian Urban Forest Million Trees Program is a major initiative under the state government's broader objective of attaining sustainability, officially launched by the Premier in June 2003. The Million Trees Program has been adopted within South Australia's Strategic Plan, with a target of 3 million trees to be established throughout Adelaide by 2014. The main goals of the Million Trees Program are to reconstruct approximately 2 000 hectares of habitat throughout the Adelaide metropolitan open space system, and to foster greater understanding, appreciation and knowledge of sustainability and biodiversity conservation throughout the wider community. Greenhouse amenity and air and water quality improvements are also being achieved.

All metropolitan local councils, 12 state government agencies, and over 100 schools have been involved in the Million Trees Program to date. Communications and education strategies, involving activities, information sheets, displays, events and a web site, have been developed to complement educational planting sites, including projects on school grounds and in local reserves. In 2005-06, over 100 project sites, totalling approximately 320 000 local native seedlings, were planned and have now been successfully planted. This brings the total since the Million Trees Program commenced to over 1 million native seedlings planted.

In 2005-06, over 30 schools undertook projects within their school grounds, and over 40 Youth Conservation Corps members were involved in the Million Trees Program. The Premier and his wife planted the 1 millionth tree in July 2006. In 2006-07, the Million Trees Program aims to establish approximately 250 000 plants across Adelaide. It is expected that 24 schools will be involved, along with 15 local councils. Funding for 2006-07 comprises an allocation of \$450 000, together with a contribution from the Planning and Development Fund, maintained at \$700 000. Project partners, including local government volunteers, service clubs and industries, are expected to contribute approximately \$700 000

as cash or in-kind services. A breakdown of the state funding allocation is available.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.24, the summary income statement. Will the minister provide a breakdown of expenses for the 2006-07 budget? Will the minister also provide the employee benefits budget for 2006-07, which was \$213 000? Will the minister also advise how many staff have been employed in 2006-07 and what services are included in the supplies and services budget line? Finally, will the minister provide details of what grants and subsidies are available under the budgeted \$524 000 and who receives them?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am advised that there are 2.5 employees. The supplies and services relate to general administrative expenses. The grants and subsidies are to the RSPCA.

Mr PISONI: Supplementary to that, of that money given to the RSPCA, how much will be returned to the state government through payroll tax?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I believe that matter needs to be referred to the Treasurer; it is not within my purview.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.25, performance indicators. I note the number of complaints about ill-treatment that require action by the RSPCA, and I also note that the RSPCA is under-funded by between \$200 000 and \$250 000 per year and that it is currently eroding its cash reserves at an alarming rate. Will the review of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act include an increased commitment by the government to adequately resource the RSPCA? Will the minister also advise what is the future of rodeos in South Australia? I note that the Minister for Tourism (Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith) refuses to promote South Australian rodeos. Can the minister offer an assurance that rodeos will not be banned in South Australia?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: For the past decade, the government has provided the RSPCA with \$500 000 per annum towards the enforcement of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985. This represented 12 per cent of the organisation's total revenue of \$4.3 million in 2005-06. Enforcement by the RSPCA includes inspectors, investigators and prosecutions. In 2005-06 the RSPCA spent \$1.2 million on these functions. The RSPCA's net revenue was \$0.35 million in 2005-06, and the RSPCA has about 30 000 supporters, I understand—members and donors—and this is higher than any other Australian jurisdiction, per head of population. The society received \$770 000 over 2005-06 in legacies.

Utilising the funding by the government in 2005-06, supplemented from its own funding sources, the RSPCA undertook 71 prosecutions, 30 of which were related to cockfighting; received 25 752 animals, some of which were related to prosecutions, some from councils and others from members of the public; and responded to over 4 800 calls from the public, some seeking advice and others alleging breaches of the legislation, which were subsequently investigated. The government is committed to providing \$500 000 per annum to the RSPCA towards the enforcement costs of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. I think there was a question relating to the bill.

Mr GRIFFITHS: On a point of order, Mr Chair, I am very interested in the detail on that, but the specific question was: is the government intending to increase its commitment from above the \$500 000 to provide more resources to allow the RSPCA to do its work?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I was just trying to complete my answer before I was interrupted, Mr Chair. As I was going on to say, the current legislative review does not involve any budgetary considerations. As the member would be well aware, budgetary matters are a matter for the budgetary process, and that will be included in the next round of bilaterals in relation to the next budgetary program. In relation to rodeos, they are currently a legal activity, which we regulate—obviously—to prevent any potential cruelty. They are legal under certain conditions and stipulations which are required to be met via permit. It is the government's intention to continue with this regulation. If an organisation is able to meet the conditions outlined in the permit, then they are entitled to conduct a rodeo.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.27, program 9, agency support services. This refers to information technology being used 'as a tool to generate productivity improvement through the elimination of manual interventions and superfluous processes'. Will the minister please define what 'manual interventions and superfluous processes' are? Will the minister also outline how IT has eliminated these problems?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will ask Mr Janssan to respond to that question.

Mr JANSSAN: I can provide one particular example that might assist the member regarding his question. We have recently introduced some point of sale software machinery at some of our commercial sites, for example, Seal Bay on Kangaroo Island. This machinery is basically a sophisticated cash register that is interfaced back into our financial software in Adelaide. Prior to the introduction of that software a huge amount of manual effort was required to reconcile all the income that was received during the day. The information was faxed through a fax to Adelaide, and it was then subsequently re-keyed into our general ledger machine. With the introduction of that software we have basically eliminated a lot of the manual processes, which means that the people at those sites can get on and provide a service to the public rather than be involved in a lot of mundane backroom work.

Mr PENGILLY: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.28, income statement. I note that \$52.553 million was budgeted for general supplies and services in 2006-07. The budget papers show an estimated result of \$46.933 million for general services and supplies in 2005-06. Will the minister provide a breakdown of all supplies and services in this budget line? Will the minister also explain why there is an increase of approximately \$5.5 million from the estimated result from 2005-06 for the budget for 2006-07? Will the minister clarify what the figure of \$1.07 million is for under the budget line of intragovernment transfers? I am happy to repeat the questions, if you need me to.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will ask Mr Janssan to respond.

Mr JANSSAN: In response to the question raised about the approximately \$5 million increase from the 2005-06 estimated result to the 2006-07 budget, I can give a variety of detail, largely at the higher level. A significant number of transactions that involved increased expenditure and one-off transactions occurred between those financial years. For example, in 2006-07 the budget figure includes: about \$188 000 as part of the 2006 budget initiative for the River Murray forest; an additional \$117 000 as part of a 2006-07 budget initiative for extra rangers; some one-off figures for carryover from the 2005-06 financial year to 2006-07 in regard to the Great Australian Bight initiative of about

\$278 000; a further carryover of \$600 000 from 2005-06 to 2006-07 for various Natural Heritage Trust and natural resource management projects; a further carryover of \$250 000 from 2005-06 to 2006-07 in regard to the restoration of Lake Bonney; a carryover of \$30 000 relating to the perpetual lease accelerated freeholding project; some increased costs associated with supplementation provided by the government for the minister's office; some one-off transactions in 2005-06 that do not occur in 2006-07 which offset some of those additional costs (relating to the transfer of the Office of Sustainability to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet); and some savings relating to changes in Fleet SA arrangements with our motor vehicles.

There is also a further one-off transfer included in there from the board of the Botanic Gardens with regard to a major capital program, and there is also a whole series of minor adjustments dealing with changes in indexation to our goods and services. In broad terms, those are some of the variations between those two financial years. In regard to the honourable member's request for details on the reason for the 2005-06 estimated result for intra-government transfers, that largely deals with the need to reflect the transfer of unspent budget from the former Office of Sustainability to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, which was in the order of \$924 000.

Ms FOX: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3. Page 12.25 of the Portfolio Statement refers to a number of initiatives to be undertaken in 2006-07 to improve animal welfare in South Australia. I know the minister has already talked about things that have been done, but can the minister provide some detail on what the government will be doing to improve animal welfare in the coming years?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the honourable member for her important question. The government recognises the importance that the public of South Australia places on animal welfare, and I am proud of our achievements in relation to the plans to improve animal welfare in this state. As you would be aware, a draft bill is currently being prepared which will amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985. The RSPCA wrote to my predecessor, the Hon. John Hill, making a series of recommendations to improve the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985 and the ability of authorised inspectors to enforce that act. Mr Hill subsequently released a discussion paper entitled 'Review of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985' for public comment on the proposed amendments to the act. When the consultation period closed at the end of October 2005, about 70 public submissions had been made, which were broadly supportive of the proposed changes. Additional suggestions to improve the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985 were also made.

The public submissions were collated and a series of recommendations, taking into consideration the views expressed by the respondents, were made to me. I have considered these recommendations and, with the support of my ministerial colleagues, have authorised the drafting of a bill to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985. The major initiatives contained within that draft bill are: to double maximum penalties up to \$20 000 or two years' imprisonment for the ill treatment of animals; make aggravated animal cruelty an indictable offence, further increasing the penalties for offenders; empower inspectors to routinely inspect commercial enterprises using animals (such as intensive animal industries, breeding establishments, circuses and council-operated dog pounds); allow inspectors to enter

a property to rescue an animal, even if the owner is not present; empower courts to order confiscation of objects used in an offence and any financial proceeds of an offence; force owners to forfeit mistreated animals without having to seek a conviction through the courts; create a new offence for keeping animals in conditions likely to cause pain, distress or disease; and change the name of the legislation to the Animal Welfare Act to reflect the change in emphasis from preventing cruelty to promoting welfare.

I recognise the importance of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985 to the public of South Australia and will therefore provide the community with an opportunity to comment on the provisions contained within the draft bill. I expect a consultation draft bill to be finalised within weeks, and this will then be available to the public for a consultation period of six to eight weeks. I encourage all South Australians with an interest in animals—whether that interest be commercial, professional, or simply a love of animals—to make their views known to me. After due consideration of all the submissions I receive, I intend to introduce an amendment bill into parliament in the autumn session 2007.

Once the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985 has been amended, there are other issues of animal welfare that I intend to consider. These include: reviewing the standards for the use of animals in rodeos; the development of a code of practice for the keeping of dogs, with particular emphasis on the standards of breeding and boarding facilities; in consultation with the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, I shall consider the manner in which nationally endorsed model codes of practice will be incorporated into our regulatory framework; the adoption of the Primary Industries Ministerial Council Agreement in relation to hen housing; and the implementation of a revised model of code of practice for the welfare of animals—the pig. I again emphasise that appropriate enforceable legislation underpins all these initiatives, and that the amendment of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985 is and will continue to be my primary focus in animal welfare in 2006-07.

Mr PENGILLY: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.19, program 5, coast and marine conservation—performance commentary. I note that the target for the number of marine parks for 2006-07 is two. Will the minister give details of the cost of (a) management, (b) research, and (c) policing across all 19 proposed marine parks to be proclaimed by 2010?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government allocated \$2 million during 2006-07 and beyond to progress the Living Coast Strategy, including planning and the creation of marine reserves, and increasing the total commitment to date for the initiative to \$3 million since its inception. The marine parks component of the Living Coast Strategy has a budget of \$711 000, and it provides salaries and wages for 8.6 FTEs. This includes marine park scientific and technical staff, as well as a number of casual divers who assist in the habitat mapping components of the program. In relation to funding requirements for the ongoing management of marine parks post-proclamation, that is yet to be determined, and it will be included in future budgetary processes.

Mr PENGILLY: I have a supplementary question. Has this figure been allocated in the forward estimates?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have been advised that we currently have \$2 million funding, which is ongoing.

Mr PENGILLY: I have a further supplementary question. Who will pay for the management, research and policing of the 19 proposed marine parks?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have been advised that that is the responsibility of the South Australian government.

Mr PENGILLY: Is the department planning on levying all users of the marine resources, for example, commercial and recreational fishermen and aquaculture users?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have been advised that the answer is no.

Mr PISONI: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.8, targets for 2006-07 and highlights for 2005-06. I notice that there is no mention of the privatisation of the Botanic Gardens Bookshop. I believe a contract has been let to Mary Martin Bookshop to actually run that bookshop, which was previously run by the Botanic Gardens. Has the project been abandoned and, if not, when will the transition be completed?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The Botanic Gardens Bookshop has not been privatised, and there is no intention to do so. My advice is that the bookshop in question was, in fact, previously run by the Friends of the Botanic Gardens. Under the new arrangements, the friends group did not wish to continue their management of the bookshop. Therefore, under the new arrangements, a new private operator will manage the bookshop. It will be under a lease arrangement. The building and the land on which the bookshop is situated still belongs to the Botanic Gardens.

Mr PISONI: I have a supplementary question. What income will be received from Mary Martin Bookshop and what income was received from the Friends of the Botanic Gardens previously?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am advised that a commercial rent has been charged to the lessees. Those moneys go to the board of the Botanic Gardens Trust Fund. In fact, it does not go through to the department.

Mr PICCOLO: I draw the minister's attention to page 12.21 of the Portfolio Statement, where the department highlights its advanced planning and, in some cases, projects it has commenced as part of the Gardens 150 program in 2005-06. Will the minister advise how these works are progressing and what is planned for the 2006-07 year?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The first capital works projects undertaken by the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide as part of its 150th anniversary were the Schomburgk Pavilion and SA Water Mediterranean Garden. The Schomburgk Pavilion has been built to the north of the heritage-listed Museum of Economic Botany to help create a cultural heart for the Adelaide Botanic Gardens, as envisaged in the new master plan for the Adelaide Botanic Gardens. The Schomburgk Pavilion reinvigorates this central area of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens by providing a variety of visitor services, namely, the Botanic Shop, the cafe and the Visitor Information Centre. The Schomburgk Pavilion is a wonderful design with beautiful curved and laminated glass panels which provide dappled shade. At the same time, the Italianate Garden was redeveloped to create the SA Mediterranean Garden. I have spoken previously about the Schomburgk Pavilion.

The new SA Water Mediterranean Garden showcases plants from the mediterranean regions around the world. The Schomburgk Pavilion and the Mediterranean Garden present an eye-catching vista of rich plant diversity and contemporary design. The SA Water Mediterranean Garden was completed for a total project cost of \$1.1 million and officially opened at the same time as the Schomburgk Pavilion. The next project, which is currently underway, is construction of the Amazon Waterlily Pavilion. This is being built to replace Victoria House and the Schomburgk range of glasshouses,

which had become dilapidated and a maintenance burden. I understand that the Amazon Waterlily Pavilion will be smaller in area than the glasshouses formerly on the site, and the original pond built for the waterlily in 1868 will be retained as a central feature in the centre of the new glasshouse.

In addition, the terrestrial Bromeliad collection within the Adelaide Botanic Gardens will be reestablished around the new Amazon Waterlily Pavilion. Together these plants—the Amazon Waterlily and the Bromeliads—will highlight the Adelaide Botanic Garden's collection of exotic and charismatic plants that fascinated earlier generations of Botanic Gardens visitors and provide a focus for educating the public about the history of collecting exotic plants.

A call for tenders for the construction of the waterlily pavilion occurred in 2006. The demolition of the existing site commenced in June 2006 and was completed in July 2006. Work is now progressing on footings, with the steel and glass expected to be erected in December 2006. Completion is expected for May 2007, with the final completion of subsidiary landscaping works and the opening of the facility expected in late 2007. The project, with an estimated total capital expenditure of \$4.221 million, was recently the subject of a very positive report from the Public Works Committee. Construction on the pavilion is being funded within the Department for Environment and Heritage capital works budget, with a contribution of \$1.6 million from the board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium. This contribution is being made over a number of years.

The next project under development is the building of the western entrance of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens to recreate the entrance that used to exist between the Adelaide Botanic Gardens and the former exhibition grounds on Frome Road. The site is now being developed by the Adelaide City Council as the Frome Road Parkland. It is anticipated that a new pedestrian gateway and a medicinal garden will be created as part of the new western entrance. Before this work can proceed the current cactus collection—which is very dear to my heart—needs to be relocated from its current location near the western fence to the Palm House. The cacti were originally moved to enable the restoration of the Palm House but had never been returned. Plans are well advanced to undertake some landscaping works on the northern and western sides of the Palm House to enable the cacti collection to be returned.

In addition, preliminary concepts have been developed, and are currently being refined, to make some landscaping modifications around the Palm House and in Botanic Park to better accommodate periodic flooding events from the lake and to integrate the matching landscape works being undertaken by the Adelaide City Council on its land. These works are needed to encourage flood events to flow adequately. While the board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium is currently in the process of securing \$250 000 for the design and development of these projects and the relocation of the cacti, cost estimates for the works in the proposed new western entrance and medicinal garden are yet to be received.

Mr PISONI: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, pages 8.7 and 12.8. One of the targets of the Department for Environment and Heritage for 2005-06, as stated in Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, in 2005-06, was to improve the condition of the Chowilla flood plain, Murray Mouth, Coorong and Lower Lakes as significant ecological assets of the River Murray. The 2005-06 highlights in this year's budget paper reveal that no improvement of the above assets had been

achieved. Will the minister explain the reasons why this target has not yet been achieved? Is it due to drought? At what point will the minister see the river flow that will achieve an improvement in these significant ecological assets?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Grazing has been removed from the Chowilla flood plain in the Murraylands. The Chowilla lease and park management plan are undergoing a review process to incorporate changes to the reserve grazing regime and proposed ground and surface water management initiatives. A number of initiatives for Chowilla surface and ground water management have been proposed by the Chowilla Coordinating Committee. Indeed, a number of significant achievements have occurred through 2005-06, and these include the following. Grazing on the Chowilla flood plain ceased on 30 September 2005, and 21 flood plain sites have been artificially flooded for red gum health. This resulted in an 80 per cent recovery in red gum health at flooded sites and significant breeding events for the threatened golden bell frog and water bird populations.

In 2006-07, the following actions are planned to continue these improvements. An environmental monitoring framework encompassing the Chowilla flood plain is being finalised, and implementation is due to begin in November 2006. This is being funded by the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation in the amount of \$15 000, using DEH staff and resources. Negotiations to develop a new lease encompassing alterations to the grazing regime are well underway and are expected to conclude by late spring 2006. The review of the Chowilla Regional Reserve and the Chowilla Game Reserve Management Plan is expected to be finalised by June 2007. There will be watering of 10 existing red gum sites and one additional site on the Chowilla flood plain for red gum recovery. This is a DWLBC funded project, with a budget of \$600 000.

The Chowilla Coordinating Committee has proposed the construction of regulators in Chowilla Creek and associated flow paths and modification of existing inlet banks and regulators controlling flow into the anabranch to enable more frequent replication of natural flooding events. Some \$2.5 million has been committed for inlet bank and regulator modification this financial year. The construction of a 38 bore ground water management scheme on the Chowilla flood plain to alleviate salt entering the River Murray is also proposed. Business cases are being developed for these projects for submission to the December 2006 meeting of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission.

In relation to the Coorong and Lower Lakes, under the Ramsar convention there is a commitment to list wetlands of international importance and to assess and report any changes to the ecological character of any site. The DEH, as the manager of the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar site, has developed an ecological character description for the site to guide management priorities. While the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar site still meets the eight criteria for which it was nominated, it has been in ecological decline for at least 20 to 30 years prior to the listing in 1985, the ecological decline has been accelerated and exacerbated by unsustainable water extractions and there has been a significant change in the ecological character of the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar site since it was listed.

The water required to reverse the change in ecological character of the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar site is considerably higher than that provided for by the Living Murray initiative. For longer term rehabilitation and mainte-

nance of ecological character of the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar site, it is estimated that an annual flow of 1 500 gigalitres per annum, plus an increase in the frequency of medium sized floods (20 to 80 gigalitres per day) and larger flood events (100 gigalitres per day), are required. The completion of the ecological character description will enable a comprehensive review of the Ramsar Management Plan for the site, which will seek environmental benefits within the restrictions of the current River Murray environmental flows.

The change in ecological character of the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar site has now been formally reported to the Australian government. The ecological description provides South Australia with the opportunity to work with the Australian government to press for an increase in the River Murray environmental flows to be made available to South Australia, and a review of the Ramsar Management Plan for the site will commence in 2006-07. The cost of completing the ecological character of the Coorong and Lower Lakes Ramsar site and the review of the Ramsar Management Plan costs will be met from within existing resources.

Mr PENGILLY: Mr Chair, I have a supplementary question on same issue. With respect to the flooding of the trees, to which the minister earlier referred in her response, given the current disastrous state of flows coming down the river and the announcement this week about just how much water is available, have the targets that the minister plans to achieve in flooding some of these gum areas now been put on the backburner? Will they still take place, or will they not be achieved? Is continuing research being undertaken on the long-term impact of these river red gums, in particular, and the fact that they are not receiving water, even the amount that was targeted?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: We are all concerned about the impact of the drought that is upon us and the significant challenges it creates for the management of our environment and other natural resources. I understand that the Minister for the River Murray (Hon. Karlene Maywald) made a statement the other day that some of the environmental flows for the River Murray were to be suspended in light of the drought conditions, but it is appropriate that any details in relation to those flows be referred to her.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.29, balance sheet. Will the minister explain why the Department for Environment and Heritage has long-term borrowings of \$38.054 million, and can she give details of all departmental loans and borrowings and their terms and rates? How does long-term borrowing of these funds fit in with the department holding over \$132 million in cash and cash equivalents?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Given the accounting complexity of this question, I ask that Mr Rick Janssan respond.

Mr JANSKAN: There are two separate questions raised by the member. First, long-term borrowings are steeped in a bit of history. There are no specific loans per se that the department has with any external organisations. This level of borrowings is with the consolidated account and stems from the notional allocation of the government's long-term borrowings at the time of the introduction of accrual accounting. The basis for that was a notional allocation and I do not have the detail with me at the moment. Some interest payments are made on that level of borrowings, but the government also gives us an equal amount of appropriation, so there is no net effect on the department's operations due to the long-term borrowing figure.

The level of cash held by the organisation is increasing over time, largely as a result of accrual appropriation provided, which is subject to release by the Treasurer and is largely used with his permission for increasing our capital works allocation. At this stage the Treasurer has not provided us with any provision from that accrual appropriation. Subsequently, you will see on that page that the level of cash and cash equivalents has been increasing quite significantly. We could talk to the Treasurer about offsetting some of that increasing cash against our long-term borrowings, but we have not done so at this stage.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.14, summary income statement. It is interesting to note that the figures for 2006-07 have been omitted. Will the minister explain why, and why those figures are not consistent with the 2005-06 budget papers?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Will the honourable member repeat the question?

Mr GRIFFITHS: The first question relates to the fact that the summary income statement has only the 2005-06 figures and there are no 2006-07 details.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: In relation to the first part of the question, it is a printing error and the 2005-06 budget line should read 2006-07.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My second question was that I am advised that the figures for the net cost are not consistent with the 2005-06 budget papers.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am advised that this is largely due to a change in our program structure, which has involved not allocating overheads. The significant program changes from last year's portfolio statement mean that the program financial information is not directly comparable with that produced for the 2005-06 budget papers. Historical 2004-05 data has been recast applying DEH's new 2006-07 program structure. Consequently, actual 2004-05 revenues and expenditures are indicative only and may differ from those published in DEH's 2004-05 annual report.

The 2005-06 original budget has also been recast applying DEH's new 2006-07 program structure. Given the indicative nature of program allocations, explanations have been provided only for material variances. In previous portfolio statements, agency support costs have generally been allocated across all operational programs using a variety of parameters. Consequently, the changes to the DEH program structure mean that direct comparison between financial information in the 2005-06 budget papers and financial information in the 2006-07 budget papers is not possible.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.34, balance sheet. I note that the total assets held by the department have fallen by \$30 million to \$59.5 million (the budgeted result for 2006-07) from the actual result of \$89.4 million in 2004-05. Can the minister outline why the total assets have fallen by \$30 million?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am advised that the difference is largely due to the sale of land to the Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation. I refer the member to page 12.40. The balance sheet shows a net decline in non-current assets between the 2005-06 estimated result and the 2006-07 budget. This is predominantly as a result of the sale of surplus land and property during 2006-07, including the sale of vacant land at Port Adelaide to the Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation (\$23.5 million). Other current assets and non-current liabilities are expected to remain broadly consistent between the 2005-06 estimated result and the 2006-07 budget.

Ms FOX: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.13, which refers to the upgrade of visitor facilities and amenities in the Belair National Park. What improvements can be expected from the upgrades at the Belair National Park in terms of visitor experience?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the member for her important question. The Belair National Park was South Australia's first national park and is the second oldest national park in Australia. The Belair National Management Park Plan was commenced in 2001 and adopted in 2003. Extensive public consultation was undertaken as part of the management planning process, when a clear expectation was expressed by the community to provide well-designed and maintained facilities within the Belair National Park whilst contributing to its heritage status and cultural significance.

In accordance with the Belair National Park Management Plan, the Belair National Park Visitor Facilities and Services Plan was completed in 2002 to provide design guidelines for the upgrade of the recreation facilities and public amenities and to ensure that a consistent high-quality theme was evident across the park. The preparation of the Visitor Facilities and Services Plan was guided by a steering committee of stakeholders, including representatives from the public, Friends of the Parks and the South Australian Tourism Commission.

A clear outcome for the Visitor Facilities and Services Plan was the development of a master plan within the Visitor Facilities and Services Plan for the redevelopment and upgrade of the Belair National Park entry in order to establish a sense of arrival. The plan originally identified that the new Belair National Park entry should be from Sheoak Road and continue along Sir Edwin Avenue and around Playford Lake. The Visitor Facilities and Services Plan received broad community support at the time.

On commencement of the design process for the major upgrade to the Belair National Park entry, officers representing the City of Mitcham and the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure expressed strong opposition to the proposed new entry from Sheoak Road due to engineering, operational and road safety issues. Accordingly, the design plans for the new entry precinct to the Belair National Park are the result of an extensive two-year traffic study conducted by the Department of Environment and Heritage in collaboration with the City of Mitcham and DTEI.

The Belair National Park entry upgrade will alleviate serious road traffic safety issues at the existing park entry; reduce congestion and provide safer traffic flow at the entry and within the Belair National Park; provide simplicity for signpost identification; remove entry and exit traffic from the busy Main Oval and Gums Oval precincts; provide a vastly improved sense of arrival to the park; and allow for more efficient staffing and entry fee collection.

Additionally, the plans have included consideration of future design needs for both the Playford Lake precinct and the main oval precinct. Also, the Belair workshop will be removed from the playground area. Construction of the Belair National Park entry precinct and Southern Lofty District office and workshop rationalisation has been tendered, and construction is expected to commence in early November 2006. Cost estimates for the works are currently on budget at \$2.5 million. An extensive public communication plan was implemented at the conclusion of the tender process. The general public response to the completed and proposed works and upgrades has been very positive. There is also a small but

active group opposed to the entrance road passing Playford Lake.

In 2004-05 and 2005-06, construction works for the Karka, Pines and government farm (the old Government House) precincts were completed at a cost of \$2 million. The restoration of the heritage listed Karka Pavilion within Karka precinct received a Royal Australian Institute of Architects commendation in the heritage category and also received a 2004 Edmund Wright Heritage Award. I have had the pleasure of visiting that park, and it is indeed a wonderful pavilion.

Concept designs for Playford Lake precinct have commenced, and construction works for Playford Lake are scheduled for 2007. In 2007, planning and design will commence at the very popular adventure playground and main oval precincts. These projects will see significant upgrades and improvements to visitor facilities for the most popular and heavily utilised sections of the Belair park. In answer to the member for Finnis' earlier question about the application of water restrictions in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens, the gardens are subject to similar restrictions as apply to the general public.

[Sitting suspended from 1.02 to 2.00 p.m.]

Additional Departmental Advisers:

Mr Vaughan Levitzke, Chief Executive Officer, Zero Waste.

Mr Piero Fioretti, Business Manager, Zero Waste.

The CHAIR: Order! We now continue with the Department for Environment and Heritage and Zero Waste until 2.30.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I would like to make an opening statement for Zero Waste, if I may.

The CHAIR: For Zero Waste, yes.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: In 2003 this government created Zero Waste SA with the primary objective of promoting waste management practices that, as far as possible, eliminate waste or its consignment to landfill. The agency has 15 very dedicated and motivated staff working on a range of issues from plastic bag reduction to kerbside collection of household recyclables and hazardous waste. South Australia's Strategic Plan includes a goal to reduce waste to landfill by 25 per cent within 10 years—that is, by 2014. This is an ambitious target, and Zero Waste SA is the key to achieving that target.

The Zero Waste SA Act 2004 provides for an independent board to govern the agency and establishes a fund, the Waste to Resources Fund, which is dedicated to the purposes of Zero Waste SA. Zero Waste SA is fully funded from the Waste to Resources Fund. The fund receives 50 per cent of the solid waste levy which, as no doubt members are aware, will be increased in part to compensate for the reduction in income as the amount of waste to landfill is reduced.

After peaking in 2001-02, the amount of waste disposed to landfill has declined. The decrease, over the past two financial years, was over 9 per cent, well on the way to the target reduction. While we are on target to achieve the 25 per cent reduction by 2014, the challenge for Zero Waste and the government is that the closer we get to the target the harder it will be to make gains, especially in a growing economy.

In 2005-06 Zero Waste SA consolidated its progress in programs commenced in 2004-05. The majority of metropolitan councils have introduced, or will implement over the next year, high performing kerbside recycling systems. A success-

ful trial of kerbside collection of kitchen organic waste for composting was carried out in the Burnside council area. The household hazardous waste and farm chemical collection program recovered over 345 tonnes of chemical waste from the environment, with 5 857 members of the public bringing the material to 63 locations in 53 council areas.

Wipe Out Waste (a schools waste education program targeting reception through to year 12) was launched. This program, funded by Zero Waste SA and delivered by KESAB, will see for the first time in this state a comprehensive teacher training and development package that schools can use to influence the behaviour and attitudes of our young people.

To assist in the development of much-needed recycling and resource recovery infrastructure, Zero Waste SA has committed almost \$3 million to local government and industry for recycling facilities and equipment. Since 2003, Zero Waste SA has provided grants totalling over \$3.5 million to local councils to improve kerbside collection and the adoption of high-yielding recycling services, and 31 councils throughout South Australia now have high-performing kerbside collection servicing over 370 000 households. Through a service agreement with KESAB valued at just over \$1.3 million over three years, Zero Waste SA has delivered a number of anti-litter, anti-dumping and education programs.

Assisted by Zero Waste SA most local councils in regional South Australia are now cooperating in regional waste management groups to address their common waste problems. Zero Waste SA will now offer financial and other assistance to regions to implement solutions to their waste management problems. Zero Waste SA is an agency dedicated to changing the way South Australians manage their waste, and I commend the agency for its work over the three years it has existed.

Mr GRIFFITHS: We waive our right to make an opening statement and I defer to the member for Unley, who would like to ask the first question.

Mr PISONI: My question refers to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3. I note, under 'Highlights' on page 12.91, that the plastic bag reduction program was refocused on education in preference to the provision of alternative bags. Can the minister explain what that means and advise a date when we will see the legislation banning plastic bags, as promised in a press release back in May 2006?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the honourable member for his question. I believe he is quoting from a specific purposes payment from state to local government on page 4.17, Volume 3; is that right?

Mr PISONI: No; I am quoting from Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.91, dot point 4 under 'Highlights'. My understanding was that back in May this year, as well as in October 2005, the government set a plan to introduce a ban on single-use plastic bags by the end of 2008. Can the minister explain whether those first two lines in dot point 4 mean that the government no longer intends to introduce a ban? If not, why not? If it does still intend to introduce a ban, when will we see the consultation period started or, alternatively, the legislation drafted?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the member for his question. The legislation pertaining to the phasing out of plastic bags by the end of 2008 is currently being drafted now. That draft bill will then go out for extensive consultation before being introduced into parliament. We plan to implement the phasing out of the single-use type plastic bags

by the end of 2008, and that is consistent with a national approach.

Mr PISONI: I have a supplementary question. The article in *The Advertiser* of Thursday 27 October said the government would introduce a ban, not a phase out, of single-use plastic bags at the end of 2008. So, does that mean the ban will be introduced or the ban will start at the end of 2008? Can you be more specific as to when we can expect to see a ban on the use of plastic bags?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: This government has been committed to the phasing out of the single-use type plastic bags by the end of 2008. We have said that we would prefer to adopt a national approach to that phasing out. We believe it would be in everyone's interest if we were able to adopt a consistent national approach to achieve that strategy. At present, although we are participating in quite lengthy negotiations and each state is certainly doing its best, nevertheless, at this point in time we have not been able to reach a nationally consistent position, and South Australia's position has been that, if we are not able to achieve a nationally consistent approach, we would introduce a ban on the use of single-use plastic bags by the end of 2008.

Mr PISONI: When will that ban come into effect?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I understand we will attempt to achieve to have that introduced by the end of 2008.

Mr PISONI: So the ban will start at 2008, or be introduced in 2008? What will be the warning that consumers and retailers will get?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: My understanding is that we are attempting to achieve the introduction of bans by the end of 2008.

Mr PISONI: In an article published on 1 December 2003, the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association State Secretary, Don Farrell, was reported as telling the ALP convention that moves—

The CHAIR: Order! Don Farrell is not in the budget papers.

Mr PISONI: There were some issues raised about the banning of plastic bags by Mr Farrell at that convention, and I want to know whether those issues have been dealt with, Mr Chairman. Mr Farrell told the ALP convention that moves to ban the plastic bags meant occupational health and safety concerns for store workers. I wonder whether those occupational health and safety concerns have been addressed in the lead-up to the drafting of the legislation.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I did not think that the convention agenda was part of the budget papers but, nevertheless, Zero Waste has convened a plastic bags phase-out task force with membership from the retail sector, consumer groups, the Conservation Council, the EPA and the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association, and that task force is helping the government introduce a ban with the least adverse impact on retailers and shoppers, and also in light of the occupational health and safety issues that the retail sector has drawn to our attention.

Mr PISONI: Referring to page 12.91, dot point 4, can the minister give us some details of the education program? It says here that the plastic bag reduction program was refocused on education in preference to the provision of alternative bags. I am struggling to understand what that means. What education is in process, or what does that mean by 'education'? What is the provision of alternative bags? I am not sure I understand that part of the statement.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: In the past we have had a considerable focus on the provision of alternative bags to the

general population in an attempt to demonstrate how accessible the use of alternative bags is to single-use plastic bags. That was part of our earlier strategy. However, we believe that we have reasonably successfully completed that part of our strategy. Over the past two financial years, this government has put almost half a million dollars into programs to raise public awareness of the need to phase out single-use plastic shopping bags. Most of this money has gone into joint initiatives with local government, half-funded by Zero Waste SA and half by local councils, to provide free or subsidised multiuse bags for distribution to the community.

Recently, we completed a market survey in an attempt to identify the next step or anything else that we may need to do to lead up to the elimination of single-use plastic bags. When we collate the findings of that survey, we will be using that information to feed into our communication plan for the forthcoming year.

The CHAIR: The member for Goyder has omnibus questions.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Given the restructured time schedules, I thank you for your wise counsel on this. The omnibus questions that we have for the first session of today are:

1. What was the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more per employee and the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$200 000 dollars or more per employee for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister as at 30 June 2006? Also, between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006 will the minister list job title and total employment cost for each position with a total estimated cost of \$100 000 or more for, (a) which has been abolished and (b) which has been created?

2. For all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what is the estimated or actual level of under-expenditure for 2005-06, has cabinet already approved any carry-over expenditure into 2006-07 and, if so, how much?

3. In the financial year 2004-05 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs was not approved by cabinet for carry-over expenditure in 2005-06?

4. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, how many surplus employees are there as at 30 June 2006 and, for each surplus employee, what is the title or classification of the employee and the total employment cost of the employee?

5. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors in 2005-06 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant or contractor, the cost, the work undertaken and the method of appointment?

6. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown for each of the forward estimate years of the specific administration measures as listed in Budget Paper 3, Chapter 2, expenditure, which will lead to a reduction in the operating cost in the portfolio?

I have questions on notice which relate to Zero Waste, as follows:

1. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.91 and the Zero Waste SA targets and highlights. Will the minister provide a breakdown of all grants and subsidies included in the \$517 892 for regional and industry infrastructure projects stated in the 2005-06 highlights by giving case-by-case details and amounts for each project?

2. The 2005-06 highlights included the refocussing of the plastic bags reduction program. Why was this program refocussed? Why has the government walked away from its

commitment to eliminate plastic bags from the waste stream? Given that the survey listed in the 2005-06 highlights states that the majority of shoppers want single-use plastic bags banned, when will the government phase-out all single-use, non-biodegradable plastic bags? That has probably been dealt with in a previous question.

3. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.93. Will the minister explain why supplies and services have dropped by \$1.4 million from \$2.4 million in the 2005-06 budget to \$1 million in this year's budget? Will the minister explain why the grants and subsidies have been slashed by almost \$2 million from \$3.8 million in the 2005-06 budget to \$1.9 million in the 2006-07 budget?

4. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.98. I refer to the Zero Waste SA \$340 000 cash outflow to invest in property, plant and equipment, as referenced previously. Will the minister detail what property, plant and equipment has been purchased with the \$340 000 estimated result for 2005-06? Will the minister explain why this investment was not budgeted for in the 2005-06 budget?

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

Environment Protection Authority, \$9 623 000

Departmental Advisers:

Dr P. Vogel, Chief Executive Officer, Environment Protection Authority.

Mr J. O'Daly, Director, Business and Corporate Division, Environment Protection Authority.

The CHAIR: I declare the proposed payments open for examination. I refer members to the Budget Statement, in particular, Appendix C, and the Portfolio Statement, Volume 3, part 12, pages 12.72 and 12.89. I call on the Minister for Environment and Conservation to make a statement. I will then afford the same opportunity to the lead speaker for the Opposition to make a statement if he wishes. The rules of examination for Committee B remain as I read out earlier. To save time, I will not read them out again, other than to remind members that they must clearly identify their question in terms of expenditure in the budget papers and make an identifiable reference. All questions are to be asked of the minister, not her advisers. Does the minister wish to make a statement?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Yes, Mr Chair. Through the 2006-07 financial year, the Environment Protection Authority will continue to implement the government's and the board's priorities to ensure that it meets key environmental challenges and its responsibilities as the state's primary environmental regulator. Key targets for the forthcoming year include:

- The development and implementation of risk-based compliance auditing programs, which will provide a set of processes and protocols in relation to industry audits.
- Finalise, for the government's consideration, a draft bill for the management of site contamination in South Australia.
- Prepare for public consultation a draft environment protection policy for more effective management of waste in order to support and promote waste targets in South Australia's Strategic Plan.

- Work with a range of stakeholders to implement the findings of the Adelaide Coastal Waters Study, which deals with gaining a better understanding of the impacts of land based pollution on our metropolitan coastal waters and key sources of pollution that require management.

The targets for 2006-07 complement the highlights of 2005-06 that include:

- public consultation on the bill to manage site contamination and analysis of submissions completed;
- a feasibility study into the long-term management of radioactive wastes completed;
- industry audit and the environmental monitoring for Gepps Cross/Kilburn area finalised;
- educational and training packages for industry near completion;
- risk-based system for licence management developed, and 90 per cent of EPA licences have been assessed using agreed criteria; and
- River Murray risk assessment final report completed and consultation with stakeholders to develop strategies for addressing priority risks to water quality commenced.

An organisational change program was also established during the year to continue the EPA's strategic goal of being a smarter, more effective and responsive regulator. It is a key measure to support the implementation of the savings initiatives listed in the budget papers. The program includes proactively supporting the state government's policy on reducing red tape for industry and government alike. To this extent the EPA has already introduced long-term licences for industries of up to 10 years.

Further, the EPA is introducing a risk-based approach for determining the need for environmental monitoring requirements as part of licence conditions to ensure that the monitoring programs for industry—often quite expensive undertakings—are justified on the basis of environmental risk. Broader ambient monitoring programs will also be reviewed to ensure they are targeted on the basis of environmental need and that they continue to best inform the EPA's regulatory program, policy development and national obligations. Smart regulation and efficient use of resources by the EPA, such as the amalgamation of EPA resources and the services at Murray Bridge and Stirling, will complement the implementation of the regional NRM plans and through more effective integration and coordination of programs and responsibilities.

For some time now the EPA has been focusing on how it can be a smarter regulator. In August 2005, the EPA commenced a program of structural and organisational change to be implemented in a number of stages over the next two years. The program was in response to increasing stakeholder expectations and emerging environmental challenges and the need for the EPA to better align itself with South Australia's Strategic Plan. The organisational change program has four major initiatives: a review of organisational structure; improved organisational performance measurement and reporting; staff development and culture change; and processes, improved systems and policies.

The EPA's divisions and branches have been restructured to improve accountability, enhance responsiveness and service ethic and develop stronger partnerships for problem solving. All this will lead to more efficient and effective use of resources by the EPA. The EPA, as a smarter regulator and decision maker, will provide benefits for this state beyond direct environmental health benefits. It will contribute to significant positive future impacts through the reduction of medical costs from pollution-induced illnesses and stresses,

reduced workforce productivity, damage to infrastructure and adverse effects on tourism.

Mr PENGILLY: Minister, I refer to the 2006-07 Budget Statement, Budget Paper 3, page 3.6, entitled 'Agency revenue measures'. In 2006-07 a 100 per cent increase is established in the Environmental Protection Agency solid waste levy from 2007-08, which will raise an additional amount of \$10 million per annum. It is understood that both the EPA and Zero Waste SA are to receive an additional \$5 million per annum from this increase. This allocation is determined by section 113 of the Environmental Protection Act and section 17 of the Zero Waste Act.

Perusal of the relevant budget item indicates only \$3 million of the additional \$5 million revenue is being allocated to Zero Waste SA revenue in 2007-08 and the out years in the forward estimates. Can the minister advise what has happened to the remaining \$2 million that should have been allocated to Zero Waste SA? As previously indicated, the EPA is to receive an additional \$5 million from the increase in the EPA's solid landfill levy; is this a net increase in the EPA's budget and, if so, how will it be spent?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Of the \$10 million associated with the increase in the landfill levy, \$5 million goes to Zero Waste, of which \$3 million goes into program expenditure which will be focused on initiatives to do with improving waste management, involving local government and the industry. The other \$2 million of that will go into consolidated revenue. In relation to the EPA—the \$5 million side of the equation—all of that will go into general revenue which, in fact, reduces the call of the EPA on general revenue.

Mr PENGILLY: I have a supplementary question, Mr Chair. The minister mentioned local government. This has been the cause of a fair bit of contention for local government. What assistance will the state government provide to local government to offset the combined cost pressures arising from the implementation of the EPA's landfill guidelines and the increase in the EPA's solid waste levy and licence fees?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The EPA established a collaborative working party with membership from local government, the waste industry and Zero Waste, which is reviewing the details of the EPA draft landfill guidelines. A final draft has been forwarded to all local councils and key stakeholders within the waste industry with an invitation to submit any issues to the EPA board's landfill subcommittee, with the focus on specific local concerns relating to meeting the requirements of the guidelines. A deadline of 29 September 2006 was given for all submissions. However, we are willing, and have already agreed, to grant some extensions on request.

A total of 21 submissions have been received by the EPA and these will be assessed by the EPA board's landfill subcommittee. The state government is aware that there may be potential cost implications for councils in complying with the guidelines, and the EPA is very sensitive to this as it negotiates with councils and landfill operators on an appropriate transitional period from the finalisation of the guidelines to the date of compliance.

In relation to the second part of the question, in 2002 the EPA endorsed in principle a preferred model for sharing environment protection services and responsibilities with local government, based on the outcomes of the EPA-LGA working group, the recommendations of the ERD Committee of parliament following its investigation into the EPA, and findings and recommendations of a trial program between the EPA and three councils. The elements of the model include

the clarification of roles. The Environment Protection Act 1993 has been amended to identify participating councils as administering agencies for dealing with all environmental matters relating to non-licensed premises. In relation to 'polluter pays', amendments to the act implemented on 1 July 2005, as passed by parliament through the Environment Protection (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2005, also allow councils as administering agencies to recover costs associated with issuing environment protection orders, investigating complaints and undertaking follow-up investigations.

In relation to ongoing support, an EPA unit has been established to coordinate support to councils to ensure consistent compliance and enforcement standards are applied. The EPA currently funds the training of council officers, provides councils with relevant equipment and, on request, will accompany council officers to investigate and assess environmental matters. It provides ongoing support to officers authorised to administer the EPA act in councils, SAPOL, PIRSA, DWLBC and DEH, particularly in light of changes that have been agreed in the passage of the EPA miscellaneous bill 2004 through parliament. Some of our other steps include the use of a formal agreement as the basis for negotiation between the EPA and individual councils that choose to become administering agencies.

We continue to develop, maintain and deliver training programs to assist officers authorised to administer the EPA act in councils, SAPOL, PIRSA, DWLBC and DEH to achieve consistent outcomes for persons undertaking a potentially polluting activity, and we continue to encourage a shared approach to the provision of environmental protection services, using the relevant compliance and enforcement provisions in the act.

Mr PENGILLY: I have a supplementary question. The proposed \$1 million increase to the EPA licence fee will move this from a policy of cost recovery for the EPA regulatory activity to one of revenue raising. Will the minister advise how the additional \$1 million will be spent? Will it be spent entirely on what you have just said? Indeed, is that not enough? What is the situation?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: As was pointed out, the government is considering a new system for determining licence fees. The objectives of the proposed licence fee structure are to provide licensees with incentives for improving their environmental performance through the implementation of a load-based component to the fees. As part of the budgetary process, it was determined that the EPA licence fees will increase from July 2008 by \$1 million. That will happen irrespective of the government's decision on the structure of the fees. The EPA will receive an additional \$1 million from 2008-09, which will reduce its call on general revenue.

Industry and public consultation in 2004 revealed support for a load-based component in which fees would be based on the amount and type of pollutants emitted, and even more support for an environment and management component in which fees would be based on environmental risk of an activity, as indicated by the EPA regulatory effort. The new structure has been developed as a result of that early consultation, and is now the subject of further and more detailed consultation before it will be considered by the government. All licensees have been included in this consultation, as well as a number of government agencies, sections of the environment movement, Business SA and the Farmers Federation, amongst others.

I am informed that, at the most recent meeting of the License Fee Structure Reference Group that was held on

13 October, Dr Paul Vogel advised members of the licence fee decision. At that meeting, Dr Vogel requested that members consider options for how the increased revenue should be allocated across licensees. I am informed that the reference group is now considering a number of options, and will advise the EPA in early November.

Given the opposition's interest in the membership of our consultation and reference groups, I would like to list the membership of this group: Business SA (two representatives); the Engineering Employers Association (two representatives); the SA Wine Industry Association; the Local Government Association; the Waste Management Association; the SA Chamber of Mines and Energy; Northern Industries Environmental Forum; SA Water; the power sector in the Port Adelaide region; the SA Farmers Federation; the Department of Trade and Economic Development; and the Environmental Defenders Office.

Mr HANNA: How much was spent on the Kilburn Environment Project and the Kilburn Odour Study, both of which have reported in the past year?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I do not have those details with me, but I am happy to take that question on notice. I would also like to put on record a correction with respect to the figures that I previously gave. I need to make it clear, in case there is any misunderstanding, that, of the \$5 million to Zero Waste SA, \$3 million goes to Zero Waste SA programs and \$2 million to the Waste to Resources Fund, not consolidated revenue.

Mr HANNA: My second question in relation to the Kilburn area is also specific, and I would appreciate it if the minister takes it on notice. How much was specifically spent on the monitoring of PM10 levels in the Kilburn area between 16 July 2005 and 6 October 2005 and the subsequent analysis of such levels, compared to the amount spent on environmental air quality monitoring across the state during the period over which the Kilburn Environment Project was undertaken?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Again, I do not have that level of detail with me today. I am happy to take that question on notice.

Mr HANNA: My third question relates to page 2.30, where there is a reference to some monitoring programs being reduced. Out of the 2 600 or so industrial sites licensed by the EPA, how many sites are monitored for pollution and where will monitoring programs be cut?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will ask Dr Vogel to respond to that question.

Dr VOGEL: The EPA licenses about 2 000 industries. We do not conduct monitoring of the boundaries of each of those industries. We monitor generally ambient air quality in the environment so that we can get a good understanding of the air quality to which the general population is exposed. Large industry has an obligation to monitor its own emissions, and that can be done through licence conditions—and they are required to do that a lot of times through licence conditions and report that information to the EPA. We have an extensive monitoring program across the Adelaide metropolitan area to understand general air quality. We also have some monitoring stations at particularly sensitive points where there are air sheds that are subjected to impacts from industry, for example, Port Pirie, Whyalla and other areas.

We generally have both what we call general ambient monitoring and hot spot monitoring to do with particular sources. We evaluate that information and make judgments about what are the appropriate strategies to manage those

sources of pollution. In many instances, in urban cities motor vehicle pollution is a major contributor to air pollution as well.

Mr RAU: I have a supplementary question. Given the questions that the member for Mitchell asked, what is the nature of the ongoing monitoring occurring at Kilburn?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will ask Dr Vogel to respond.

Dr VOGEL: As you would be aware, we did conduct some very intensive monitoring over a short period to gain an understanding about what the air quality environment there was like so that we could take early action in identifying sources and dealing with those sources of pollution. We conducted monitoring that did measure particulars and volatile organic compounds—things like chemicals such as benzene and what have you which are generally attributed to motor vehicle pollution. We will be conducting further monitoring on VOCs (volatile organic compounds) again, because the laboratory failed to analyse those chemicals properly, so we will be redoing that. The Kilburn-Gepps Cross area is subjected to a number of industries—and the area's air quality is contributed to by motor vehicle pollution—at least 30 or 40 industries, about half of which are licensed by the EPA.

We need to have a comprehensive strategy that deals with air quality in the area and the contribution that each of those industries and motor vehicles make to that. In most urban cities, motor vehicles make a substantial contribution to degraded air quality, but in the Kilburn-Gepps Cross area we have sufficient information, I think at this stage, which needs to be augmented by some further monitoring (which we will be conducting because of the failure of the laboratory to provide us with good data), so that we can then refine our strategies. So, it has been a snapshot, I guess. We did not monitor it over a year but we wanted to do a snapshot so that we could take some early action. Quite frankly, even monitoring for a further year would probably not have changed the strategies that we have put in place to deal with the sources of the pollution. We wanted to deal quickly with the sources rather than spend another year monitoring before we took any action.

Membership:

Mr Bignell substituted for Ms Fox.

Mr Pederick substituted for Mr Pisoni.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I ask the following omnibus questions:

1. For all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what is the estimated or actual level of under expenditure for 2005-06? Has cabinet already approved any carryover expenditure into 2006-07? If so, how much?

2. In the financial year 2004-05, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what under spending on projects and programs was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2005-06?

3. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, how many surplus employees are there as at 30 June 2006? For each surplus employee, what is the title or classification of the employee and the total employment cost of the employee?

4. Will the minister provide a detailed break down of expenditure on consultants and contractors in 2005-06 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant or contractor, the cost, the work undertaken and the method of appointment?

5. Will the minister provide a detailed break down for each of the forward estimate years of the specific administration measures as listed in Budget Paper 3, Chapter 2, expenditure? Which will lead to a reduction in operating costs in the portfolio?

6. What was the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more per employee and, as a sub-category, the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$200 000 or more per employee for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister as at 30 June 2006?

7. For the year between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006, will the minister list job title and total employment cost for each position with a total estimated cost of \$100 000 or more? Which has been abolished? Which has been created?

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

Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity
Conservation, \$81 993 000
Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land
and Biodiversity Conservation, \$16 111 000

Additional Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Freeman, Chief Executive.
Mr G. Knezevic, Chief Financial Officer.
Ms A. Barclay, Adviser, Minister's Office.
Mr P. O'Neill, Executive Director.
Mr P. Hoey, Executive Director.

The CHAIR: I declare the proposed payments open for examination. I refer members to the Budget Statement, in particular, Appendix C, page C.2, and the Portfolio Statement, Volume 3, Part 12, pages 12.44 to 12.71. I call on the minister to make a statement, if she wishes. I will then afford the same opportunity to the lead speaker for the opposition.

The CHAIR: Any information the minister undertakes to supply must be submitted by Friday 17 November 2006. Both the opposition and government are allowed 10 minutes for an opening statement. There will be a liberal approach to asking questions. Any member of the committee, at my discretion, will be allowed to ask a question. Importantly, all questions are to be directed to the minister and not her advisers and the minister may refer questions to an adviser for a response.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Over the past four years the government has moved closer to achieving the commitment we made to a system of integrated natural resource management, based on natural catchment boundaries. We put in place a regional network of natural resource management boards, prepared to drive landscape scale initiatives to enhance, develop and protect the state's resources with the active engagement of the irrigation community, rural towns, development industries and South Australians in general.

This participatory regional system is backed by strong legislation and a firm commitment to sustainably utilise the state's natural resources for the benefit of the entire community. We are implementing the governance tools and structures that all South Australians can access to better harness, manage and restore balance to their natural resources. In February 2006 the state NRM plan was launched. Subsequently agency staff have developed a project business plan, which was noted by the NRM Council at the August

2006 meeting. Implementation of the state NRM plan is under way and will be reviewed by June 2007, alongside the act. During the course of the year seven regional boards delivered the initial NRM plans, with the eighth to be considered shortly. In the coming year NRM boards will be working on comprehensive NRM plans, most of which will be finalised by 2009. Long-term regionally based community focused NRM planning is taking place.

The state government is investing in the management of natural resources and is finding partners at all levels of government and in the wider community. The flexible participation of commercial natural resource managers is a key element to integrated NRM. To facilitate good management we are giving developers and irrigators options in managing the natural resources they use. In the Upper South-East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Program in the 2005-06 financial year, consultation with landholders led to the development of a biodiversity offset scheme, allowing landholders to offset biodiversity in place of cash levy contributions. Current expressions of interest cover 11 000 hectares of native vegetation and wetlands. The South Australian government has also committed \$5.7 million over four years to establish River Murray forests, involving over 2.5 million native trees and shrubs. The community will have the opportunity to co-invest in this project.

The drought has emphasised the importance of water management to everyone. Managing water as a precious resource at all times has been a major objective throughout South Australian history and the last year has seen several practical on the ground initiatives to improve the sustainable development of our state's water resources. South Australia continues to extend the prescribed water resources areas of the state to allow for sustainable development of the state's resources.

In the past financial year the eastern and western Mount Lofty Ranges, an extended part of the Mallee, the Peake, Roby and Sherlock Wells areas were all prescribed in order to allow regional communities to develop water allocation plans to manage their resources. In addition, the Central Adelaide ground water area is undergoing public consideration for prescription. The Waterproofing Adelaide strategy, *A Thirst for Change 2005-2025*, was released in 2005. Seven of the 63 strategies have already been completed, including mandatory requirements for plumbing in rainwater tanks to new homes and passing water efficiency labelling and standards legislation.

As a next step, the agency has commenced the development of a project proposal for waterproofing South Australia. South Australia is a leader in stormwater reuse in the Adelaide region, currently capturing and using between 3 000 and 5 000 megalitres of stormwater each year. A key outcome for the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy is the increase in rainwater and stormwater use to about 20 000 megalitres per annum by 2025. South Australia has the highest per capita level of recycled water use in Australia, with 14 000 megalitres of recycled water reused each year.

By 2025 it is expected that recycled water use will increase to more than 30 000 megalitres per annum if Waterproofing Adelaide strategies are fully implemented. The 2006-07 DWLBC budget supports the department's commitment to manage this state's natural resources.

Membership:

Mr Venning substituted for Mr Pengilly.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Bignell): Does the member for Goyder wish to make an opening statement?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I will not make an opening statement. The member for Hammond will ask the first question.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer to Budget Paper 3, page 2.31 and the line 'savings initiatives—branched broomrape'. Deductions for 2006-07 are \$500 000; for 2007-08, \$750 000; 2008-09, \$1 million; and 2009-10, \$1 million. In 2006 only 360 hectares of branched broomrape infestations were treated in the eradication program. This is out of a quarantine area of 193 100 hectares with 572 infected paddocks. Considering the size of the quarantine area, should not the budget for eradication be increased, not decreased, as it takes 12 years to declare a paddock free from quarantine and the first paddocks are due for release in only 2011?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Broomrapes are recognised internationally as a serious weed. A group of countries, which include Australia's major commodity destinations, have zero tolerance to broomrape. Twenty per cent of the agriculture area in South Australia is at risk from branched broomrape infestation—1.2 per cent of the agriculture area is in the quarantine zone. The program aims to contain the weed within this zone. Paddocks where branched broomrape is found are placed in quarantine and must be managed to prevent the further emergence of branched broomrape.

The Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity is currently into the fifth year of a 10-year eradication program. This program uses fumigation and good farming practice as a strategy to eradicate broomrape. The eradication program will be followed by several years of monitoring to guard against germination of remnant seed. The program is long term because the seed bank, which is held in the soil, must be reduced to zero balance, and this takes approximately 12 years. The first paddocks will qualify for release from quarantine at the end of 2011. Experts from the Australian Weeds Committee assess the progress of the program annually for the Primary Industries Ministerial Council.

In 2005-06, 361 hectares were treated with methyl-bromide, pine oil and Basamid fumigates to destroy branched broomrape seed. Newly developed equipment worked well, but dry weather conditions halted fumigation with 90 per cent of the planned seed destruction completed. All properties have management plans for their infested paddocks. Indicators show that progress towards eradication is successful. The Primary Industries Ministerial Council approved the program and provided funding for the 2006-07 financial year.

The targets for 2006-07 are to maintain satisfactory progress to ensure PIMC funding of \$2.3 million per annum is approved until June 2009. Other steps involve engaging the industry to maintain support. We want the nine projects that comprise the program to achieve their milestones to support the overall aim that no branched broomrape will set seed, including:

- complete the spring market assurance and discovery survey;
- continue the works program to address infestations;
- ensure landholders act on their management plans;
- and continue research to a practical management options for landholders with a particular focus on eradicating branched broomrape in pastures.

Targeted savings will be made by reallocating work within the existing seed destruction project of the branched broomrape program so that reliance on more expensive fumigation techniques is reduced. Savings will be effected by:

- modifying the fumigation program with no further expansion of the use of methyl bromide (about \$20 000 per hectare), although it will continue to be used strategically on critical and small sites totalling 4 per cent of the seed destruction budget;
- replacing the expensive pine oil (\$9 800 per hectare) with the more effective Basamid on arable sites (\$2 200 per hectare); and
- implementing better application technology.

As you can see, we continue to have an aggressive eradication program.

Mr PEDERICK: Minister, you still have not answered the question. My question was: as only 360 hectares are included in the eradication program, when the measured area of branched broomrape is 6 439 hectares, I would consider that, to get an effective eradication program on track, it would be far better to ramp up the program and get the problem out of the way in a more efficient and timely way. However, I appreciate that methyl bromide has dropped out and that other items, such as Basamid and pine oil, are cheaper.

Mr PICCOLO: On a point of order, Mr Acting Chair, the question asked for an opinion not an examination of the cost of the program.

Mr PEDERICK: I asked whether the budget should be increased.

Mr PICCOLO: Again, Mr Acting Chair, that is asking for an opinion and not an examination of the expenditure itself.

The ACTING CHAIR: There is no point of order. I think that the minister will answer the question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The current program has been indicated to be very successful. As I have already said, it is a long-term program because of the life of the seed stock. It is a 10-year program, and the current allocated funding is considered adequate.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer again to Budget Paper 3, page 2.31, savings initiatives—branched broomrape. The \$500 000 deducted from the branched broomrape program this financial year is around 10 per cent of the normal annual budget for the program. The Branched Broomrape Community Focus Group has been informed that the \$500 000 will come straight off the eradication program. Will this irresponsible approach to the control and eradication of branched broomrape send a message to our federal and state partners that we are not serious about the program and they will pull their funding and put our exports at risk?

Mr PICCOLO: On a point of order, Mr Acting Chair, that is not a question; it is actually a comment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have already answered that question at some length. It is outrageous to suggest that these savings are irresponsible; in fact, it is quite the opposite. I have indicated how successful the eradication program has been to date and our commitment to the ongoing eradication of this parasite. We believe that the changes we have made to spending in the program will result in a far more efficient and effective use of very precious South Australian government resources.

The ACTING CHAIR: Thank you, minister. I think that the minister has answered the question several times.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.49. The performance commentary refers to the eight NRM boards that were established under the Natural Resources Management Act 2004. Will the minister provide the following information in relation to these boards: the total cost to the state government for the eight boards; outline the

savings gained by the changed structure from the three peak bodies to the eight individual boards; the total revenue raised from NRM levies on a region by region basis; the total federal government commitment to the NRM boards on a region by region basis; the number of employees of the boards and the remuneration they receive, again, on a region by region basis; and outline all new projects (as in 'on the ground' work) that have commenced or been completed since 1 July 2005?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Are these your questions on notice?

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, this one is not.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the member for his important questions. The regional NRM boards, through their regional investment strategies, are responsible for approving funding for 2006-07 and 2007-08 through the Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) and the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP). NHT funds are provided in cash by the Australian government and are matched in kind by the South Australian government. The NAP funds are 50 per cent state funded and 50 per cent commonwealth funded.

In July this year, the Australian and state governments approved 100 per cent of NHT and NAP funds for 2006-07 and initial funding for 2007-08, totalling over \$54 million for these two years. Of this \$54 million, just under \$36.6 million has been approved for 2006-07 through NAP (just under \$21.5 million) and NHT (just over \$15 million). This amount does not take into account additional state in-kind contributions provided by the state government to match the NHT cash. The activities funded for both years cover the whole spectrum of natural resource management issues, including coast, marine, biodiversity, capacity building, land management and water. All projects will support the delivery of the region's initial plans and also the state NRM plan under the NRM act.

In addition to the NHT and NAP funds, the state government also provides recurrent funding support to boards to both establish their governance arrangements and deliver on their initial plans. The state funds are collectively made up of those provided previously to the regional NRM boards' predecessors and an extra allocation of \$5.5 million over four years from 2004-05 to support the establishment of the boards. In 2006-07, the total state support to boards will be \$4.7 million, which supports the boards to deliver over \$60 million worth of projects.

The outcomes in 2005-06 are as follows. The Australian and state governments jointly invested a total of just over \$37 million in 2005-06 to support activities identified under regional investment strategies. Just over \$21½ million of NAP funds and just over \$15.5 million of NHT funds were jointly invested in 2005-06 to support activities identified under regional investment strategies. The State Natural Resources Management Council undertook the role to assess the 2006-07 regional investment strategies and to provide independent advice to the joint commonwealth-state steering committee.

For the remainder of 2006-07, the joint commonwealth-state steering committee will assess the progress of the NRM boards in relation to the NHT and NAP investments. The committee will work with the NRM boards to facilitate the development of their next investment strategy package for access to the remainder of 2007-08 NHT and NAP funds. A further almost \$11 million is yet to be allocated for 2007-08. Regions are now preparing their investment strategies for

consideration by the joint steering committee and recommendations to ministers in May 2007. The final year for both the NAP and NHT is 2007-08. The Australian government included a contingency in the 2006 budget for NRM program funding for two years (2008-09 and 2009-10), and the NRM Ministerial Council indicated support for future NRM programs and will consider a proposal at its 24 November 2006 meeting in New Zealand.

Overall, the regional funding amounts in total will decline in 2007-08, compared with 2006-07. This decline will have minimal impact as the majority of the NRM boards are behind in the expenditure for NHT and NAP-funded activities already approved. The majority of the 2006-07 NHT and NAP funds were allocated to regional projects within the pre-approved allocation to each regional NRM board. Most of the remainder was allocated to regions through a competitive element entitled the 'strategic reserve'. Of the NAP funds approved in 2006-07, just over \$20 million was the total of the pre-approved regional allocations and \$265 000 was allocated to regions through the competitive strategic reserve.

An amount of \$845 000 was allocated to the Centre for Natural Resource Management for research-related activities. Of the NHT funds approved in 2006-07, just over \$14 million related to the pre-approved regional allocations and just over \$1 million was allocated to regions through the competitive strategic reserve. The \$54 million approved for expenditure over 2006-07 and 2007-08 includes an initial approved allocation to regions of nearly \$18 million of both NAP and NHT funds for 2007-08.

I am pleased to say that, given the complexity of these questions, in relation to levies the regional Natural Resources Management (NRM) levy is obviously not a new levy, as we know; it is a new name for a contribution South Australian ratepayers have been making for many years through their catchment levies and/or animal and plant control, general rate revenue contributions from local government. The regional NRM levy is collected by local councils on behalf of regional NRM boards and will appear as a separate line on council rate notices.

Regional NRM levy funding will be used to implement the regional NRM board's programs set out in their initial plans. The initial plans consolidate the existing plans of the previous NRM bodies in each region, including programs for catchment management, soil conservation and animal and plant control. The proposal for each regional NRM levy is set out in the relevant initial plan.

On adoption of each initial plan the regional NRM levy proposal contained in that plan was referred to the Natural Resources Committee of parliament. The committee resolved not to object to any of the levy proposals for 2006-07. The Governor subsequently determined council contributions to each NRM board on 8 June 2006 and councils are now in the process of sending out rate notices that include the regional NRM levy as a separate item.

In each region the total amount to be contributed via the regional NRM levy is equivalent to the amount previously contributed for animal and plant control, and the catchment levy increased by CPI of 3 per cent, plus an allowance for the estimated costs that will be claimed by councils for raising and collecting the levy. The basis for dividing the regional NRM levy between councils was determined by the NRM boards as part of each initial plan and varies, depending on their assessment of what would be equitable for the ratepayers.

Councils were consulted about the shares of the regional NRM levy proposed prior to the shares being forwarded to the Governor for approval and, of course, a flier has been provided to local councils to enable its distribution with council rate notices, should councils elect to do so. This has also occurred in all NRM regions where a regional NRM levy is being collected, except in parts of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges. Previously, under the Water Resources Act 1997, people who paid a water levy were not required to pay a catchment levy in the prescribed areas located in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges (including the North Adelaide Plains prescribed wells area), Eyre Peninsula and south-east NRM regions.

This was because both levies were funding water management programs, undertaken by the catchment water management boards. This exemption no longer applies because the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 (the NRM Act) does not provide for an exemption from the regional NRM levy for persons holding a water licence. This is because licensed water users also need to contribute towards the range of NRM activities undertaken by the boards, including animal and plant control work, as well as towards management of the water resources.

In terms of each of the boards, as asked in respect of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges regional NRM levy, the total amount to be contributed by the regional NRM levy for 2006-07 is \$12 711 402. I think the programs were requested as well, so I am happy to list those. The regional NRM levy will provide funding for the following programs in the Mount Lofty Ranges region:

- a water allocation plan for the long-term protection of water supplies in the western Mount Lofty Ranges;
- advice and financial assistance to landholders to restore our rivers and remnant native vegetation;
- regional strategies to protect primary production and biodiversity from pest animals and plants;
- projects to improve stormwater management and flood mitigation;
- caring for our coast, estuaries and marine environments;
- monitoring the condition of our natural resources; and
- development of a regional NRM plan.

For the AW (Alinytjara Wilurara) NRM region there was no levy collected.

The Eyre Peninsula regional NRM levy for 2006-07 was \$971 781, and the programs include:

- mapping and controlling weeds and revegetation;
- integrated pest management programs, including rabbit and fox control;
- asparagus weeds control program (bridal creeper);
- monitoring of regional wetlands, including 11 wetlands of national significance;
- education for school students and landholders through community field days and workshops;
- proclaimed weed and plant identification;
- development of a regional NRM plan; and
- supporting regional development through planning and management for sustainable water supplies;

The Kangaroo Island regional NRM levy for 2006-07 is \$44 089. The programs include:

- Building a Sustainable Future—on-ground works to promote biodiversity, manage water quality and reduce salinity and groundwater recharge;
- Repel the Invaders—

Mr GRIFFITHS: Mr Chair, I have a point of order. I appreciate the great detail being provided by the minister, but

my question related more to the revenue raised by the regions, not actually the projects that they are undertaking.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am reading out the levies that are collected. I believe that you also were wanting information on the projects. You did ask for the projects.

Mr GRIFFITHS: From 1 July 2005.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Yes. I am listing them for you. I am answering the specifics of the question that you asked me.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Thank you.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Where was I up to? Perhaps I had better start at the top of the list.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Let us not encourage the minister.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I think I got to around repel the invaders—repel, I beg your pardon. We are not repealing them; we are repelling them. The list continues:

- Repel the Invaders—managing, controlling and eradicating pests and preventing new pests from becoming established;
- Rivers of Life—developing a regional water management plan to facilitate the sustainable use of water resources;
- Island Refuge—monitoring the condition of biodiversity assets and threats to inform best practice management of biodiversity.
- Fahrenheit 451—promoting biodiversity and protecting assets through the implementation of fire management plans in high risk areas;
- Back from the Brink—managing the recovery of threatened species, such as the Glossy Black Cockatoo, and threatened plants;
- Oceans of Blue—monitoring coasts, estuarine and marine systems to detect changes in their condition and respond to threats; and
- development of a regional NRM plan.

In relation to the Northern and Yorke regional NRM levy for 2006-07 the amount is \$760 402, and the programs include:

- regional strategies to protect primary production and biodiversity from pest plants and animals;
- land and conservation management—working with landholders to improve the sustainability of their soils and farming systems;
- development of a regional NRM plan; and
- support for investigations into water resources sustainability in the region.

In relation to the South Australian Arid Lands regional NRM levy, there is no levy for that region; however, the programs include dingo management and working towards the development of a regional NRM plan.

In relation to the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin regional NRM levy for 2006-07, the amount is \$1 042 599. Programs include:

- pest plant control—including biological control of salvation jane, horehound and bridal creeper;
- pest animal control—including foxes, rabbits, goats, pigs, deer and other feral animals;
- flow management—working with community groups to improve flood plain and wetland management;
- developing land and water management plans and helping to address salinity issues;
- land and soil conservation management—working with landholders to improve the sustainability of their soils and farming systems;

- helping local government address stormwater and waste water issues to improve the equality of water entering streams and rivers;
 - funding training programs to help irrigators improve their water use efficiency and on-farm operations to reduce environmental impacts; and
 - the development of a regional NRM plan.
- Finally, the South-East regional NRM levy for 2006-07 is \$1.092 million. Their programs include:
- protecting and managing Mosquito Creek, Bool Lagoon and its downstream ecosystems;
 - protecting our agricultural ecosystems by control of pest plants and animals, like foxes and rabbits;
 - involving people in protecting our natural resources with programs such as Landcare, Waterwatch and Blue Lake WaterCare;
 - protecting our water resources by promoting profitable and innovative irrigation;
 - helping communities like Tintinara and Coonalpyn tackle pressing problems like salinity;
 - scientific research into issues such as forestry, water use and salinity to bring certainty to industry while safeguarding water and wetlands; and
 - developing a regional NRM plan.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I admit to having learnt a valuable lesson then, Mr Chair. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.4, and the workforce summary. This table shows that between the 2004-05 actual and 2005-06 estimated results there is an increase of 29 full-time equivalent staff going to the department, and that between the 2005-06 estimated result and the 2006-07 budget estimate a further 21 full-time equivalent staff are going into the department. Can the minister provide a breakdown of the increase in each of those years and advise to which branches of the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation they apply?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: DWLBC estimates that around 540 FTEs will be employed in the department at 30 June 2007 compared with 519 FTEs at 30 June 2006. The slight increase in FTEs reflects the additional staff being employed in the department for new projects being funded under the National Water Initiative and the Murray-Darling Basin initiative. In terms of the question as to where they will occur in the agencies, predominantly, those positions will be in knowledge and information, but any further details other than that I will need to take on notice.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I presume our time remaining is still only 18 minutes. I have quite a few questions on notice. Shall I read them now?

The CHAIR: Are they the omnibus questions, or other questions?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Not the omnibus questions.

The CHAIR: You have until 3.45 for completion. So go until then and see how many you have gone through, and then ask again.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I think it will take me that long to read all my questions on notice into the record.

The CHAIR: Well, question the minister until then.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.58, the income statement and shared services reforms across government. Can the minister outline the baseline costs for the provision of corporate services in the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation? The baseline costs are to include the current total cost of the provision of payroll, finance, human resources, procurement records, management and information technology services.

Can the minister also include the number of full-time equivalent staffing numbers involved?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: DWLBC retained services through the Department of Administrative and Information Services through a series of service level agreements which cost around \$3.5 million per annum, and the department employs only a very few staff in those expert areas, which are not available through the service level agreements.

Mr PEDERICK: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.59: total equity. Will the minister provide details of why DWLBC equity has fallen from the budget figure of \$72.764 million in 2005-06 to \$54.102 million in 2006-07?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: One of the main reasons for the decrease in retained earnings was due to a purchase of water during 2005-06 that had to be met from existing funds. That was the main cause for that decrease.

Mr GRIFFITHS: For the purpose of the record I will read in our omnibus questions, as follows:

1. For all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what is the estimated or actual level of under-expenditure for 2005-06, has cabinet already approved any carry-over expenditure in 2006-07 and, if so, how much?

2. In the financial year 2004-05, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs was not approved by cabinet for carry-over expenditure in 2005-06?

3. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, how many surplus employees are there as at 30 June 2006 and, for each surplus employee, what is the title or classification of the employee and the total employment cost?

4. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors in 2005-06 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant or contractor, the cost, work undertaken and method of appointment.

5. Will the minister please provide a detailed breakdown for each of the forward estimate years of the specific administration measures as listed in Budget Paper 3, Chapter 2, 'Expenditure', which will lead to a reduction in operating costs in the portfolio?

6. What was the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more per employee and the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$200 000 or more per employee for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister as at 30 June 2006? Between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006 will the minister list job title and total employment costs for each position with a total estimated cost of \$100 000 which (a) has been abolished and (b) has been created?

I will now read in for the record questions on notice, as follows:

Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.3. Will the minister please explain the almost \$5 million cut in the cost of providing services from the 2004-05 actual figure of \$91.987 million to the 2006-07 budget figure of \$86.075 million?

Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.52, 'Performance commentary'. Will the minister please give details of the biodiversity offset management agreements that have been executed under the biodiversity offset scheme? How many landholders have applied to the biodiversity offset scheme? How many of these applications have been assessed? How much of the land assessed under these applications was found to have no biodiversity value? How many landholders have not paid drainage levies? Is the government, as a result of the

drought, considering an extension of time for landholders to pay the levy? When will the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation have a fully functional adaptive management plan for the whole South-East drainage network?

Has any allowance been made in the forward estimates for the implementation of an adaptive management plan? What will the budget impact be on the project bringing water north from drain M to drain E into the U scheme? Is the minister satisfied that all landholders along the proposed alignment of drains yet to be constructed have been consulted and are happy with the negotiations with the department?

Budget Paper 3, page 2.31, 'Savings and expenditure initiatives.' I note the department's savings initiative on the branched broomrape program of \$500 000 in the 2006-07 budget growing to \$1 million in the 2009-10 forward estimates. Has branched broomrape been eradicated as per the Rann government's agreement 'Compact for good government' with the former member for Hammond and does the minister expect it to be eradicated by 2009-10? If branched broomrape has not been eradicated, why has this program been cut? Do the savings from this program reflect that pine oil is being used over a smaller total area, rather than methyl bromide over a larger area? How many staff will be retrenched or redeployed as a result of this savings initiative?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have already provided an answer to that question.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.45 and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation target to hold the inaugural state NRM conference. Will the minister give details of the conference and indicate what its cost will be? I refer to the target further down the page concerning the progression of the review of irrigation legislation. Will the minister please give details of the review? What are the outcomes that the department hopes to achieve from this review? Have the volumetric conversions of water licences been completed? When does the government plan to charge irrigators for water taken from underground and surface water sources?

I refer to the further target of continuing implementation of the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy and the 2005-06 highlights stating the completion of seven strategies. Will the minister give details of all projects initiated by this government since 2002, not including the effluent reuse schemes at Virginia and McLaren Vale, both initiatives of the federal Liberal government, and the aquifer storage and recovery project at Salisbury, also funded by the federal Liberal government?

I refer to the target of finalising the scope of the Waterproofing South Australia initiative and preparing an implementation program, including a community engagement process. Can the minister outline which components of the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy are to be scoped? Will the minister outline the proposed implementation program? I refer to the 2005-06 highlight of on-ground rehabilitation of the Lower Murray reclaimed irrigation area commencement in 17 of the 21 irrigation areas. When will this rehabilitation be completed, and when will the four remaining areas be rehabilitated?

I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.42, cash flows statement and to the footnotes regarding the Murray Mallee Partnership transfer. Will the minister give details of the purpose for which the transfer was agreed, and give details also of the agreement made with the Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment? How has the

agreement benefited and what are the expected future benefits of the agreement for South Australia?

I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.48, summary income statement and to 'Natural resources management: other expenses. Will the minister give details of the 'other' budget line by specifying items and their amounts included in the 2006-07 budgeted amount, the 2005-06 estimated result, the 2005-06 budgeted amount, and the 2004-05 actual result for 'other' expenses? Why has the cost of supplies and services risen by \$12 million from the 2005-06 budgeted amount of \$18.8 million to the 2006-07 budgeted amount of \$30.8 million? I draw your attention to the commonwealth revenue income, further down the summary income statement. Will the minister please explain why commonwealth revenue increased by \$2.45 million from the 2005-06 budgeted amount of \$113 000 to the 2005-06 estimated result of \$2.5 million?

I refer to Budget Paper 3, page 3.6. I note the introduction of charges to provide for technical and scientific support to the natural resource management boards. This is expected to provide revenue of \$400 000 in 2007-08, \$400 000 in 2008-09, and \$800 000 in 2009-10. How will this revenue be achieved with the introduction of charges for the provision of technical and scientific support to natural resource management boards; which boards will receive additional support, or will offices located within the department provide support to all NRM boards; and will the charges be funded out of increased NRM levies?

In Budget Paper 3, page 3.6, I note the increase in projected revenue for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation by \$300 000 in 2007-08, \$300 000 in 2008-09, and \$1 million in 2009-10. How much unallocated water does the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation own? Who will this unallocated water be sold to, at what price will it be sold and at what price was the water purchased?

I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.68, Income Statement—Administered Items. I note that the decrease in operating expenditure of \$11.6 million between the 2005-06 estimated result and the 2006-07 budget includes various decreases in expenditure. Can the minister please provide explanations for the decreases in expenditure in the following areas: expenditure associated with the NRM boards, formerly Mount Lofty Ranges INRM group; expenditure for the Natural Heritage Trust program; expenditure associated with the Centre for Natural Resource Management; and expenditure for the National Action Plan for the salinity and water quality program?

I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.59, Balance Sheet. Will the minister explain why the cash and cash equivalent was budgeted in 2005-06 at \$31.66 million, however the estimated result for 2005-06 is \$8.214 million? What has happened to the \$23.446 million in the 2005-06 budget? I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.58, Income Statement. Will the minister provide details of the \$13 million increase in the general supplies and services from \$37.612 million in 2005 to \$50.375 million in 2006-07?

Referring to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.67, Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation financial commentary, will the minister explain why there has been a reduction of \$300 000 in expenditure for River Murray Mouth boating access? Will there be a need to review the dredging program as a result of the drought?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will make a brief statement. Several of the questions that the member has asked are

outside of my portfolio responsibilities. I am happy to provide answers to those areas that are relevant to my portfolio responsibilities.

The CHAIR: Minister, if questions are not relevant to your portfolio, you do not have to respond to them. The ones that are relevant to your portfolio, the same rules apply as to the other questions. You can take them on notice.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you, Mr Chair.

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

Membership:

Ms Chapman substituted for Mr Griffiths

The CHAIR: I read the following communication I have received as the Chair of Estimates Committee B:

Chair, Estimates B

Dear Chair,

I refer to my statement during Estimates Committee B on 23 October 2006 as follows: 'I remind the member that his party was in government for eight years and offered no payroll tax relief during that entire period.' I have since been advised that this statement is incorrect and, therefore, request that the *Hansard* record be amended accordingly.

Yours sincerely,
Karlene Maywald
Minister for Small Business
25 October 2006.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Chair, do I understand for the purposes of the committee there is to be a correction from one committee to another? The minister may have made that statement yesterday, but my understanding of the position is that it has to be done either in the committee period or, alternatively, in the open parliament as a matter of personal explanation. I seek clarification on that ruling before we start this committee.

The CHAIR: I understand your point. However, the minister has sought clarification from the Speaker and the Clerk. The advice she has received is that she can do it in this committee process. Given that she made the statement in committee B, at her earliest opportunity she has forwarded the correction.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will seek clarification. Perhaps it would be appropriate that there be some reference by the Speaker to the parliament. I know that in other committees in which I have participated during the course of estimates, some other members have wished to correct the record. In fact, I recall that one of the ministers was advised that on that occasion he could not make that statement.

The CHAIR: That was me to minister Hill. Amazingly, I was wrong. That was in relation to a question relating to a budget line which had been closed. This is in relation to a statement made by the minister. She has since reflected upon it and found it to be incorrect. In order not to insult or mislead the house she has come back at the earliest opportunity to correct the record. What minister Hill was trying to do was give a response to a question that he took on notice at a later period during a different line. They are similar, but they are different. Perhaps when the member for Bragg has a bit more experience in the chamber she will understand these subtle differences.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you for your experienced advice, Mr Chair. I will remember that subtle difference the next time.

Department of Health, \$1 638 252 000
Administered Items for the Department of Health,
\$278 000

Departmental Advisers:

Dr T. Sherbon, Chief Executive, Department of Health.
Mr C. Bernardi, Deputy Director, Financial Services,
Department of Health.

Dr J. Brayley, Director, Mental Health Policy, Department of Health.

Mr D. Exton, Director, Asset Services, Department of Health.

Mr K. Evans, Executive Director, Drug and Alcohol Services of SA, Department of Health.

Ms M. Mills, Ministerial Coordinator, Office of the Chief Executive, Department of Health.

The CHAIR: I declare the proposed payments reopened for examination. I refer members to the Budget Statement, in particular, Appendix C, page C.2, and the Portfolio Statement, Volume 2, part 7. Does the minister have an opening statement?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Yes, I do. The budget continues to build on the increased investment that this government has made since coming to office and takes health funding to record levels. It sets a strong base not only for 2006-07 but also for the next four years. As Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, I am strongly committed to ensuring that South Australia's mental health system is transformed and meets the needs of our community. We are continuing to develop infrastructure and provide new and better services in ways that support greater opportunities and choices for mental health and substance abuse consumers.

In terms of infrastructure, this government is committed to the provision of new purpose-built facilities as well as updating existing facilities. In 2006-07, this government will provide \$17.9 million in capital works plus an additional \$9 million for the commencement of works as part of the stage B redevelopment at Lyell McEwin Health Service. The Glenside campus will retain a continued and significant role in the provision of mental health services in South Australia. After listening to rural and regional communities, we made an election commitment to retain rural and remote services at Glenside and, as part of the 2006-07 budget, we have allocated \$5.5 million to upgrade the Rural and Remote Unit.

A number of our adult acute services are being transferred from Glenside to our public hospitals so that people can be treated closer to where they live. The Margaret Tobin Centre at the Flinders Medical Centre and the new facility at the Repatriation General Hospital have been purpose built for this reason.

Funding of \$14.5 million has been allocated to provide 60 beds in three community rehabilitation centres across Adelaide over the next 18 months. These centres will provide intensive residential rehabilitation to people to help them recover from mental illness so they can return to independent lives in the community. Also included in the forward capital plan are new forensic and secure rehabilitation centres. The approved total project cost for these centres is \$30.5 million, with \$16.5 million allocated for the forensic facility and \$14 million for the secure rehabilitation facility. The budget also provides funding for the new GP shared care initiative and new Healthy Young Minds program.

Under the GP shared care initiative, 30 allied health workers such as psychologists, occupational therapists, nurse

practitioners and social workers will provide much needed support, information and referral services for our GPs. They will be located in community mental health teams in metropolitan and country areas but will provide services at GP clinics. The budget for this initiative over the next four years is \$9.7 million, and it is proposed that services will commence in April 2007. The Healthy Young Minds program has been designed to provide more early intervention services for children and young people to reduce the social, health and economic impact of mental illness. The budget for this new service is \$10.2 million over the next four years, and it is proposed that services will also commence in April 2007.

This program includes 20 new community outreach services and three psychiatrists for children in adolescent mental health services, two specialist mental health workers and a consultant psychiatrist. The Emergency Mental Health Service at the Women's and Children's Hospital has also received funding to extend their service from 18 hours a day to 24 hours, a seven day service for children and young people in crisis. Across the state, rainfall during the last winter has been either below average or the lowest on record, which has impacted on our farming communities. Across government services are being provided to assist our rural communities, including one-on-one in person counselling and telephone counselling. The government has set up a free drought information hotline to assist in this regard.

The government is also working on providing extra resources to health workers and GPs, and has funded a reprint of the popular resource book called *Taking care of you and your family*: 16 000 extra copies have now been printed and made available free of charge. The reduction of psychological distress has been identified as a key priority in South Australia's Strategic Plan. Some of the things that can make a difference include suicide prevention plans, depression awareness and broad strategies to improve mental health services in primary and specialist care. In collaboration with the commonwealth government and the SA Divisions of General Practice, a suicide prevention model is currently being trialled, which involves coordinated assessment, early intervention and support for people at risk or self-harm or suicide through partnerships between GPs, mental health and community services, drug and alcohol services, emergency services, community organisations and community members.

On 14 July 2006, the Prime Minister, premiers and chief ministers released a national action plan for mental health. This plan emphasises coordination and collaboration between government, private and non-government providers to deliver a seamless and connected care system, so that people with mental illness are able to participate in the community. The commonwealth has agreed to spend \$1.9 billion nationally over five years as part of the COAG package. South Australia's contribution included in the COAG plan was approximately \$116.2 million over four years, including an estimated \$50.1 million in new funding over that period, as well as previously announced recent initiatives in mental health.

After finalising the budget before this house, I am advised that new funding of \$50.8 million over the next four years will fund the GP shared care and Healthy Young Minds initiative, an expansion of the successful home visiting program, Every Chance For Every Child, early childhood development centres and transition to a new model of care for the new facilities opening at the Repat General Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. I am pleased to say that the total amount of new funding that South Australia has committed over the next four years to matching the commonwealth's

mental health initiatives is now \$50.8 million. This is slightly more than the \$50.1 million that we put to COAG earlier this year. Soon we will have proposed new mental health legislation out for consultation that will affirm the rights, dignities and civil liberties of mental health consumers and their carers, and balance these rights with the community's legitimate expectations that it be protected from harm. New legislation will assist in the achievement of object 2 of South Australia's Strategic Plan, and the target of reducing the level of psychological distress in the state will promote a more responsive and consumer-focused mental health system.

A master plan is being developed to ensure that the Glenside campus becomes a precinct for best practice care for vulnerable people. The government is working closely with key stakeholders, and the Social Inclusion Board is consulting extensively with mental health consumers, carers and service providers across government and non-government sectors. The Social Inclusion Board expects to complete its advice for government by December 2006. We know that drug and alcohol use accounts for a large part of the health, social and economic costs of our society; that is why we are focusing on reducing the prevalence of risky drinking in South Australia. Achieving this will require a whole-of-government and community approach.

In regard to smoking, one of the targets in South Australia's Strategic Plan is to reduce the percentage of young people who smoke tobacco by 10 per cent in 10 years. To achieve this we will be guided by the South Australian Tobacco Control Strategy 2005-2010. The South Australian Tobacco Control Strategy also includes a strong focus on addressing the needs of people who are particularly vulnerable to higher levels of tobacco use. Some of these measures include banning smoking in cars when children under the age of 16 years are present, restricting point-of-sale displays, increasing tobacco licence fees, and increasing the number of penalties in the Tobacco Products Regulation Act 1997 that can be expiated. We have already banned fruit flavoured cigarettes.

As part of our 2006 election commitments, the government will consolidate three major drug and alcohol clinical services on the Glenside campus. This new facility will enable better service delivery to the community and an integrated facility. This government is planning a substance abuse facility for the APY lands, which will be jointly funded by the state and commonwealth governments. A site for the new facility has been chosen in consultation with the traditional owners and a mobile outreach service has already commenced. This service offers assessment and intervention for substance users as well as providing support to local communities.

Addressing issues related to co-morbidity is a key factor in improving the overall health and wellbeing of many people with mental illness. A policy on co-morbidity is currently being developed between Drug and Alcohol Services and our mental health services. This policy is supported by seven new drug and alcohol workers who will focus on co-morbidity issues and working within health regions. In addition, 2.5 FTEs have been recruited to work on co-morbidity issues across the Adelaide metropolitan area with GPs, Assessment and Crisis Intervention Service teams and emergency department staff. This government is committed to improving mental health services, improving the mental health and wellbeing of all South Australians, and limiting the damages of substance abuse. This commitment is demonstrated in the priorities for funding outlined in the budget package.

Ms CHAPMAN: From listening to this, one could be forgiven for believing that the minister is looking at one set of budget papers on mental health and the rest of the world is looking at another. The South Australian Chair of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, Dr James Hundertmark, said ‘the government had come through with pre-election commitments only and had missed an ideal opportunity to show its true mental health credentials by immediately injecting substantial funding into the mental health system’. He continued:

The gaps in our mental health system affect the care available to consumers and impact on the resilience of hard working mental health workers every day. While the government has made some promising moves in the mental health area in recent times, the lack of a solid financial commitment is concerning.

Mr Geoff Harris, Executive Director of the Mental Health Coalition of SA, whom I presume to be one of the willing stakeholders referred to by the minister, said:

The State’s plan for mental health is still unclear and there is no follow-up of the one-off \$25m allocation that was announced in the previous budget. The lack of a comprehensive plan for mental health in this State continues to hold back momentum towards real reform.

The opposition’s position is that the budget has largely ignored the crisis in mental health. This is the budget which has stalled the mental health reform agenda. There are very low levels of funding for non-government mental health services—now only 2 per cent of mental health funding. The non-government sector has been lobbying for a continued commitment to mental health reform which seems to shift away from hospital-based services. Everyone agrees on that, but the money is not there. They were hopeful, at the very least, that the government’s \$25 million one-off payment would be made recurrent, but no such commitment has been made.

There are now concerns that service providers will be unable to make long-term provision and, particularly in light of the COAG agreement, this is very concerning when there is so much money from the federal government sitting on the table. Nearly every current capital works project in the health portfolio is running behind schedule and/or is over budget, but at least they are still being delivered. I am sure the Hon. Lea Stevens was devastated to read this budget after her extensive speeches at the 2004 budget estimates and the announcement of a number of projects that have completely disappeared. Not only have they not been built, they now have no funding whatsoever.

I refer to the \$7 million for the Boylan Ward/Helen Mayo mental health facility, listed in the 2005-06 budget, which does not rate a mention. The \$6.5 million Noarlunga Hospital mental health unit, listed in the 2005-06 budget, has been completely dropped from this year’s budget. The cost of the Margaret Tobin mental health unit at Flinders has blown out from approximately \$14 million to \$17.2 million. Ultimately the penny might drop for this government that, when you delay projects, ultimately they cost more and that leaves less money for much needed services in this area.

In this era we are hearing repeatedly about primary health, chronic disease management and mental health—the three areas of health reform. We have heard it from Menadue and from experts all around the country. We have heard it from the Mental Health Council of Australia, the minister and the opposition, and it is generally agreed amongst the parliamentary representation in this parliament that they are all important things that need to be addressed. We have to do two things: fix what we have, and look at these other areas

of health that are absolutely necessary to ensure that our health system does not collapse, yet the government’s two major health projects are cancelled altogether.

Additionally, the Lyell McEwin Hospital redevelopment, the last of the stages, to build a major mental health facility has been axed from 65 to 50 beds. It is not acceptable to leave the 15 rural people, who would otherwise have been relocated from the Glenside site to the new facility (just as the southern suburbs have gone to the Margaret Tobin Centre), and to simply say, ‘We will freshen up the premises at Glenside; you guys from the country can stay there, but everyone else is deserving of a new facility.’ The opposition has consistently supported rehabilitation and some mental health services being mainstreamed into public hospitals and general hospitals, but to start to discriminate between country and metropolitan areas is unacceptable and an insult to those who are also in high demand. As I have said in another committee, every four days a male person in the country is attempting or actually committing suicide. It is simply alarming that we continue to have this discrimination against country people.

I thank the Hon. Dean Brown for his initiative that has come to fruition in the past few months—the Repatriation General Hospital facility and the Margaret Tobin Centre. These facilities are magnificent. It is a shame, when we come to consider mental health, that we still have projects that are left-overs from the last administration and that we are not getting on with those that were to be announced by this administration but have since been cancelled. There could hardly be a person in South Australia who would not be affected in some way by mental health issues: either personally suffering from a mental health disability in their lifetime or having a member of their family suffer and their being expected to provide personal and financial support to the best of their ability.

There are students and teachers in the classroom experiencing an anxiety or panic attack, which is obviously disruptive to the education system. Someone who may be at an ATM in the street may be approached by a person whose actions cause members of the general public to scatter and avoid that person. We have the disturbing situation at emergency departments in our hospitals where staff and patients are at risk as a result of mental health, drug and alcohol issues. The most alarming situation, but fortunately the most limited in number, involves those people who escape from a secure facility and create fear in the community.

The Glenside section of the Royal Adelaide Hospital is in my electorate and is bordered by a school and an aged care facility. It is an alarming situation, even within our secure facilities, which fortunately have to deal with only a small number of people in the community who suffer from mental health problems. These facilities are very important in terms of the safety and fear level of members of the community. It is also very important to ensure that this situation is covered as we try to redress the shockingly inadequate provision for community health services by administering treatment on a community basis as distinct from institutional care. They are very important issues.

The other matter relates to the appointment of Commissioner Cappo. I noted with interest his appointment and the payment the government is giving to him to provide advice to the government on mental health. I am not quite sure who is in charge now, but I find it very puzzling that Commissioner Cappo would be appointed to conduct a major review into mental health in this state (with the advice and support of his Social Inclusion Board), as well as the redevelopment of the

site at Glenside, which is due for completion in December this year.

On the other hand, we have an announcement in this budget of the relocation of Drug and Alcohol Services to the Glenside site, which has been proceeded with without Commissioner Cappelletti's report. If there has been some other report or some other consideration by the Social Inclusion Board as to its support of the relocation of Drug and Alcohol Services to the site, or if there has been some interim or advance report, not only would we like to hear about it but preferably we would even like to see it.

This leaves open the question: why is it that, for the government to move on any serious redevelopment of the Glenside site in terms of its future as part of the mental health services in this state, the Glenside site must wait months and be delayed; yet, on the face of it, there can be relocation of another major area of responsibility in relation to drug and alcohol management without the Commissioner's advice or recommendation? They are the puzzling inconsistencies, and one must ask whether he is just trotted out as an excuse to delay something when the government is not prepared, is not ready or is uninterested in making a commitment to the capital funding and redevelopment of this site as an integral part of mental health.

When it suits the government it says that we must wait for his advice and report. When it does not suit the government it simply makes the announcement. That is an inconsistency which I find extremely puzzling and of great concern and for which the government ought to be making some provision. With respect to the stakeholders I have already quoted, I note the lack of genuine commitment that is necessary to bring about the important initiatives that have been agreed at the COAG meetings. These are meetings between the federal and state government ministers. Ministers at both the federal and state level have met and agreed upon this.

It has been an important base of the Premier's announcements in the last six or seven months, yet, from the state's point of view, there is inadequate funding to make that work. That is alarming because we have a situation where the Treasurer has signed off on mental health funding, which is inadequate to provide for all that has been committed to under the imprimatur of the Premier no less. To be frank, I feel a little sorry for the Minister for Mental Health. It seems as though she has been skinned dry in the whole budget. If the minister comes to this committee and feels that she is advancing with great achievement in this area, then she is under quite a delusion about what is really required given the stakeholders in this area and the statements they have made.

My first question refers to Budget Paper 1, page 11. Will the minister advise the committee of the recurrent funding base for 2006-07, that is, excluding the capital and one-off funding commitments; what budget allowances have been made for potential reforms arising from Commissioner Cappelletti's report, which is due out next month and which, in his own words, aims for a 'total transformation of mental health services'; and what percentage increase is that from the 2005-06 budget?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: As has already been put very clearly on the public record, the Commissioner for Social Inclusion, Monsignor David Cappelletti, is chairing a reference into mental health looking at the transformation of our public mental health system in South Australia. We have made it very clear that that report will not be delivered until December this year, so full consideration of any of implications that might come from that report cannot be considered

until after that time. However, in relation to budgets for designated mental health services that have not been finalised by the health regions and health units, these are expected shortly.

The 2006-07 budget provides additional funding of \$19.936 million over four years for the GP Shared Care and Healthy Young Minds initiatives. These will result in the recruitment of an additional 56 mental health professionals. The 2006-07 budget for the GP Shared Care program is \$.744 million and \$.874 million for the Healthy Young Minds program. The capital works budget for 2006-07 is \$17.9 million for projects such as three community rehabilitation centres and a rural and remote facility at Glenside, to name just a few. A further \$9 million has been allocated to the Lyell McEwin Hospital redevelopment, which includes facilities for acute and aged mental health services. We expect that these initiatives will be consistent with any findings of the Social Inclusion report into mental health.

Ms CHAPMAN: Minister, how do you know that they will be consistent with the report if you have not yet seen it? It will not be finished until December. Have you been given an advanced draft?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I work very closely with Monsignor Cappelletti, and we meet just about fortnightly. We consult regularly, and he keeps me well informed of the progress of his work. In line with his thinking and the considerations he has discussed with me, I believe that these initiatives will accord with the report's considerations. However, clearly, I am not a mind reader. As we have announced, the report will not be forthcoming until December this year. As I have said previously, budgetary considerations in relation to that report will be considered in future budget cycles.

Ms CHAPMAN: Has Commissioner Cappelletti given you a recommendation in relation to the relocation of the drug and alcohol facility to the Glenside site? If so, what is it? If he has not, why has he not been consulted? Is it his view or just that of the inclusion board?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: In relation to the consolidation of drug and alcohol services at the Glenside site, this has been an initiative that has been considered for a number of years. Due to the physical state of the building in which some of these services are currently located, and also in an attempt to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of those services, the consolidation of the drug and alcohol services at the Glenside site was announced as an election commitment at the last election. I have discussed our election commitment with Monsignor Cappelletti, and he is very supportive of such a consolidation of services.

Ms CHAPMAN: In order to clarify that, minister, do I take it, then, that that is his personal view, or has his board considered it and given you a recommendation to that effect?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am not aware of any board recommendation in relation to that matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: Minister, given that the Glenside Hospital site has not otherwise had any proposal for redevelopment—in fact, we have had an indication that that will not occur until Monsignor Cappelletti's report—why is it then that you have proceeded with the consolidation of drug and alcohol services on the site before there has been any major decision about the total redevelopment of the site?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have already answered that question. I have stated that the consideration of the consolidation of those services commenced a number of years ago, before the reference of Monsignor Cappelletti and the Social

Inclusion Board. It was made in light of the condition of the buildings from which the services are currently being provided and consideration of improved efficiencies.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is the 24-bed North Glen Rehabilitation Unit at the Glenside site of the Royal Adelaide Hospital going to close in June 2007 and, if so, where will those patients be placed?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government is committed to the Glenside campus retaining a significant role in mental health service provision. Glenside will complement community mental health services and those provided in mainstream acute hospitals. Many adult acute services will transfer from Glenside to purpose-built mental health facilities in public hospitals so that people can be treated closer to their communities and receive high quality care for physical and mental health problems.

A number of beds have been transferred from Glenside to new facilities at the Margaret Tobin Centre and the Repatriation General Hospital. These centres incorporate beds from Glenside. The Margaret Tobin Centre also incorporates beds from existing beds at Flinders Medical Centre. The returning home project will also enable long-stay clients currently in Glenside rehabilitation services to return to the community, with appropriate support from NGOs and mental health services. A master planning process for the site is underway to identify uses for each area of the site, including heritage buildings, and to canvas options for delivering other health services from the site.

The Social Inclusion Board report and non-government and community services providers are being consulted in resolving the future plans for Glenside. Our aim is to create a precinct for the best practice care of vulnerable people at Glenside. An assessment of the condition and utilisation of the existing facilities and infrastructure was conducted to inform the plan. A master plan (strategic opportunities planning) report will be developed for the future development of the Glenside Hospital campus.

These are the next steps that were involved: identify core objectives for Glenside, such as services and service delivery and key principles for development; develop the master plan in conjunction with key stakeholders, including the Department of Health, the Social Inclusion Board and the Department of Families and Communities. The proposed date of the completion of the Social Inclusion Plan is, as I have said, at the end of this year.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Chair, I wonder whether I just might have a supplementary to conclude that topic?

The CHAIR: Of course you may.

Ms CHAPMAN: Where are the 24 patients going from the North Glenside—

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Mr Chair, I have not finished. Just to continue my answer to the question: the North Glen Ward is a 15-bed extended care ward that we are looking into—in terms of a change of mental health services—in accordance with the National Mental Health Plan and, of course, the Mental Health Council of Australia's requirements. Some extended care wards, we believe, will close. However, no final decisions have been made, and these will depend on the Returning Home project, which I outlined earlier in my answer.

The CHAIR: Was it answered?

Ms CHAPMAN: It was not answered, but I think I understand from the minister that they will be sent home. There is no other facility being proposed to relocate them to. She has made it clear.

Mr PICCOLO: Minister, I was interested in the Healthy Minds program that you alluded to in your opening statement. I draw your attention to the Portfolio Statement, page 7.52. At that page the statement indicates some of the initiatives that will be undertaken during 2006-07 in relation to child and youth mental health. Could the minister please provide the committee with more information about these initiatives for young people and children, plus any additional mental health services that will benefit this important population group?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the member for his important question. Early intervention services for children and young people are critical to reduce the social, health and economic impact of mental illness. This government is continuing to implement a range of initiatives and services across metropolitan and country areas to support good mental health outcomes for our children and young people. Some of these initiatives and services include: the Healthy Young Minds program, one aspect of which will involve employing additional allied health and professional workers to improve child and adolescent mental health services; the Family Home Visiting program, as part of the 'Every Chance for Every Child' initiative; establishing children's centres; the Adolescent Assertive Mobile Outreach Service; and strengthening services for children and young people living in country areas.

The aim of the Healthy Young Minds initiative is to improve mental health outcomes for children and young people. Some of the ways in which the initiative will achieve this is by:

- providing an additional 20 community outreach workers and three psychiatrists, who would be employed by Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) to assist in reducing waiting times for children and adolescents for mental health services. They will also increase the mental health services capacity to provide outreach to areas and primary care services. Funding for these positions will be available from April 2007;
- establishing an outreach service for adolescents with mental illnesses and substance use issues, and this will include two specialist mental health workers and a consultant psychiatrist. Funding for these positions will be available from April 2007;
- providing additional funding to enable the 24-hour Emergency Mental Health Service at the Women and Children's Hospital to be extended through the employment of a mental health nurse who provides assessment and consultation between 8 a.m. and 2 a.m.

Detailed planning is currently under way with the Children, Youth and Women's Health Service for these initiatives to be implemented, including the recruitment of 26 health professionals. The budget for the Healthy Young Minds initiative is \$10.246 million over the next four years, and it is proposed that services will commence in April 2007.

The budget for 2006-07 is \$0.874 million. The Family Home Visiting Program provides at risk families with additional support, following the birth of a child, to enhance child development and parental attachment, and to improve health and wellbeing. Most families enter the program following a screening assessment carried out during the universal home visit by a child health nurse in the two weeks following birth. Families can participate in the program for two years. As at 30 June 2006, over 1 500 families had accepted home visiting. Of these, 19 per cent were Aboriginal families. The acceptance rate for Aboriginal families was

80 per cent compared with 76 per cent for non-Aboriginal families.

Research shows that early intervention and prevention services in the first years of a child's life have a significant whole-of-life benefit, establishing the foundations for social and cognitive development, educational achievement and life chances. Long-term outcomes from family home visiting include: better school retention and employment, less child abuse, less youth offending, and enhanced social and emotional health.

The Adolescent Assertive Mobile Outreach Service (AAMOS) was established for young people with severe mental health issues who are not able to access mainstream services. This service is providing assertive and mobile case management to help young people and their families to access a range of services to assist in their recovery and involvement in the community. The staff required to commence this service have now been recruited, with orientation and training having occurred in July 2006. The AAMOS team is now fully operational and is currently working with eight young people, with a further three referrals currently in process. The team continues to provide education sessions to external stakeholders, including CAMHS and Adult Mental Health Services across the metropolitan areas. Pathways for Young People has been negotiated with non-government organisations regarding social rehabilitation packages which some young people have begun to access.

Ensuring children and young people living in country areas have access to appropriate mental health services is a particular focus for this government. To this end, \$1.9 million over four years has been allocated to employ additional child and adolescent mental health clinicians across country regions surrounding Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Clare and Whyalla. This funding will provide greater opportunity for country services to create a system of mental health care that is well integrated and responsive to the needs of country South Australians. This will mean more country people will be able to access mental health care closer to where they live.

Mr Chair, I need to make a correction, if I may. The ward that is called 'The Glen' is not a 15-bed ward, as I previously said. I have now been advised that it is, in fact, a 24-bed ward and it is not scheduled to close in 2007. It will be affected by the Returning Home Program, but not in 2007.

Mr BIGNELL: I would like to ask the minister to pass on the appreciation of the people of the southern suburbs for the great work that the Southern Adelaide Health Service does. I have been a regular visitor, as a local member, to their facilities. They do a tremendous job. Page 7.61 of the Portfolio Statement provides some data about the number of South Australians accessing government-funded substance abuse treatment programs and advisory services. It seems that the figures look relatively stable and that prevention and treatment programs are working to a satisfactory degree. Is there any other data to support this?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I thank the honourable member for his most important and very informed question. Drug and Alcohol Services SA is actively involved in research to measure the extent to which South Australians use illicit substances such as illegal drugs and licit substances such as tobacco and alcohol. I am happy to say that, in general, there is not a significant increase in the abuse of any of these substances by South Australians.

In fact, our research indicates that for some important areas numbers have decreased. The National Drug Strategy

household survey is the only survey of alcohol and illicit drug use undertaken in each state and territory to provide prevalence data on the use of these substances among the general population. Findings from the latest survey conducted in 2004 show the prevalence of recent use (within 12 months) of any illicit drug in the South Australian population, and it shows that that continues to decline: in 1998, 23.8 per cent of people reported using an illicit drug; however, this has fallen to 15.4 per cent in 2004, following the national trend.

The largest reduction seen was in the prevalence of recent use of cannabis, which declined from 17.6 per cent in 1998 to 11.7 per cent in 2004. The prevalence of recent use of many illicit substances in South Australia declined or remained stable in 2004 compared to 2001. The National Drug Strategy household survey also reports that the recent use of methamphetamine stabilised between 2001 in 2004 at 4.1 per cent after the increase seen in previous years.

Smoking rates in South Australia plateaued; from the early to mid-1990s smoking rates seemed to again show a slow but steady decline. In 2005 the smoking rate amongst young South Australians was 19.1 per cent—the lowest rate ever recorded. Alcohol is the most widely used drug in Australia and is associated with a range of harms, including adverse social and health outcomes. Risky or high risk alcohol consumption for short-term harm is defined as alcohol consumption greater than recommended in the Australian alcohol guidelines—no more than six standard drinks on any one occasion for men and no more than four standard drinks on any one occasion for women.

In South Australia in 2006, 30.6 per cent of people aged 18 years and over drink at risky or high risk levels for short-term harm, and there has been no significant change in these levels over the last five years. Amongst young South Australians aged 18 to 29 years in 2006, 33.9 per cent drink at risky or high levels, and there has been no significant change in these levels over the last five years. It is a worry, Mr Chairman, that the opposition does not appear to be at all interested in these important gains.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, it is most unfair that the minister should make that sort of disparaging comment, given that in my opening statement I made a number of comments in relation to drug and alcohol abuse in this state which the government has failed to address.

Mr PICCOLO: There is no point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIR: Order! I will make those decisions.

Ms CHAPMAN: I would like to ask another question in relation to the hospital site at Glenside. Has any term of reference been given to Commissioner Cappo in the preparation of his report, in particular as to whether the southern block of the Glenside Hospital should be sold? This was the subject of a question which was put to the Premier prior to estimates, and he advised the parliament that it was a matter for the budget. So, I am asking whether there has been any reference to Commissioner Cappo regarding the sale of that part of the Glenside site? I also understand that the minister commented on radio that she does not know the value of that site—it has not been valued—but, given the impending proposal for sale, has Commissioner Cappo been asked to consider it and, if so, are we awaiting his report; and, if not, why not?

Mr PICCOLO: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I did not hear the budget reference.

Ms CHAPMAN: Budget Paper 3, page 2.21.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The responsibility for the development of the Glenside master plan is a project for which I am responsible. Obviously, I work closely with Monsignor Cappelletti and communicate with him regularly. The responsibility for the carriage of that project belongs to me. That work will not be completed and the report not finalised until some time towards the end of this year. Clearly, any contemplation of the sale of land will not be considered until after that report has been completed.

Ms CHAPMAN: Perhaps I have not made myself clear. I think I just said all that. I was asking whether he was given it as a term of reference to prepare in his report. If not, why not, and, if so, are you expecting therefore to give it to us as part of his report when he reports to us later in the year?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Mr Chair, I have answered that question.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 7.13. What is the revised role of the current director of mental health, given that a position for a second director of mental health has been recently advertised, and who will ultimately have authority to report to the minister on mental health?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I would ask Dr Tony Sherbon to respond to that.

Dr SHERBON: The answer to that question is that the previous role of director of mental health has been split into two roles—director of mental health (policy) and director of mental health (operations). They will report to different executive directors within the health department but will take on a combined role to progress the government's mental health reform agenda. Dr Brayley is currently filling both roles while recruitment action is under way. We will expect there will be improved coordination of the operations of mental health services across the four regions as a result, and more effective and expedient delivery of the government's mental health reform process.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will seek some clarification on that. So, both of them will report to Dr Sherbon, is that correct?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will ask Dr Sherbon to respond.

Dr SHERBON: The positions will report to my executive directors, who will eventually report to me. The director of mental health (operations) will report to the executive director of operations, who has a broad remit across all health services, not only mental health; and the director of mental health (policy) will report to my executive director of policy and intergovernmental relations. So, yes, everyone eventually reports to me, but these people will report through an executive director.

Ms CHAPMAN: Do any senior mental health staff report directly to Monsignor Cappelletti in the Social Inclusion Unit?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I have been advised that no mental health staff report directly to Monsignor Cappelletti.

Ms CHAPMAN: I would like to ask some questions about the Aldinga GP Plus health care centre which was announced in July 2005, six months before the election, but it ultimately was embraced and is now one of the first of the GP Plus centres. Referring to pages 2.20, 2.21 and 2.22, my question is in relation to this new centre, which is to open next week. My understanding is that it will absorb the existing GPs in the area and a dietitian will start there one day a week, who is also a local person. My question is: will the minister explain when the clinic will incorporate a mental health clinic, or a nurse, or any staff, to be employed at that site, and why there is no funding provided for GP Plus health centres in 2006-07?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The issue of the Aldinga GP Plus centre is not part of my budget responsibility and is outside my portfolio responsibilities, and I understand that minister Hill addressed that issue in estimates the other day.

Ms CHAPMAN: Perhaps I need to clarify this, because I did ask minister Hill about this issue and he indicated that the mental health nurse component of this was the minister's responsibility, which is why I am asking her when the mental health adjunct to this facility will come into play. I listened with interest to the minister's opening statement in which she glowingly reported on the advance of these centres and the important mental health aspect they would have. When is there going to be a mental health nurse or any mental health adviser actually allocated to them?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The honourable member's original question referred only to general health services and she did not stipulate any reference to mental health nurses that I heard. Nevertheless, I am happy to note that there will be mental health nurses employed at the GP-Plus centre at Aldinga to provide support services to GPs.

Ms CHAPMAN: Does the minister know how many?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I am happy to take that on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to Budget Paper 1, page 11, under the heading 'Improve wellbeing', the papers read:

This budget provides additional mental health services with a focus on early intervention.

How much recurrent funding is provided to the NGO sector for mental health and substance abuse services, and will the minister provide a complete list of the NGOs that receive funding, how much each receives and how many clients they provide services to? I do make the comment here, as it may not be familiar to the minister, who is new in this portfolio, that this is the sort of information that is often provided but, as we do not have annual reports for these areas any more, I would ask the minister to provide that information.

I raise it particularly because the Mental Health Coalition has told us that the NGO sector in SA is the most poorly funded in Australia and receives only 2 per cent of mental health funding. As the \$25 million one-off funding has not been made recurrent, this is obviously an area of concern to them.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government recognises the considerable contribution made by the non-government sector in the delivery of services across the alcohol and drug sector. Through the Department of Health's Drug and Alcohol Services Program, the government will provide \$4.24 million in the 2006-07 financial year to the non-government alcohol and drug sectors providing services to the South Australian public. The government has provided \$206 000 funding over the three years for the establishment of the non-government peak body known as the South Australian Network of Drug and Alcohol Services (SANDAS) specifically in acknowledgment of the need to enhance support within this important sector.

I am delighted at the progress made to date in the establishment and operation of SANDAS in South Australia, and look forward to continuing to work with SANDAS in the future. It is my understanding that SANDAS is currently working closely with DASSA in undertaking a mapping exercise to identify all drug and alcohol prevention and treatment services in this state. Once completed, this important piece of work will inform our capacity to identify areas where further enhancements can be made to our service delivery capacity in South Australia. I have met with a

number of representatives from the non-government sector who have a significant role to play in providing services to the South Australian community. I have given an undertaking to work closely with them to further enhance preventative and treatment services for all South Australians. There is no earmarked additional funding for the NGO sector within the 2006-07 financial year budget.

In the 2006-07 year, the following programs are funded under the Drug and Alcohol Services Program by the Department of Health: the Byron Place Community Centre and Kuitpo Community (Unitingcare Wesley Adelaide) facility, \$477 400; Adelaide Day Centre (Moore Street), \$71 000; Australian Drug Treatment and Rehabilitation Program (DrugBeat of SA), \$289 900; Archway Rehabilitation (Anglicare), \$227 600; Archway Sobering Up (Anglicare), \$370 500; Hindmarsh Youth Centre (Mission Australia), \$300 400; Nganampa Health Council Inc., \$74 800; Salvation Army Sobering Up, \$703 000; Counseling Support Program (Unitingcare Wesley Bowden), \$60 900; Adventure Services and Self Help Program (Baptist Community Services), \$72 900; Ceduna/Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service, \$172 000; Port Augusta Sobering Up, \$463 900; South-East Drug and Alcohol Counselling Service, \$187 600; Life Education SA, \$520 100; and National Centre for Education and Training in Addiction, \$248 200.

Ms CHAPMAN: The omnibus questions are as follows:

1. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown for each of the forward estimate years of the specific administration measures, as listed in Budget Paper 3, Chapter 2, Expenditure, which will lead to a reduction in operating costs in the portfolio?

2. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors in the 2005-06 year for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant and the contractor, cost, work undertaken and method of employment?

3. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, how many surplus employees are there as at 30 June 2006, and for each surplus employee, what is the title or classification of the employee and total employment cost of the employee?

4. In the financial year 2004-05, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2005-06?

5. For all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what is the estimated or actual level of under-expenditure for 2005-06, and has cabinet already approved

any carryover expenditure into 2006-07, and, if so, how much?

6. What is the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more per employee and, as a subcategory of the total, the number of employees with the total employment cost of \$200 000 or more per employee for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister as at 30 June 2006? Between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006, will the minister list job title and total employment cost for each position with a total estimated cost of \$100 000 or more which (a) has been abolished, and (b) has been created?

7. Can the minister outline, in respect of the shared services reforms across government, what the baseline costs are for the provision of corporate services in the department or agencies responsible to her, including the current total cost of the provision of payroll, finance, human services, procurement, record management, information technology services and full-time equivalent staffing relating to these areas? If it is applicable, in respect of her department, what particular issues need to be resolved with the proposed centralised shared services unit?

With that, sir, I indicate my appreciation to members of the department in attendance at the committee, in particular Dr Sherbon and other members of his staff, for their assistance today.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: All the questions asked by the member will in fact be answered in the Hon. Mr Hill's omnibus answers under the Department of Health portfolio. I would also like to put on the record that the returning home clients, as suggested by the member, are in fact not sent home without support. They are given intensive support packages in their home, so it is quite improper and incorrect to suggest that they are simply sent home. They are sent home with intensive support services in place in their own home. I would also like to thank all the staff and departmental members for their support and hard work today, and to you, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed. I now lay on the table a draft report.

Mr PICCOLO: I move:

That the draft report be the report of the committee.

Motion carried.

At 5.32 p.m. the committee concluded.