

*Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations — Eighty-sixth Report —
Consideration of the 2020–21 annual reports — Motion*

Resumed from 16 November on the following motion moved by Hon Peter Collier —

That the report be noted.

Hon JACKIE JARVIS: I stand today to continue my remarks with regard to the eighty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, *Consideration of the 2020–21 annual reports*. I note that the hardworking estimates committee is currently working on this year's annual report, and that this report reflects the work the committee did for last year's annual reports. I will also seek the call later in discussion, but, for now, I will refresh people's memory on what this report is about.

The report provides an overarching summary of the annual report hearings for the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations. I understand that in the past, report hearings might have been held en bloc. In the forty-first Parliament, this committee has called in agencies throughout the year. Members who are not familiar with the operation of the estimates committee may know that we hold budget estimates hearings here in the chamber, but not that annual report hearings have been carried out by the committee on Wednesday mornings on an agency-by-agency basis.

In the 2020–21 round of annual report hearings, the committee examined the following agencies in detail: the Department of Education, the Department of Health, the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage and the North Metropolitan Health Service. It is important to know that all health service agencies have separate annual reports. We examined the Department of Health as a whole, but the individual health agencies have their own annual report; hence, we called in only the North Metropolitan Health Service on this occasion. We also called in the Office of the Auditor General. We sought to examine the office of the State Coroner, and I will speak on that later because I have only a minute left.

The agencies we looked at collectively received \$11.1 billion in appropriations from consolidated accounts. Obviously, they report against a number of key performance indicators, desired outcomes and service provision. Part of the annual report hearings involve looking at what the agencies have done, which obviously is different from budget estimates hearings. In budget estimates, we are looking forward to what agencies say they are going to do in the following year. The annual report hearings reflect on the work of those agencies and check they have delivered what they said they were going to deliver, and consider how they have delivered it. The estimates committee obviously looks at the financial matters. Quite a broad scope of questions is asked in both annual report hearings and budget estimates hearings, because, if we are looking at financial matters, that leads to service delivery outcomes and understanding how those services are delivered.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: As we consider this eighty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations and the consideration of last year's annual reports, members will note that the committee had the opportunity to examine four annual reports, or at least have four hearings with a number of agencies, starting on 16 February and going through to 31 March this year. It is fair to say that the overarching theme that would describe the outcomes of those four hearings is evidence of the McGowan Labor government's lack of transparency. It was interesting this morning that the Premier and the Attorney General saw fit to send out a boastful media release entitled "Auditor General granted unprecedented access to sensitive information". First thing this morning, we awoke to this boastful media release from the Premier and the Attorney General. If people did not know better, they might think that the McGowan government actually adheres to a gold standard of transparency. Let me remind them what happens at some of these agency hearings when the one committee not controlled by the government in this Parliament—the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations—does its work and examines these annual reports. In particular, one hearing on 23 March this year was held with the Department of Health and the North Metropolitan Health Service. A massive amount of taxpayers' money is spent on health in Western Australia and it is appropriate that the estimates committee inquires into the proper use of those taxpayer moneys. Members will note that page 18 of the committee's report sets out that, of the various things that took place on 23 March this year, the committee sought information on the "Chief Health Officer's advice in relation to public health state of emergency declarations" and the "Chief Health Officer's advice in relation to state of emergency declarations". They are the public health state of emergency declarations and the, shall I say, "ordinary" state of emergency declarations, albeit that there is nothing ordinary about declaring a state of emergency. The committee inquired into these matters and it has been a matter of great interest in the community. More than 8 000 Western Australians signed a petition earlier this year calling for this information to be provided. That petition, amongst other things, read as follows —

We the undersigned ...

note that:

Extract from *Hansard*

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 23 November 2022]

p5711g-5718a

Hon Jackie Jarvis; Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Dan Caddy; Hon Dr Steve Thomas

1. The McGowan Labor Government first declared a “state of emergency” more than two years ago on 15 March 2020 under the Emergency Management Act 2005 and a “public health state of emergency” the following day under the Public Health Act 2016;
2. Both state of emergency declarations have been extended every fortnight since;
3. The Chief Health Officer gave evidence to the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations on 23 March 2022 revealing that he, or someone acting in his place, had provided advice prior to each declaration and extension;
4. Prior to being elected Premier, a promise was made by Mr McGowan that his Government would adhere to a “gold standard” of transparency;
5. The Premier recently declared under oath in open court that “gold-standard transparency does not apply to every single thing”;
6. Premier McGowan and his Ministers have refused to make the health advice and any associated modelling publicly available.

We therefore ask the Legislative Council to urgently inquire into this matter so that all health advice and modelling used to justify each state of emergency declaration is tabled in Parliament without further delay.

And your petitioners as in duty bound, will ever pray

The hearing that took place with the committee on 23 March 2022 was so revealing that more than 8 000 Western Australians decided to put their signature to that e-petition. What was the e-petition asking for? It was asking the government to adhere to its own gold-standard transparency and provide the health advice it was relying on. It was asking, “Just provide the health advice that you say justifies the state of emergency and the public health state of emergency; and, while you’re at it, provide the health modelling that you’ve indicated you’ve also been considering.” It is very interesting that, despite the fact that this hearing took place on 23 March this year, only recently the replacement health minister, Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson, deemed it necessary to respond to this matter. This response was sent to the other hardworking committee, very capably chaired by Hon Peter Foster, the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs. This is what the replacement health minister had to say —

Dear Peter,

Thank you for your letter dated 27 September 2022, regarding Petition No. 049—State of Emergency Declarations, which was tabled by Hon Nick Goiran MLC on 10 May 2022.

The State Government’s management of the COVID-19 global pandemic continues to be world class. It is disappointing to receive a petition from members of the community, and tabled by a Members of Parliament —

There was no error there, *Hansard*; that is what the replacement health minister had to say—“and tabled by a Members of Parliament” —

that seek to undermine the Government’s efforts to keep Western Australians safe.

I will not be providing further comment on this petition but thank the Committee for the opportunity to do so.

Kind regards,

Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson

Such is the contempt of the replacement health minister that 8 000 Western Australians might simply ask, “The member for Rockingham said he would adhere to a gold standard of transparency. Please provide us with this health advice that you say justifies.” The replacement health minister said, “Talk to the hand. Under no circumstances will I do that. In fact, it is disappointing that 8 000 Western Australians should have the hide to ask my arrogant government—the McGowan government—to provide this information. Who do these Western Australians think they are?” They are only the taxpayers, after all, the residents and voters of Western Australia, under our system of responsible government, presumably thinking that it might be okay for them to ask a few questions, and indeed for their representatives in the chamber to ask a few questions. But not on your life, not with this replacement health minister! That is the attitude that comes out of these things. It is absolutely appalling. Then the government had the gall this morning when the Premier, with his unreliable, confused and confusing Attorney General, came out and produced a press release basically boasting about the level of transparency that the McGowan government is adhering to. Give me a break! It is very clear from this example on 23 March 2022 that there is nothing along the lines of gold-standard transparency being adhered to by this particular government. In fact, it is the exact opposite. It is gross secrecy, even when more than 8 000 Western Australians decided to put their signature on a petition and ask for this information. It is one thing for the replacement Minister for Health to have an arrogant

and contemptuous attitude towards the opposition, but even when a hardworking parliamentary committee asks the government to please explain, this is the type of response it gets!

Two parliamentary committees have tried unsuccessfully to inquire into this and to break into the safe of secrecy that is the McGowan government, particularly on health advice. On 23 March 2022, the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, chaired by Hon Peter Collier, tried and was unsuccessful. Then the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, chaired by Hon Peter Foster, a Labor member of Parliament, tried and still the replacement health minister displayed contempt and arrogance. What is it going to take for the McGowan government to truly adhere to a gold standard of transparency? That is the question.

Hon DAN CADDY: It gives me great pleasure to rise this afternoon and speak on the eighty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, *Consideration of the 2020–21 annual reports*. As it is my first time talking to this report, I will thank the hardworking members of the committee—chair Hon Peter Collier, my good friend Hon Jackie Jarvis, Hon Dr Brad Pettitt, Hon Samantha Rowe and Hon Nick Goiran—for the work they are doing. As members of this place will be aware, I was recently appointed to this committee’s inquiry into homelessness, and it has certainly improved my knowledge of how the committee works and what it does.

I want to skip over a lot of the report content to something that caught my attention in the conclusion. We hear a lot in this chamber, especially from the Leader of the Opposition, Hon Dr Steve Thomas, about financial responsibility and getting the numbers right. Paragraph 6.2 of the report’s conclusion says —

The data indicates that in 2020-21:

- the Government spent \$30.2 billion from the Consolidated Account, only \$13 million more than expected at the time of the 2020–21 Budget

In percentage terms, that difference is measured in the hundredths of a per cent. I think that shows a high level and a good level of government budgeting and knowing where we are going and what we are doing.

I also want to touch briefly on the government’s succinct response to the report. There were three recommendations, and the government response addressed them all. The government supported the first two recommendations, so it is disingenuous of members to suggest that somehow the government and this committee stand on opposite sides of some sort of argument or some sort of wall, constantly working against each other. Recommendation 1 suggested —

The Treasurer direct the Department of Treasury to advise accountable authorities that the Treasurer’s prior approval is required to overdraw any agency special purpose account.

I will get to special purpose accounts later, as they are another topic that is often brought up by Hon Dr Steve Thomas in this place. Recommendation 1 was supported by the government. Recommendation 2 suggested —

The Attorney General advise each head of the respective courts of the *Guidelines for communications and relationships between the judicial branch and the legislative and executive adopted by the Council of Chief Justices of Australia and New Zealand on 23 April 2014*.

Recommendation 2 was also supported by the government. The government listens to the recommendations that come out of this committee and takes them seriously. Recommendation 3, which was noted by the government, suggested —

The Government amend section 83 of the *Financial Management Act 2006* to better enable documents, including annual reports, to be tabled in Parliament on non-sitting days.

The government noted this and responded —

Section 65 of the FMA which enables the Minister to inform Parliament if the annual report cannot be laid before each House of Parliament prior to 28 September or dealt with under section 83 is a viable alternative mechanism which worked effectively for a number of agencies in terms of their 2020–21 annual reporting and, as stated by the Committee, did not adversely affect the Committee’s consideration of agencies’ 2020–21 annual reports.

Although the recommendation was for a fix, it would appear it was a fix that was not really needed.

I want to go now to special purpose accounts. I said I would speak about these as I know they are a pet subject of Hon Dr Steve Thomas. I think my good friend Hon Jackie Jarvis summed them up beautifully with a family budget analogy —

... we have our everyday money and we have our savings money. A special purpose account is essentially savings that have been set aside.

I want to set the record straight about special purpose accounts and put some facts into the debate. We currently have about 30 special purpose accounts. The opposition likes to assert that there is some sort of conspiracy or secrecy about the number of special purpose accounts, but that is simply not the case. There is nothing sneaky. There is

nothing new about the Treasurer's special purpose accounts. They are established under section 10(a) of the Financial Management Act 2006 and are completely transparent and publicly reported.

Another fact is that, of the current 30-odd Treasurer's special purpose accounts, 18 existed when we came to office. The use of these accounts is not unusual or new. It has been common practice under successive governments. I think this is something that needs to be put out there. The addition of Treasurer's special purpose accounts under the McGowan government is actually a sign of good and stable financial management, which is what this government is known for, not just around the state but around the entire country. Those on the other side of the chamber do not understand, because when they were in government, they funded daily operations on the government credit card. That is essentially what they did.

Let us talk about the debt reduction account. It was used to make physical repayments of debt. Between the 2017–18 financial year and the 2021–22 financial year, \$6.1 billion went through this account, with a further \$1.2 billion payment earmarked in the 2022–23 budget to repay the debt that those opposite left us with.

Another thing to note is that physical repayments of debt should not be confused with net debt. It is projected that, by the end of the 2021–22 financial year, net debt will be almost \$14 billion lower than the projections of those opposite. Hon Dr Steve Thomas may laugh at this, but these were his government's projections—\$44 billion of net debt. It is now \$14 billion less than what his government projected. My good friend the Deputy Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council often refers to members opposite having spent like drunken sailors during their time in government, and that is exactly what they did—spending on the company credit card, with no understanding of good financial management and no understanding of fiscal management at all.

A significant new Treasurer's special purpose account in the 2022–23 budget is the \$350 million remote communities fund, which will fund new housing in remote communities, as well as a raft of other things, including clean water and renewable power networks for those communities. These issues were the responsibility of the federal counterparts of those on the other side of the chamber, but the Morrison government abrogated its responsibility and completely de-funded them.

The Treasurer's special purpose accounts are not hidden—they are transparent and reported. I go back to that key point right at the start that, at the moment, there is a list of 30 special purpose accounts that either have just been closed or are still operating. The opposition comes in here and throws around conspiracy theories and talks about secrecy, but of those 30 accounts, 18 were inherited from the former Liberal–National government.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: I was not going to respond in this debate—I was waiting for the first bill to come before the chamber—but I need to pass on a message to Hon Dan Caddy, one that I should have passed on to Hon Pierre Yang a few weeks ago. My birthday has been and gone; it is in early October. If government members are going to stand up and say things that are like a birthday present for me by making comments and instigating debates that I have a lot of fun with, I would appreciate it if they could do it earlier, because that would seem like a birthday present. At least Hon Pierre Yang's motion was in the right month.

Hon Pierre Yang: You're welcome.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Thank you very much. This one is great.

Hon Dan Caddy: He is far more organised than I am.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Yes; he got in a bit quicker.

I will take this opportunity for a late birthday present and address some of the things said by Hon Dan Caddy.

I will jump first, of course, to the debt reduction account. I remember that Hon Dan Caddy was in the budget estimates hearings a week ago today.

Hon Nick Goiran: The annual report hearings.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Sorry; the annual report hearings.

I asked questions about the debt reduction account and the special purpose accounts, amongst a few other things, because they are of enormous interest to me. I will remind the chamber what the Labor Party said about the intent of the debt reduction account in case members have forgotten. The Labor Party likes to have a bit history, so we will remember this. The Saturday, 11 February 2017 press release from the then shadow Treasurer, Hon Ben Wyatt, stated —

... a McGowan Labor government will protect future iron ore windfalls from being exploited by future governments, by bringing in laws to allocate 50 per cent of iron ore royalties into a new debt reduction account ...

Point of Order

Hon JACKIE JARVIS: Deputy chair, I accept that during committee reports the debate widens. I note that Hon Dan Caddy referred to the government response and the recommendation pertaining specifically to this

report and hence his discussion on special purpose accounts related to the eighty-sixth report, to which, I suggest, Hon Dr Steve Thomas has not alluded. I am not quite clear where he is going with his remarks.

The DEPUTY CHAIR (Hon Dr Brian Walker): I have consulted on this and it is apparent that he is responding to the honourable member and is entitled to do so. There is no point of order.

Committee Resumed

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Thank you, deputy chair. Nice try! Going forward, Hon Pierre Yang's points of order will be replaced with those made by Hon Jackie Jarvis. I can see that that might come up at the end of the year.

I will read in those comments again just in case members missed it. The press release states —

... a McGowan Labor government will protect future iron ore windfalls from being exploited by future governments, by bringing in laws to allocate 50 per cent of iron ore royalties into a new debt reduction account ...

Hon Dan Caddy, who was at the annual report hearings, will remember, hopefully, that I specifically asked about the debt reduction account, which has had \$6.1 billion go through it in the last four years. What were iron ore royalties over that time? In 2020–21, they were \$11 billion and in 2021–22, they were \$10 billion. That is \$21 billion over two years. What is 50 per cent of that \$21 billion for that two-year period? It is not difficult to work out the maths, is it? It is a fair bit higher than \$6.1 billion. It also does not include the two years before that. The debt reduction is \$15-plus billion below what the Labor Party promised it was going to be.

In fact, if members attended the annual report hearings, they would know that every year this government runs through some benefits from the state government Insurance Commission of Western Australia, which is about half a billion dollars a year. What the government calls spending so that it does not have to borrow future debt is just spending: "To avoid additional debt, we spent this money." It is just spending. What did the government do? The GST top-up money in 2021–22, which was billions of dollars, was simply spent by the government. It was run through the debt reduction account, but only half a billion dollars of government insurance money and bits and pieces came off debt, and that is why this government has reduced debt—well done and congratulations—from \$32 billion to \$30 billion, and it is on its way to \$29 billion before it will go back up again.

Hon Dan Caddy: That's a whole lot less than your \$44 billion, isn't it?

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: It is interesting that the member raises that, because the Labor Party loves to refer to the \$40-odd billion.

Hon Dan Caddy interjected.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Forty-three billion dollars.

Hon Dan Caddy interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIR: Order!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIR: Order! I enjoy this cut and thrust as much as anyone else, but I would like to hear the debate.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Thank you, deputy chair.

The Labor Party loves to run the figure of \$43 billion. Do members know where it was? It was in the last budget of the Liberal–National government—government members are absolutely right—but do members know where else it was? It was in the first budget of the McGowan government. In its first two budgets the McGowan government did not say, "We're suddenly going to pay down debt." Do members know what happened? Debt continued to rise.

Hon Pierre Yang: We had a plan.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: The Labor government did not have a plan. It did not change the outcomes. The government did not change the outcomes until the start of the latest boom in 2019, which was the biggest boom we have ever had. The government did not change it. Government members should go back and read the budget papers for 2017–18 and 2018–19; the government retained the debt levels that government members say were so terrible. The government did not come in and say, "We're good financial managers and through good financial management, we're going to reduce the debt levels that are proposed, all the way up to \$43 billion." The government said, "We'll actually get to \$43 billion. We, the Labor Party, in our first couple of budgets, will get to \$43 billion as well." What happened? The boom came along and the government did not have to get to \$43 billion; and, luckily for the government, Scott Morrison corrected and underpinned the GST, which, I suspect, the government is putting in danger with its latest fundraising plan, but I will come to that another time. Thanks to Scott Morrison and the price of iron ore, the government did not have to get to \$43 billion, the figure that the government projected that it

would get to. There was not a great and massive change; the government simply took advantage of the boom. Well done; it is great that it took advantage of the boom, which is what it should have done.

Let us talk about the other special purpose accounts that I have tried to print on the printer, which never seems to work for me. Hon Dan Caddy is right; a number of special purpose accounts already existed. Some of them, such as the road trauma trust account, have been around for a very long time. What has this government done? It has introduced a plethora of new special purpose accounts at a rate that we have not seen before. It has kept some of the old accounts; indeed, money has been set aside for hospital development. Royalties for regions is a special purpose account, and that has been around since 2009. Hon Dan Caddy is right; a lot of those accounts still exist. They were generally quite modest amounts, but we saw an explosion in the amount of money sitting in special purpose accounts to \$5 billion or \$6 billion.

Hon Dan Caddy: The holding account is the biggest.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: Sorry. The holding account is intermittently very big because it is used to flow money through. At some points, it has almost nothing in it and at other points, it has a lot of money in it. Commonwealth grants come in and commonwealth grants go out. Money comes in and money goes out.

Hon Dan Caddy: It has as much money in it as the rest put together. Just to be clear: we understand things. That account holds more than 50 per cent of all the accounts, and that is one we inherited.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: What Hon Dan Caddy needs to look at is the amount the holding account held, particularly prior to the 2019 boom, when we saw an explosion in the number of special purpose accounts. He should look at the proportion of the special purpose account money that was held in the holding account, which was the vast majority of it, and he should look at how much is now held and all the additional accounts. Billions of dollars have been added in.

Hon Dan Caddy: All has been reported publicly.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: I know it has all been reported. That is right. I do not think it is secret. It might be morally questionable, but it is not secret. What this government is doing is no secret.

Hon Dan Caddy: It is paying down debt.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: This government is not paying down debt in any significant way. It is squirreling the money away and putting it in the money bin, initially so the Premier can roll around like Scrooge McDuck, but ultimately so the Premier can cut the ribbons he wants to cut on projects and not pay down debt significantly. He thinks he can attach that previous debt to previous governments. The reality is that the debt is owed by the people of Western Australia. It is the government's debt; it is the people's debt. This government has had the greatest opportunity in the history of the economics of this state to pay down debt, and it has twiddled its thumbs. It wants that money—billions of dollars—kept aside, sitting in special purpose accounts. The interest rate has been low, so it has probably got away with it a fair bit. As the interest rate starts to rise, it will be interesting to see how much interest we will end up paying. That is what the government has done, and it is quite blatant about it. It is setting the money aside for its own political benefit, and I love the Christmas present of being able to say so again.

Hon Dan Caddy: I thought it was a birthday present.

Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS: It is nearly Christmas, too.

Hon JACKIE JARVIS: I stand to speak on the eighty-sixth report of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations. It is always a good committee report that invokes terms like Scrooge McDuck and spending like drunken sailors.

One of the challenges of being a committee member and speaking about a report in Parliament is that we always need to check and remind ourselves that committee discussions are private, privileged and not to be shared, and then remind ourselves which documents are public and which are not. It is fair to say that we saw some confusion yesterday during the second reading debate. A letter from the Auditor General, which had been declared public by the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations at short notice, was available to some members and not to others. That appeared to be just a glitch of our internet system.

Hon Nick Goiran: I think it was available to all members, but whether all members availed themselves of that is another thing.

Hon JACKIE JARVIS: Hon Nick Goiran is indeed right. Once a document is public, it is indeed available to all members. Unfortunately, in that situation, it was not readily available on the internet. Perhaps that is something that the committee needs to look at, but I digress. I actually got up to speak about finding 1 of the report.

I am just checking, deputy chair. Do I have three minutes left? I think I have three minutes on this before we move to the next report.

The DEPUTY CHAIR (Hon Dr Brian Walker): Yes, three minutes.

Hon JACKIE JARVIS: Thank you. Finding 1 relates to the office of the State Coroner, so I thought I would reflect on that and perhaps provide some information and my overview of that.

I remind members that the function of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations is to consider and report on the estimates of expenditure laid before the Legislative Council each year, matters relating to the financial administration of the state, and any bill or matters referred to the committee. The committee also consults regularly with the Auditor General.

During the consideration of annual reports last year, the committee requested a meeting with the State Coroner on the basis that the office of the State Coroner produces an annual report. As is detailed in the eighty-sixth report, the coroner declined to attend, citing a desire to preserve judicial independence. It is also worth noting that the annual report of the office of the State Coroner does not contain any financial information. The annual report of the State Coroner provides statistical information, such as the number of cases investigated, and deals with other matters that it is required to report on annually under section 27(1) of the Coroners Act, like specific reports on the death of persons held in care, which can include people subject to protection orders, people under the custody of police, prisoners and involuntary mental health patients. If the State Coroner had attended and we had looked at the State Coroner's annual report, we would have seen that it contains very little about the financial administration. That is because the Coroner's Court and the office supporting the coroner's report does not receive a separate appropriation in the state budget. That is important to understand. Funding for the office of the State Coroner is incorporated into the Department of Justice's budget.

The committee did not hold an annual report hearing with the Department of Justice. As a member of the committee, I would suggest that was perhaps an oversight on our part if we wanted to consider the financial operations of the State Coroner. If we had examined the Department of Justice's 2020–21 annual report, we would have seen detailed information, such as the number of cases investigated in the Coroner's Court, data on the backlog of coronial cases, the median time to inquest, the number of reportable deaths and the number of death certificates issued. We would have also seen things like the key achievements and other financial matters, which are what our committee is charged to look at.

I will run out of time, so I might have to speak more about this in a future debate on this matter. As I said, it is worth reminding ourselves that the Coroner's Court of Western Australia and the office supporting the court does not receive a separate appropriation. Its funding is incorporated in the Department of Justice's appropriation, and the Coroner's Court's key performance indicators are also contained in the Department of Justice's annual report.

Consideration of report postponed, pursuant to standing orders.