

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
Tuesday 12 October 2010
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chair:

Mr T.R. Kenyon

Members:

Ms F.E. Bedford
Mr M.R. Goldsworthy
Mr L.K. Odenwalder
Mr M. Pengilly
Mr P.A. Treloar
Ms L.A. Vlahos

The committee met at 10:00

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE, \$673,863,000
ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE, \$165,000

Witness:

Hon. M.J. Wright, Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M. Hyde, Commissioner of Police, South Australia Police.
Mr D. Patriarca, Director, Business Services, South Australia Police.
Mr I. Hartman, Manager, Finance, South Australia Police.

The CHAIR: The 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 changeover of departmental advisers. I ask the minister and the lead speaker for the opposition if they could indicate whether they have agreed on the timetable for today's proceedings and, if so, provide the chair with a copy.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We have agreed to a timetable. I am not sure we have it in writing but, providing the lead speaker agrees, which he has indicated he has, it will be from 10 to 11.15 and the government will not ask questions, nor will I make a ministerial statement.

The CHAIR: Changes to committee membership will be notified as they occur. Members should ensure the chair is provided with a completed request to be discharged form. If the minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be submitted to the committee secretary by no later than 19 November 2010. This year the *Hansard* supplement, which contains all estimates committee reports, will be finalised on Friday 3 December 2010.

I propose to allow both the minister and the lead speaker for the opposition to make opening statements should they wish to do so. There will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions based on roughly three questions per member, alternating each side. Supplementary questions will be the exception rather than the rule. 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 House of 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 in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the house, that is, that it is purely statistical in nature and limited to one page in length. All questions are to be directed to the

minister, not the minister's advisers; and the minister may refer questions to advisers for a response. I also advise that, for the purpose of the committees, television coverage and filming will be allowed from both the northern and southern galleries.

I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to Portfolio Statements, Volume 2, Part 5. I call on the minister to make a brief statement, should he wish to do so.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: As I said, I will not make a statement.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: As the minister outlined in terms of the program, there will be no opening statements and no questions from government members; and the committee is to run for one hour and 15 minutes. That is what we agreed to. I confirm that is our understanding of the proceedings.

I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.99, Statement of cash flows, cash inflow for sale of goods and services. It shows that the budgeted amount for 2010-11 is \$16.59 million. In July it was announced that the new traffic police plan would result in a reduction in the number of motorcycle police from around 50 to 22. The message from SAPOL, in essence, was that the move was a matter of staffing and redeployment. It was getting more police on country roads, and the best option for that is a motor vehicle.

I note that on page 178 of the SBC document the recommendation is for the sale of 32 motorcycles. What portion of the \$16.5 million from sale of goods is attributable to the sale of the motorcycles?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that this is a capital receipt and shows up on 5.99, near the bottom of the page, Cash inflows, Proceeds from sale of property, plant and equipment. So, it would not come from the \$16.599 million that the shadow minister refers to because it is not a sale of a good or a service. Nonetheless, I think what the shadow minister would like to know is how much that figure is, and the advice I have received is that it is about \$160,000, and I will allow the commissioner to go into a bit more detail about that.

There may well be a number of questions about this item, and that is fine. This, of course, when announced, was highlighted as being a road safety measure, not a budget saving measure. I know that the shadow minister and other members here today, particularly country members, also share our concern for the road safety toll, particularly in country areas—right throughout the state, but it is higher in country areas. This is a road safety strategy.

I note that police went out for consultation about the numbers that were put out by police some time ago, and the commissioner will speak to that in greater detail. There has been a revision of those numbers, about which the commissioner can go into detail. It has gone out for consultation; there have been discussions with the Police Association. We think we have come up with the right mix in regard to the numbers, and I will allow the commissioner to go into that detail.

Mr HYDE: This is a road safety initiative. As people would appreciate, the fatality rate and the serious injury rate is higher in the country than it is in the metropolitan area. Over the last few years, we have been moving more specialist traffic resources into country areas to be able to continue to reduce the road toll.

In terms of fatalities, it normally sits around 60 per cent of fatalities in country areas and 40 per cent in the metropolitan area. This year, the rate got to about 70 per cent in country areas and 30 per cent in the city. We need to be careful; these are small numbers that vary, so you do not make policy decisions on some of these movements, and you really look over time to see what the position is. We need to be more effective in terms of driver behaviour in country areas.

We reviewed our traffic model, where our specialist resources were, and it was originally proposed to take 66 staff to the two central areas based in Adelaide—northern and southern traffic enforcement sections—and to put nine additional staff in to make 75. Thirty of those positions were then to be put into country locations, 30 into traffic services branch, which is a central area, and 15 into metropolitan local service traffic areas.

We put the paper out for consultation; we received quite a lot of feedback, particularly from local government in country areas, and they were generally very supportive of the initiative. We received a letter from Sir Eric Neal, the Chairman of the Road Safety Advisory Council, supporting the move, and I have also had support from the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure in terms of the road safety component of that.

The Police Association was concerned about reducing traffic resources in the city out to the country, and they were concerned about the impact on the metropolitan road toll. We took that into account. We also took into account the fact that many of the motorcycle police wanted to continue operating with motorcycles. In terms of the motorcycles, 50 of those 66 I referred to are motorcycle based police and there are 55 motorcycles involved.

Taking into account the consultation—and we did receive a paper from the Police Association as well—we recently revised the model, and so the changes proposed now are 21 positions into the country, instead of 30. Of those 21, nine will be new positions, so 12 positions only will be redeployed from the metropolitan area, and 25 to 30 per cent of the current duties involving those positions are in country areas, so effectively only nine full-time positions are being redeployed to the country. So we will still achieve moving specialist traffic resources into country areas, but we will also look at further recruitment to top up that number and also look at further numbers in the future.

It was proposed to have 22 motorcycle police, with two supervisors. That has been increased to 36, so there is a significant increase there, and when you consider the 50 current motorcycle police, it is only 14 fewer. So there is a fairly significant change there, which does give the opportunity for those motorcycle police to continue to work in that field if they wish to do so. So, a total of 42 would now go into the traffic service or traffic support branch, and about 12 into local service areas.

In terms of the cost, which comes to the nub of the original question, this will cost us more; there are not any savings in terms of recurrent costs. It will cost us approximately \$60,000 a year extra in terms of recurrent costs. There will be savings in the capital budget of not having to purchase motorcycles in the future, but there will be no reduction in the capital budget, and so that is really an opportunity cost and the money will be spent on other equipment for police.

The asset sales of motorcycles no longer required were in the budget papers at around \$160,000. We do not expect that number to be realised, and no doubt we will have to make up the difference within police. We get \$4,000 to \$5,000 on the sale of motorcycles, when they are no longer required, and the total numbers are going to be reduced from 55 to 32. Part of that reduction is because we are adopting a different model. Instead of allocating a motorcycle full time to an individual officer, the motorcycles of those who are on leave will be returned to a pool to go out to another officer. So there will be a greater efficiency in the number of motorcycles. That is generally the breakdown with respect to that matter.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: There is quite a lot of statistical information there. The commissioner said in the last couple of sentences that the number would go from 55 to 32, and that is a reduction of 23 motorcycles. Is that how many motorcycles are budgeted to be sold?

Mr HYDE: It will take place over time. We do not expect this to be implemented simply in one financial year. There will be a transition arrangement in place, which is yet to be discussed with the Police Association. We will be moving to fill the country positions as a matter of priority because we want to get on with road safety in the country, but in terms of motorcycle police moving over to other positions, that will need a transition plan and I cannot tell you at this stage how long that will take and what process for any sales of motorcycles not required will take place.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: In light of that answer, can the minister tell us how many motorcycles are budgeted to be sold and what is the likely revenue per unit to be raised?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: As the commissioner said, we will be doing this over a period of time. There will be a transitional stage, but it is correct to say that we will be going from 55 to 32. The figure I gave earlier is the figure that has been put in by Treasury, namely, the \$160,000, to which I referred, that will occur as a result of the sales.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: On 9 July an article was posted in the *Independent Weekly* online that the Premier had said:

These decisions are made by the Police Commissioner, and if any premier tried to interfere then that premier wouldn't be fit for office.

Given the SBC recommendations, does the minister consider this to be an operational issue, which is really contrary to the implications of the Premier's comments, when it could be argued that it is an economic issue? There are savings that appear to be achieved of \$160,000, so there is obviously an economic aspect to it also.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I will allow the commissioner to answer.

Mr HYDE: I cannot comment in terms of the Premier's reported comments with regard to the relationship and what issues might be suitable for the government's decision or the police decision, but in this case there are effectively no savings in recurrent expenditure because it will cost us more, in the order of \$60,000 a year recurrent costs. That is the main area of cost within our budget and it is an ongoing issue.

On the capital side, in terms of not purchasing motorcycles we may have purchased under a different arrangement, that is simply an opportunity cost because the money is then spent on equipment other than motorcycles. The only return to the budget, to put it that way, is any asset sales that relate to motorcycles no longer required, and that is really a one-off return rather than any ongoing saving.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am happy to take the first part of the question because it is more of a political question that should be answered by me rather than the commissioner. Obviously, I do not have the value of the article that the shadow minister refers to on 9 July, but the Premier and myself are ad idem on this. I cannot speak for the Premier, but I can speak for myself, and we have said on a consistent basis that we do not interfere with the operations of the commissioner. I am confident in being able to say that the commissioner and I have a very professional relationship and that he does a fantastic job of running the police force.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We would certainly hope that you have a good working relationship with the commissioner, minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I just thought I would point it out in case you did not realise it.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: But you don't have a barbecue together on Sundays, though.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We don't have to go into our social activities here, do we?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: In answering the question (and I know we have to refer questions to the minister), the commissioner said that there will be a \$60,000 recurrent cost as a result of this. Can you give us some details of that cost? What is that cost about?

Mr HYDE: I do not have the breakdown with me, but we take into account all the cost items between one proposal and another. So, the difference between the current operations and the proposed operations will be in the order of \$60,000. To give you an example, housing costs for country police are an issue for us, so moving positions from the metropolitan area, where the housing cost is not there, into a country location, where the housing cost is located, is one issue. We need more vehicles because of the way they will operate in country areas; however, they are leased as opposed to purchased, which is motorcycles. So, when you look at both of these things, you have to weigh up all the differences in costs and how they come together.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Going along on the same issue, can the minister advise the date when SAPOL actioned the report for the proposed restructure of the traffic policing model, and were the project authors or managers advised, in any capacity, of the proposal put forward by the SBC?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We do not have that date to hand; we will go back over our records and see if we can provide that to the shadow minister. I am not exactly sure, so I do not want to guess, what he is talking about with respect to the project authors. He might like to come back with more detail, if he has it, in regard to that. There was, of course, a flow of information that occurred from police to cabinet to SBC. Police advised us, appropriately, that there were no budget savings, but I am not sure what you are alluding to with regard to the project authors.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Someone would have had to come up with the idea, in terms of the project; 'author' may not be the right word, but someone in government put together the report that recommended this project. That is what I am referring to. Were those people advised of the proposals put forward by the SBC?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think I know where you are coming from, and it would be more appropriate for the commissioner to go into detail. It is my understanding that this proposal was put forward by the police, but the commissioner can go into detail and either confirm that particular area or otherwise. I may not necessarily have all this in the correct order, but the commissioner will go through the technical detail. As I said in my previous answer, my understanding is that this was a concept generated by police. Obviously, during the process the police needed to deliver something to government—to me, I guess, as the minister—and to the SBC, and maybe earlier to the SBC than to the minister. I may not have the order correct—the commissioner will clarify that—but, generally speaking, that is how it came about.

Mr HYDE: In general terms, when we are working through the budget process and are given budget targets such as efficiency targets—and this happens quite often, not just through an SBC process—we are asked, as are other agencies, to identify ways of meeting those targets. So it is a sensitivity analysis around what you have to do to meet those targets. We generally put those up and they are considered by government, and ultimate decisions are made.

The SBC process was no different from any other time. So, in terms of the targets that were presented there, we put up a range of options, including some revenue options as well. Reducing the number of motorcycle police was an option that was included in all of that, as were closure of police stations and things of that nature. Ultimately, decisions were made by government about all that list of proposals, but in respect of this one we withdrew it as an option because, when we had completed some analysis, we preferred to shift the resources into country areas to deal with road safety there. We knew that model was likely to cost us more money rather than save it, which has ultimately been borne out by the model now being put forward to go into place. So we advised the minister and the government that there were no savings in this area for the purposes of the SBC savings.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: In an earlier answer, you said that the initial number of motorcycles would be reduced to 22. However, I understand that 14 motorcycles will come back into service, bringing that up to 36. I think that was a number that the commissioner spoke of. Given the fact that 14 are coming back, your proceeds on page 4.99 are \$465,000 from the sale of property and plant, as I think the minister provided in his very first answer. You will not reach that revenue level if 14 are going to be brought back in, so I guess you are not going to reach either that revenue level or the savings target. If that is the case, where will you find the remainder of the money in either revenue or a cost saving?

Mr HYDE: Just to clarify, the 14 number refers to positions not motorcycles, so the 22 that goes to 36 are positions, then separate from that is how many motorcycles you need. We think we can manage with 32—so, slightly less than the total number of 36. The point is still right that we would probably have fewer motorcycles sold, so that asset sale item may well not realise the amount which is in the budget paper.

The information I have—and I did not put this part together in the budget, so I am relying on that information—is that it is \$160,000 which relates to the sale of motorcycles. It is highly likely, and I can only give this opinion without checking the facts, that we would need to find any shortfall from within our budget, and that is an adjustment we would make. At this time, I cannot tell you where that would come from. It is likely to come out of the capital budget and it would mean we would just simply have to adjust some of our expenditure to make up the difference. I cannot give you any better information than that at this stage.

Mr PENGILLY: Same page, paper and volume. Can the minister inform the committee how many of the reassigned motorcycle police have resigned from SAPOL, taken extended leave or indeed gone on WorkCover stress leave, if any?

Mr HYDE: I am not aware of any.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We move now to Budget Paper 6, Part 2, page 59, Budget Measures by Portfolio and Agency, under Administered items for the South Australia Police, Expiation fines—increase. There is an increase in expiation fines to raise an additional \$44.8 million over three years. Fines less than \$100 are to be raised by \$20 and those over \$100 by \$50. Additionally, a reminder fee on expiation notices is increased by \$15 from 1 January 2011. This is expected to raise an additional \$570,000 in 2010-11 and \$1.1 million per annum from 2011-12.

I note that the increase in reminder fees was a recommendation within the SBC document. There was also a recommendation to attach a \$50 enforcement fee to each expiation notice. While it appears that the recommendation was not adopted, there is the substantial increase in expiation fines themselves. The Treasurer himself stated on FIVEaa radio on 17 September about these increases, 'I make no apology. It is a voluntary method of taxation.' My question is: is the \$44.8 million measure a direct response to the SBC recommendation that a large sum of revenue should be generated through an increase in expiation revenue?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the shadow minister for his question, but I did not necessarily catch the precise wording. Correct me if I am wrong, but I think he might have asked whether these increases were solely—and I cannot remember the adjective he used—

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: A direct response.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: A direct response to the SBC. For total accuracy, I think we need to acknowledge that the SBC has had a role, as it has right across government, but whether it be in this particular area or whether it be in any other area of government, ultimately, cabinet makes the decision. You have recommendations, I suppose, that have been put forward by the SBC in regard to expiation fines and administrative efficiencies, and you have other areas that are CPI increases and the role of cameras—and so the list goes on.

However, what the shadow quoted is very, very much the sentiment of cabinet and the government, and it was correctly put by the Treasurer. I would hope that all members of the parliament, probably more so people in country areas, see the need to ensure that we do better in regard to road safety. The Treasurer is correct: people do not have to pay these fines. There is a simple way through this: do not break the laws, and you will not have to pay the fines.

There is a range of measures in the budget and, yes, some of them have been recommended by the SBC. However, at the end of the day, cabinet has thought carefully and clinically about all of the recommendations in this particular portfolio and in other portfolios, and we make the final call.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Bearing in mind the SBC's recommendations and treasurer Foley's comments, the government has to admit that the increases in this expiation revenue are really a revenue-raising measure. The minister says it is a voluntary form of taxation. Taxation is, clearly, by its very definition, a revenue-raising measure. I think you have to admit now that it is a revenue-raising measure and not necessarily a road safety measure.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: As I said, our priority is road safety. We would prefer not to collect the revenue. I well remember in my early days in government, as minister for transport, bringing forward a number of measures that included changes to licensing and how we spent money on infrastructure—a whole range of changes that had been introduced a number of years ago, in the main, in other states around Australia—to bring us up to date with better procedures for road safety.

Sure, you can make an argument, if you want to be negative about it, that this is a revenue-raising measure but, at the end of the day, we would prefer not to collect the revenue. We would prefer that motorists, whether they be in the metropolitan area or country South Australia, do the right thing. Ultimately, it is the person who is behind the wheel with their foot on the pedal who has ultimate control of how they drive, what laws they drive to or what laws they break, and it will be their choice.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That answer leads to the next question, because you are talking about road safety and so on. On 17 January this year in the *Sunday Mail* it was reported that minister O'Brien, the previous road safety minister, said:

All revenue raised by speed cameras will be dedicated to enhance road safety throughout the state.

On 7 October in *The Advertiser* on page 11 it stated:

Revenue raised from speeding fines is put towards improving road safety through the Community Road Safety Fund.

This leads on from what you were saying before, minister. Can you tell us what enhancements will be made to road safety with the use of this additional \$44.8 million?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think the shadow minister knows full well that I cannot provide that sort of detail because I am not the Minister for Transport. The shadow minister would also be aware that in the eight or nine years that we have been in government there has been massive money spent on infrastructure. Probably the amount of money that has been spent on infrastructure in the transport area is unprecedented—by South Australian standards, at least. He would be well aware of money that has been—

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: \$220 million in road maintenance backlog.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, backlog that we picked up from a previous Liberal government. Thank you very much!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: You blokes aren't meant to ask me Dorothy Dixers. They come from the opposite side. The shadow minister would be well aware of money that has been spent on infrastructure in the transport area in his electorate, in his region. I know the member for Finnis is

particularly pleased with what has happened in Kangaroo Island, and so we can go on around the state and, no doubt, the Minister for Transport will come forward—

Mr PENGILLY: We need more coppers for a start.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, we have 700 more police than we did when the Liberal Party was in power and another 300 promised, so that will be 1,000 more police than—

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, but I need a couple more down in my electorate, minister. I would like another one in Normanville and another one on Kangaroo Island.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Bedford): Order! I cannot hear, and I do not think anybody else can, so please restrain yourself, member for Finniss.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I will come back to the member for Finniss, if I may, because he does deserve a reply to his interjection.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Bedford): He probably doesn't.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is true. I am very confident that the Minister for Transport will continue to come forward with major expenditure for infrastructure in the transport area. We are particularly proud that, since coming to office, we have currently increased police numbers by 700. In the last term of the Liberal government, the numbers were going downward. We have increased the number of police by 700. We have also committed to an additional 300 in this term of government, which will mean that, by the year 2014, South Australians will have 1,000 extra police than they did when we last had a Liberal government.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: How many will be out on the beat? We will see. I will go on from the previous question. I know what you are saying, minister, that it is not up to you, necessarily, but you have some understanding of this matter, having held the transport portfolio. Can we be confident that that additional \$44.8 million will be reflected in cash flows into the Community Road Safety Fund? You have some understanding of this, minister; it is not as if you are new to it. You were minister for transport for quite a while; I think that was your first portfolio when you first came into government.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: So, you have some understanding of these issues. Is it your assessment, Minister for Police, having previously held the transport portfolio, that that \$44.8 million would flow into the fund?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The priorities of the Labor government, I think, have been very clear. We have made massive changes to legislation to bring us up to date in regard to road safety, which has included expenditure on infrastructure. The amount of money that has been committed has been a record amount by this state's standards. I think it has been very obvious that one of the priorities of this Labor government has been transport and road safety, and I am confident that the Minister for Transport will continue to come forward with significant projects, just as he did on behalf of the government in the lead-up to the last election—finishing off that highway that you blokes wanted to go only one way; well, we are going to complete it for you. We will continue to make sure that transport, road safety and money spent on police will be a priority of this government.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Actually, minister, I thought your priorities were health, education, law and order. That is what you banged on about for about 7½ years. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.80, Targets and Highlights. Under Highlights 2009-10, it states that police 'Responded to over 400,000 calls for service from the public.' Is that number the total calls to both the Police Communications Branch (the 000 number) in Carrington Street and the Police Call Centre (the 131444 number) in Flinders Street?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice that I have received for 2009-10 is that, for the 131444 number, the calls received were 411,955, and that for the same period in 2009-10 calls received on the 000 number were 197,895.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: How many full-time equivalents were employed in each one of those branches at the end of the 2009-10 period, and how many are budgeted for in this current year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We will take that on notice. We will get the details of both those questions for the shadow minister.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you. Now we move on to page 5.84, where it states in the performance indicators that not only did SAPOL fall short of its target to answer 90 per cent of calls to the 131444 number within 10 seconds but there was a decrease in the percentage meeting that target. Can the minister explain why the police have fallen short of that target?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The commissioner will answer that question.

Mr HYDE: The target of 90 per cent within 10 seconds is the highest target within Australia of a similar type of centre. It is the same target for our communications centre for 000 numbers as well. The communications centre exceeds the target. In general terms, I think about 89 per cent (I cannot just place my finger on the exact figure) was the service standard for the year, and we have, over a period of time, added more responsibilities and functions into the call centre, and so they are doing a broader range of things than they were initially. This target is one of the things that we will have to reconsider over time.

We do allocate staff in terms of a model; it is a well-respected and recognised model in terms of allocating staff to achieve these targets, and that has been quite consistent over a number of years. It is one of those things that we have to constantly look at to make sure that our staffing levels are right and, as we add in more functions, or as the demand for service goes up, that we get it right. For example, one of the initiatives we are looking at at the moment is to develop a service desk within the call centre, where we can spend more time on dealing with service delivery issues that might need more time over the phone, and we are putting in additional staff for that; I think an extra seven staff will go into that.

In terms of the overall target, I have now been handed the figure. It is 89.75 per cent, so we are just off the target by 0.25 per cent. I would have to say, too, that we do have to continue to look at that target, and I have had proposals that we ought to reduce it to 85 per cent instead of 90 per cent, or take it to 15 seconds rather than 10 seconds, but at this stage we prefer the higher standard of service.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Can you give the figures of the best and worst average rates of calls answered within 10 seconds over a shift?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We do not have that sort of detail. We will endeavour to get that information for the shadow minister.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Do you keep that statistical information? You would need that to be part of your analysis to come to the end figure of 89 or so per cent of calls answered within 10 seconds?

Mr HYDE: That is constantly monitored. In fact I have a display within the call centre that puts up data about calls queued, response times and things of that nature. In terms of the management of the call centre, that data is being monitored and dealt with very closely over a shift. It varies enormously in terms of what happens. We can roster staff to meet what we expect the demand for service will be, but events happen that are beyond our control.

Recently when there was a wind and rain storm we took 1,400 calls within a six-hour period, which was probably quadruple what we would normally deal with. With those sorts of events the figures obviously are affected. The information I get is on a weekly basis and broken down on a daily basis as to how they reach their targets, but the supervisors will be receiving this information real time, so they can manage accordingly.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that over the 12-month period the number of calls averaged over 33,000 per month. The commissioner said that when a bad storm hit Adelaide 1,400 calls were received that day. The computer-aided dispatch system we understand is a primary tool used when tasking or dispatching patrols. All call takers at the police communications branch and call centre use this software to enter the details of a call for assistance.

When all details are entered they are sent directly to the dispatchers in the communications branch and immediately displayed on their computer screens. The dispatcher may then voice the taskings to patrols using police radio or sending information to the mobile data terminal, which is a computer installed in patrol cars, which we have all seen when we have pulled up beside a patrol car. How many of the 400,000 calls for assistance were priority A, B and C taskings?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We do not have that level of detail with us, but we can get it and are happy to do so.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: You do not have the detail about A, B and C, but would you have the number of priority A?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Not with us at the moment.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Could you take these questions on notice: of the priority A taskings, what was the average time taken for a patrol to reach the premises; how many priority A and B taskings were cancelled due to a long passage of time lapsing before a patrol could reach the premises and no follow-up call for assistance being made throughout that time?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We will get that detail.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Still on page 5.80, the targets and highlights referred to include a target for 2010-11: 'Actively engage with the community to build community confidence in police'. The Australian Bureau of Statistics Victims of Crime Report 2009, released on 3 June 2010, reveals an alarming increase in violent crime in the state since 2002. Attempted murder has increased by 50 per cent, total homicides and related offences are up by 20 per cent, kidnapping/abduction is up by 19 per cent and armed robbery is up by 7.5 per cent. In view of those pretty alarming statistics, what indications has the minister had that building community confidence in police has to be a priority?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think it goes without saying that building confidence in police is always very important and a priority, and I will come back to that. I have a briefing here which I can go through, but I am not going to read it. Suffice to say that it is relatively easy to cherry-pick, but if you look at crime rates right across the board, since we came to office they have gone down by about 35 per cent, or more, depending upon which group you listen to.

Sure, you can pick and choose, but we are also concerned about some areas and our aim is to eliminate crime altogether. As I said before, the commissioner does a fantastic job at deploying his officers in a whole range of different areas. If you look at the overall statistics of crime, it has gone down significantly since we have come to office. Obviously, we are very pleased that we have the additional police. There was a cheap comment made before about whether they are on the beat. Well, of course, the greater percentage of police officers are on the beat, but you also have other responsibilities that need to be fulfilled.

To get back to the nub of the question in regard to confidence in the police, obviously, we work at that, and the commissioner will go into some more detail on that. As minister, in a small way, hopefully I—and I am sure members as well—can play a role. I am pretty sure in saying that since I have been the police minister I have been to every graduation ceremony; I may have missed one, but I do not think so. I have also ensured that I get out on a regular basis to our local police stations, both in the metropolitan area and, where possible, into country South Australia as well. I know that the commissioner and the force also make it a priority to ensure that the confidence of the police is paramount.

We want the police to be confident in themselves and the role they play. The other side, of course, about which the member is probably asking more specifically, relates to the confidence of the general public in the police. The commissioner can go into more detail on this, but the feedback I get, as minister, as I go around South Australia, as I speak to people, as I read media reports and as I get feedback from local members of parliament—and we have statistical information that backs this as well—is that the confidence that the public has in our South Australian police force is very high; I think it is at 85 per cent. So, we can still improve, and we will continue to work on that.

The confidence reflects the quality of the police force. I am able to share with other police ministers around Australia what happens in their states, and I am confident that we have the best police force, here in South Australia. Can it improve? Maybe so; there is always room for improvement.

Mr PENGILLY: In Australia, you meant.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: In Australia, my apologies. When we have our police ministers' conference, as we go around and talk to ministers from other states the feedback I get is that the South Australian police force is held in very high regard. I am sure we have the best police force in Australia, and we will continue to further improve that. However, we do take very seriously what I think the shadow minister asked in regard to the confidence that people have in our police force. It is high, and we want to keep it growing. It is very important. Perhaps the commissioner can give a little bit more detail about strategies that are used in regard to that.

Mr HYDE: We survey throughout Australia. All police services are involved in community surveys to measure a whole host of things, including community confidence in their police. From memory, the rating for South Australia Police is 85 per cent and is the highest in the country. We aspire to have the highest rating in the country because it is a pretty important measure for police

in terms of how they operate and how satisfied the community is with them. It is a typical measure, not only within Australia but also within other Western democracies operating with police services like ours; for example, it is in place in the United Kingdom.

It is important to have a high level of community confidence for a number of reasons. First, public servants should deliver a service that the community regards highly, so that is an aspiration that should be in place for any public servant. It is particularly important for police because community confidence in police can affect the way people conduct their lives. As we know, there are two dimensions to crime: one is the actual crime that people are a victim of, and the second dimension is what people's perceptions are around crime. People can change their behaviours based on perceptions, and those perceptions can really affect their lives and the way they operate as a community. So community confidence in police is a matter which goes to how people go about their daily affairs and, at the end of the day, how the community operates here in South Australia.

The second main reason for having a high level of confidence is that we have to work with the community in terms of delivering community safety outcomes, whether it is road safety, public order or crime. It is an important part of our way of operating and something we are quite proud of, that we do have a very close working relationship with the community. We need to build that relationship and community confidence; it is an important component of building a good working relationship with the community. So, for those reasons, here in South Australia—and throughout Australia and other countries, such as the United Kingdom—community confidence in police is a very important indicator.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I move to page 5.13, Workforce Summary, South Australia Police. I note the actual FTEs for 2008-09, the estimated FTEs for 2009-10, and the budgeted FTEs for the current financial year. I further note that the minister's media release of 23 June this year stated that the government would soon have 4,403 police and would be moving on to the goal of achieving an additional 300 police by 2014, thus taking the number to 4,703. I also note the earlier comments made by the minister.

The Productivity Commission's Report on Government Services describes an operational police staff member as:

...any member whose primary duty is the delivery of police or police-related services to an external client (where an external client predominately refers to members of the public but may also include law enforcement outputs delivered to other government departments).

Going by that definition of an operational police staff member, will the minister show how many of the 2008-09 actual, 2009-10 estimate and the 2010-11 budget for police FTEs are operational staff?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We do not have that level of detail but we can get the information for you. The commissioner wants to make a couple of comments as well, but maybe I could make a general comment. I said before that we are very proud that we have increased our police force by 700. We have committed an additional 300 that will take us to an additional 1,000 police officers by 2014. I guess when you are the opposition and your numbers were going downwards when you were last in government, it is a bit hard to argue against the numbers so you start to look at other areas to try to flip it around, and I suspect that is what is being done here.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We just need some information.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: And we are going to provide it for you. As you know, we are—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Just settle down. The member for Finniss will stop interjecting, as will the member for Kavel, and the minister will cease winding people up.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I haven't had such a tirade since I was last in the classroom 25 years ago, and the quality was about the same as it is today.

The CHAIR: I don't want to be putting people in the naughty corner; that would be bad. So let's just carry on in an orderly fashion.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Anyway, we will get the level of detail that the shadow minister would like about operational, but I am sure what we are delivering is a very good outcome for the taxpayers, and I am just disappointed that the opposition do not support the additional police who have been put in place by this government.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The minister can't make those statements; that is just not factual.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Do you support it?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We want more police in patrol cars.

The CHAIR: Order! Carry on with questions and answers. That works really well.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: He shouldn't make those inflammatory statements.

The CHAIR: Do you have a question?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The commissioner is going to elaborate on my good answer.

Mr HYDE: In terms of the full-time equivalent target for the end of the last financial year, that was 4,403 and the outcome was 4,406, so we slightly exceeded that target. We do measure operational deployment of police, and that correctly is reported by the Productivity Commission. Typically we are in the order of 89 to 90 per cent overtime, which is one of the highest in the country.

In terms of the 400 additional police recruited over the last four years, I do not have the fine breakdown into that operational/non-operational split, but I can give you the broad deployment as follows: general duties, 141; criminal investigations, 120; family violence, 23; prosecutions, 32; road safety, 19; licensing enforcement, four; and other, 61. I do not know in terms of 'other' how that breaks down into operational and non-operational; we can get that information for you.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: You can take these couple of questions on notice, too. Of those purely operational staff figures, are they all sworn police officers? Of the 300 additional police officers to be recruited between now and 2014, how many does the minister estimate will be dedicated to operational duties as previously defined? So, will you take those two on notice as well?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: On notice, or do you want me to answer them?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Well, you could not answer the previous ones, which were similar.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: You prefaced your question by saying, 'Can the minister take these on notice?' and now you are looking at me with some sort of quizzical look. What do you want me to do? Just give me an indication.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: You took the previous question on notice, and this is the same line of questioning. If you want to answer it, answer it.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: To save you time—

Mr PENGILLY: You haven't answered anything yet.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Do you want me to talk or listen to you? To save you time, because my good friend the member for Finniss would like me to take it on notice, I am happy to oblige.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We have a couple of minutes, so keep going.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We will take it on notice.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the omnibus questions without my reading them.

Leave granted.

1. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of the baseline data that was provided to the Shared Services Reform Office by each department or agency reporting to the minister—including the current total cost of the provision of payroll, finance, human resources, procurement, records management and information technology services in each department or agency reporting to the minister, as well as the full-time equivalent staffing numbers involved?

2. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 in 2009-10 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister—listing the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment?

3. For each department or agency reporting to the minister how many surplus employees will there be at 30 June 2010, and for each surplus employee what is the title or classification of the employee and the Total Employment Cost (TEC) of the employee?

4. In financial year 2009-10 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2010-11? How much was approved by cabinet?

5. Between 30 June 2009 and 30 June 2010, will the minister list job title and total employment cost of each position (with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more)—

(a) which has been abolished; and

(b) which has been created?

6. For the year 2009-10, will the minister provide a breakdown of expenditure on all grants administered by all departments and agencies reporting to the minister—listing the name of the grant recipient, the amount of the grant and the purpose of the grant, and whether the grant was subject to a grant agreement as required by Treasurer's Instruction No. 15?

7. For all capital works projects listed in Budget Paper 5 that are the responsibility of the minister, will the minister list the total amounts spent to date on each project?

8. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, how many Targeted Voluntary Separation Packages (TVSPs) will be offered for the financial years 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14?

The CHAIR: Member for Kavel, one last question.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: In order to provide the additional 300 police officers committed by 2014, recruitment numbers will need to cover natural attrition. What is the estimated natural attrition of police officers over the forward estimates?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The commissioner is happy to take that question.

Mr HYDE: Each year, we estimate the attrition, when we are setting the recruiting strategy, based on the conditions at the time. We expect attrition this year to be between 165 and 180. We would not be able to forecast three to four years out what the attrition rate will be, but it probably will be in that order. Change in economic conditions in the community, for example, can influence people as to whether they stay on or retire, but we do work on roughly 165 to 180 on a normal year. The attrition percentage is round about 3.5 per cent, which is quite low, and that has varied a little over the years but, essentially, it been quite stable.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, I declare consideration of the proposed payments adjourned until tomorrow.

[Sitting suspended from 11:17 to 13:00]

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT, \$146,381,000

ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT, \$51,292,000

Membership:

Mr Griffiths substituted for Mr Goldsworthy.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan substituted for Mr Pengilly.

Witness:

The Hon. M.J. Wright, Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. Maguire, Chief Executive, Attorney-General's Department and Department of Justice.

Mr T. Arbon, Director, Office for Racing.

Mr P. Dowling, Planning and Policy Manager, Office for Racing.

Ms D. Contala, Executive Director, Finance and Business Services, Attorney-General's Department.

Mr G. Baynes, Executive Director, Building Communities, Attorney-General's Department.

Mr A. Swanson, Director, Business and Financial Services, Attorney-General's Department.

The CHAIR: I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to Portfolio Statement Volume 2, Part 5. Would the minister like to make a brief statement, or have we discarded them?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, we have discarded ministerial statements, and we are working on the basis that we will dispense with ministerial statements and dispense with questions from the government. We will go for an hour, do racing first and recreation and sport after that, but that does not much worry me. It is really for the shadow minister to allocate the time that he wants for each of those separate areas.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I confirm that that is the arrangement, and I was pleased when the approach was made this morning. It certainly allows the opposition a little more flexibility when that arrangement is in place, and I thank the minister for that. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.27. Other than the funds used to run the Office for Racing, will the minister confirm the total assistance given to racing in 2009-10?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that for financial assistance to the racing industry in 2009-10, there was \$5.3 million from the TAB wagering tax reforms. The shadow minister would be aware that we announced that some time ago, and it increases each year, but in that year it was \$5.3 million. We also provided \$175,000 in Be Active funding and the product fee review, done through legislation, in 2009-10 was \$8.45 million.

Mr GRIFFITHS: As a supplementary, how does that compare with what is allocated for the 2010-11-year and the years going forward?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: For 2010-11, the advice I have received is that Be Active funding remains constant at \$175,000, the South Australian TAB wagering tax reforms in 2010-11 is \$6.4 million, and the product fee revenue goes to \$8.7 million. We do not have any figures beyond 2010-11.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to page 5.17, the same budget paper reference, Targets. Will the minister give further detail regarding the target of 'further examining the introduction of consistent advertising standards for Australian wagering operators'? What does this process involve?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I will give a bit of a background before I talk about the decision at the racing ministers' conference in April. There are a number of benefits to a national approach with regard to a national advertising standard to discourage marketing strategies which exploit forum shopping: to discourage leapfrog marketing by imposing a consistent advertising standard; to protect problem and at risk gamblers from harm; and to provide appropriate consumer information.

At the racing ministers' conference in April, the ministers supported a national working party of officials to consider bookmaker advertising standards, including electronic advertising and the development of specific guidelines for that purpose, and it is to report back to ministers prior to the 2011 conference. As you would probably be aware, it is a bit different from other ministerial conferences: we do not necessarily meet once a year—on average we would meet once a year but there have been some calendar years when it has slipped over into the next year; but, generally speaking, we try to meet once a year. So, that working party will report back to ministers prior to the 2011 conference, which I would imagine would be around March or April of 2011.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Has there been any level of preliminary discussions held on this and, indeed, does it pose any level of threat at all to SA racing in sponsors or advertisers?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that there have been preliminary discussions, primarily at an officer level. As you may be aware, we already have a code of advertising standards in South Australia. It is my understanding that other states are looking to do something similar. New South Wales and Victoria also have their respective codes. I think the other states are looking to do something similar, maybe not identical, to the states that already have a code. I do not foresee that there would be a threat in South Australia.

As I say, the code already exists and I would certainly not be supporting something at a ministerial conference that would disadvantage the racing industry here in South Australia. It is my understanding that the code that is in place is generally, along with those other codes, the type of thing that we are looking to move towards for a national standard.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am pleased to see that South Australia is doing well in this. I am sure that all of us in this room would be aware that racing has faced its financial challenges in recent years and recognise that efforts have been made by the government to continue to support racing. Has there been any level of dialogue between the Office for Racing and the racing industry in South Australia, even on those preliminary discussions that have been held at a ministerial level?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the shadow minister for his question. The advice I have received is that the IGA has responsibility for this code. It is also responsible for the dialogue that occurs. However, having said that, when the working party reports in December—that is, the working party that is a subgroup of the racing ministers' conference—the Office for Racing here in South Australia will certainly engage the stakeholders with regard to that report.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I move to another question on that line, page 5.27, and still discussing wagering, of course. Can you advise the committee what specific work the Office for Racing has done with the industry following the Productivity Commissioner's report into gambling?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The issues of the Productivity Commission have been discussed with the racing industry. It is my advice that the major issue regards the state and territory ministers giving in-principle support to the development of a national approach to the payment of race field fees, including the development of federal legislation to facilitate such a national approach. Ministers agreed to a working party to report on the most appropriate structures for drug testing and analysis in the racing industry.

The New South Wales racing minister has written to the federal government about these issues, and we are awaiting a response from that. However, it would be fair to say that these issues, and any other issues that are in the Productivity Commission report, have been and will continue to be discussed with the stakeholders and the racing industry. That is the advice I have received.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer back to page 5.17, and the fourth dot point under highlights for 2009-10 for recreation, sport and racing. It states you will continue to work with the controlling authorities in the racing industry and other stakeholder groups to improve industry sustainability. I have a question on behalf of regional South Australian racing—the member for Flinders and myself have somewhat of an interest in this, given that we have racing clubs in our own electorates—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: And Stuart.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Stuart also, my apologies; we have everything covered here. What specific work has been done with regional racing clubs, such as those we have talked about, to improve the sustainability of racing in country South Australia?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the shadow minister for his question, and he is right: regional clubs are very important and we should never underestimate the role that they play. Principally, these clubs are the responsibility of Thoroughbred Racing SA and have been since the corporatisation of the racing industry back in about 2002. I know that TRSA is working in consultation with Port Augusta. I suspect the local member would be aware of dialogue, and that is looking good. Members may be aware that TRSA in recent times has made Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln provincial racing clubs, increasing their status.

Members would be aware that the government has made a contribution of \$6 million to Gawler. Murray Bridge, of course, is an exciting development, and we are in dialogue with Murray Bridge. The Murray Bridge Cup is on tomorrow, and I have the good fortune of presenting the cup, so I am looking forward to going to that. I am sure there will be a good crowd.

In addition, for quite some time now (I do not want to pluck a number out of the air) I have been meeting on a regular basis with the SAJC and SARCC. As members would be aware, SARCC is the umbrella stakeholder body that has responsibility for country and provincial regional clubs. It is the South Australian Racing Clubs Council of which John Glatz is the chair.

It would be fair to say that, although it is the responsibility of Thoroughbred Racing SA (the corporate body), we also take an active interest whether it be, where appropriate, providing financial assistance and helping with the discussions, which hopefully we are in the process of doing with Murray Bridge. I think for racing to be strong in South Australia, quite clearly, the SAJC is the principal club, but everyone recognises that we want these regional clubs around the state also performing strongly. Oakbank, of course, is another jewel in the crown.

Mr GRIFFITHS: And Balaklava, too, minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Balaklava—I could keep going. Balaklava obviously has the number one cup in the country, so it is another jewel. If you think about it—whether it be Oakbank, Balaklava, Murray Bridge or the smaller clubs like Jamestown and Roxby Downs—we do very well, and I think we should always acknowledge the role of country racing clubs, not only the committee structure, which is very important, but also the volunteers who help put the show on, and they do a great job.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Minister, I endorse all those fine words, but I seek your indulgence—and I apologise if I am not as well informed as I should be, but I handle this for the Hon. Terry Stephens in the upper house. There was a report several years ago that talked about the amalgamation of clubs. Has that progressed or has it been discarded? For example, I believe that the Gawler and Balaklava clubs were encouraged at one stage.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: They were, yes.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I hope that is not the case any more. I am just wondering whether you can provide for the benefit of the record an update on that.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, I think I can, but just let me get a little bit of advice. I can say before I get any advice that this government and this minister will not force any club to amalgamate.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am happy with that. I have a question on page 5.27, Performance Indicators. I am intrigued because it talks about the number of consultations with racing and wagering industry organisations. It is in the many thousands, minister. Can you confirm for me what indeed is a consultation when there are some 10,659, which is the estimated result for 2009-10, and that divided by the number of days per year is actually 29? I am sure you do not have 29 people out there every day of the year talking to somebody in the industry, so what is a consultation?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, Jerome, as you would know, is a very hard taskmaster. Some refer to him as the elephant in the room, but that is simply not fair.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Your words, minister, not ours.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: But in all seriousness, I think there has been a clerical error.

Mr MAGUIRE: A typo.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: A typo; thank you, Jerome. Do you have the revised figures?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Not that I am aware.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We do apologise; there has been a clerical error. I will just give you the figures, so that you can have them handy. For 2010-11, there were 36 consultations; for 2009-10, there were 37. For the targets, 36; and 2008-09, 38. So, there is just a bit of a variation there.

Mr GRIFFITHS: A considerable typo. I refer to page 5.26, referring to the Gawler redevelopment. You previously said that the new design track and improved facilities at Gawler will accommodate additional race meetings. You had indicated previously that Gawler has 12 meetings and the proposal of TRSA was to move that up to about 22 meetings. Has that, in fact, been achieved?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It would not have been achieved because it has only very recently opened. I am working from old information and, if it is not correct, my adviser will tell me but, certainly, we are expecting the number of meetings to increase. In 2010-11, there were 16 meetings, and it is likely to increase to approximately 22 in the future. I guess we are moving to more than the 12 you referred to, but the expectation is that we will see that increase to approximately 22 in the future.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer again to the same budget reference. You referred last year to the fact that you expected Allan Scott Park at Morphettville to be able to conduct up to 70 race meetings per year, with its two tracks. How close is it to achieving that target?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am not exactly sure, so I will check the numbers, but I think it would be around that figure. The feedback I have received both on and off the track is that the two tracks are both racing very well. The new track, in particular, the industry is very happy with. So, I would imagine that that estimation I made last year is pretty close to the mark. I am very confident that it would be up towards that number, but we will check the detail and provide that to the shadow

minister. Irrespective of the number, the good news is that both tracks are racing very well. The new inside track is called The Parks, and that appears to have been very well accepted by the stakeholders, such as the trainers, the jockeys and the owners. So, that number would be pretty close to being accurate.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Again, I refer to page 5.27. Several months ago, Thoroughbred Racing SA announced that it was going to embark on a campaign to move the Clare Easter Saturday meeting to the Sunday and Penola's normal Sunday meeting to Easter Tuesday. Oakbank, of course, will continue to remain on the Saturday and Sunday. Obviously, that is going to be a big four days of racing in South Australia if it can be achieved, but is government support being provided to TRSA to assist with negotiating with the clubs on the potential moves?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The type of material that you ask about is really the responsibility of Thoroughbred Racing SA. The day-to-day working arrangements of the industry are the responsibility of Thoroughbred Racing SA. The government has no control over racing dates. Once again, that is something that is the responsibility of Thoroughbred Racing SA.

I imagine, and I would hope, that whether it be the particular dates and venues that the member talks about and/or, for that matter, other programming, TRSA does that in discussion and negotiation with the clubs because, obviously, we want the racing industry working together and moving forward. So, that type of decision-making sits squarely with Thoroughbred Racing SA.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My last question on racing relates to jumps racing. I know the shadow minister informs me that he receives regular contact about that and, no doubt, you also receive contact in your office. However, for the benefit of the record, can you provide an update to the committee on the state of play and what you see the future of jumps racing in South Australia to be?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It is a volatile, emotive issue. Once again, we think that the best decision for jumps racing rests with Thoroughbred Racing SA. Obviously, we will work with the industry, as is the case in Victoria. Victoria and South Australia are, as you would be aware, the two states that still have jumps racing. The government supports jumps racing. Having said that, we also support the welfare of the horse and the jockey, so safety must always be paramount.

We acknowledge and appreciate that there are certain elements, some people—one, in fact, was a candidate against me at the last state election—who have differing views, and they are entitled to those views. I think that jumps racing is well aware that it is on watch and that there are strong community standards. No-one likes to see a horse fall and then have the potential ramifications, the worst of which may be the loss of a horse's life and, for that matter, a jockey's life.

It is a delicate area. We appreciate that throughout the community there is a whole range of different views. I think we have to be realistic enough to know that maybe the future of jumps racing in South Australia is related to Victoria, because if Victoria was to close it down it may be difficult for it to continue in one state alone. I guess people associated with the jumps industry may have a different view to that, and they can make their case. We would not simply close it down because of that. I simply make the point that, with only two states doing jumps racing, I think we both need to ensure that safety is paramount. There have been some changes, largely in Victoria, because I think our standards were probably better than those of Victoria. But, of course, one death is one death too many.

Having said all that, we support jumps racing but we also support the safety of the animals and the safety of the jockeys.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Referring to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.17, can you tell the committee what work you are doing advocating to the state minister for planning on behalf of racing, and specifically the Port Augusta Racing Club, so that it may be able to get the rezoning it is looking for so it can grow and flourish?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that, at this stage, Thoroughbred Racing SA has not put a proposal before us. We are expecting that to occur, and we are looking for that to occur. When that does occur, that will be the time—when I have something in front of me—I engage with minister Holloway. Obviously, we work closely together on these types of issues but, at this stage, we do not have a proposal from TRSA.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Chairman, I indicate that we will now go to recreation and sport questions.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. Maguire, Chief Executive Officer, Attorney-General's Department and Department of Justice.

Mr P. Anderson, Executive Director, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Ms D. Contala, Executive Director, Finance and Business Services, Attorney-General's Department.

Mr A. Swanson, Director, Business and Financial Services, Attorney-General's Department.

Mr C. Paul, General Manager, Finance and Business Improvement, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Ms J. Hughes, Director, Venues Infrastructure, Planning and Policy, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Mr W. Battams, Director, South Australian Sports Institute, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Ms K. Taylor, Director, Industry Development and Participation, Office for Recreation and Sport.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I recognise the presence and the involvement of Mr Anderson and many of his colleagues who were very helpful to the Economic and Finance Committee in a couple of sessions that we held.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Maybe they were too helpful.

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, they answered a lot of questions from a lot of very parochial members of the House of Assembly. I think they presented at least twice. I refer to Budget Paper 6, page 54. I note that the budget reveals that the Office for Recreation and Sport will now come under the new Building Communities Division that Mr Baynes, as I understand it, will be heading. The government has flagged that this initiative will save some \$9.9 million over four years. Obviously, not all of those savings relate to what would have been the Office for Recreation and Sport, but can you detail to the committee what the impact will be for those people who work within the Office for Recreation and Sport?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received for recreation and sport is that in 2010-11 the indicative FTEs are nine; in 2011-12, nine again; in 2012-13, 16.5; and in 2013-14, 16.5. That figure of 16.5 is the total figure, which includes the SBC and the old savings that carry over from the past.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Sorry; the SBC? Not the Sustainable Budget Commission?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Is that how many people are going to be working within the organisation, or how many you have to lose?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, they are the indicative FTEs that will be the savings—that will be lost.

Mr GRIFFITHS: So how many currently exist within the Office for Recreation and Sport?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is approximately 105.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Just so that I am sure: in 2010-11 nine people are targeted to be removed?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is right.

Mr GRIFFITHS: And then a further nine people in 2011-12 and then a further—

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No.

Mr GRIFFITHS: It is not cumulative? That will be the total from the current figure that has gone by the end of that year? Otherwise you are losing half your workforce within four years.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is right.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Given that there is a variety of previous savings demands that have been in place, some of those funded through TVSPs and some through savings requirements of the department, are all the 16.5 FTEs that are required to leave going to have access to TVSPs, or in

some cases are they contract workers who will not have their contract renewed; or, indeed, is there any other option available to reduce the workforce?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that it will come from these areas: natural attrition, contract workers, and unfilled positions. At this stage there is no decision on TVSPs and we are awaiting Treasury advice on that.

Mr GRIFFITHS: So, there are no TVSP requirements that were part of the Treasurer's Mid-Year Budget Review announcement in January 2009 about 1,600 people going over a three-year period that you still have to meet?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that the previous TVSP that you referred to is finished. There were some people who were offered a TVSP in that package from Recreation and Sport. At this stage we do not know that number, but obviously we will get it for you. With regard to the next round of TVSPs, we are still awaiting advice from Treasury.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Budget Paper 6, page 53. This is a question about funding for facilities. It is a loose connection, but what is the current state of play for the State Association House, which I understand is home to a dozen or so different sport and recreation bodies? The shadow minister advises me that the tenure for that facility is somewhat shaky and that the tenants may be required to find other premises. Is the government assisting these bodies in any way to ensure they still have a home?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The role of the State Association House has been an important one and, rather than go through all the briefing notes in front of me, suffice to say that a subsidy of about \$170,000 has been provided to the various sports that use State Association House. The State Association House arrangement is due to expire on 18 March 2011. We are in discussion with the various sports, the tenants, with respect to their future. We are also in discussion with DTEI and certainly we are working with the sports.

We have provided that subsidy for quite some time and we know the importance of it. Yes, we are working with those various organisations to find alternatives that may or may not be available, and certainly the Office for Recreation and Sport is working closely with the sports that currently use State Association House.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As the minister is aware, every sporting club is being asked to appoint a responsible officer to deal with occupational health and safety. This officer takes on personal responsibility for the club and could be criminally liable if something goes wrong. Many clubs run solely by volunteers previously believed that they did not need a responsible officer, but SafeWork SA recently clarified the requirement.

Any club that engages in a business activity, such as operating a bar (even though it may be a non-profit organisation), must make someone accountable. Clubs, particularly those in regional areas, are run by volunteers and they are worried that their members will not want to make themselves vulnerable to criminal prosecution. The cost of training is also an issue for many of these small organisations. I have approached the minister on this matter and I am sure that other people and organisations have contacted him in recent months and weeks as well. Can he please provide some response to those concerns here today?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: This is an issue, there is no doubt about it. The member for Stuart has had the courtesy of raising this with me, and he is right. I am sure that other members, in estimates today and also in the parliament, would have had this raised because it is a concern for sport. To the best of my memory, it has also been raised with me by Sport SA and, yes, I do have it raised with me by sporting organisations, as I know the member does as well.

It is somewhat of an issue that we have to treat with care because, although the role of the responsible officer is clearly an important one, we are also—particularly where volunteers are running clubs—putting an extra impost upon those people. The best advice I can give you at this stage is that I am hearing the message and I will be working closely with the minister responsible.

SafeWork SA, which is under the responsibility of minister Holloway, has advised that a new national occupational health and safety act will come into effect from 2012, so I will be involved in dialogue regarding that at the cabinet table. By the way, sometimes national legislation does not quite appear when they say it is going to appear, so that might give a little bit of comfort to these organisations that we have to continue to have a dialogue with, but, ultimately, they want to know what is going to happen at the end.

I will certainly be involved in that debate. We know that it is an issue for sport, and we will be working very closely with them. The office also has its role and has brought concerns to my attention, in addition to the ones that I get straight up. I have just been reminded that the Office for Recreation and Sport is in continuing and ongoing dialogue with SafeWork SA in the lead-up to this projected national legislation in 2012. So, what I would appreciate is your telling your sporting organisations that we are aware of their concerns, that we have some empathy for that and that we will be bringing those to the table when these matters are brought to a head in regard to legislation.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I appreciate your genuine concern, minister, I really do. Is there any comfort that you can give some of these organisations between now and 2012, or whenever the national legislation comes through? I understand that the minister for planning, I think it is, or workplace safety, minister Holloway—

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Industrial Relations.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, thank you—does have the right to provide some exemptions. Is there any way that you could advocate on behalf of your ministry with that other minister, even if it is of a temporary nature, just to see them through? Some of these clubs, if they need to spend hundreds of dollars, or maybe in some cases thousands of dollars, even just for a few years, then some of these very small country, non-profit, volunteer-based organisations may not be here in 2012, or whenever the legislation arrives.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I cannot give you any guarantees right here and now, except to say that the advice I have received is that SafeWork SA is understanding in regard to volunteer clubs and potential prosecutions. That might help frame what they ultimately come forward with. It is a bit of a tangent, but the other recommendation I would make—and I know that the member is very active in his local electorate—is that it could be that the Active Club program might provide some short-term small amounts of financial relief as clubs go through this transition—if, in fact, they ultimately have to do that.

Obviously, we will keep looking at the issues that exist for sport, especially volunteer groups and sports that are largely, if not solely, run by volunteers. We will keep talking to the responsible agency, SafeWork SA. That will occur via the Office for Recreation and Sport, and I will continue to have ongoing dialogue with the Minister for Industrial Relations, who will ultimately have responsibility for bringing this forward.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I appreciate that, minister. I understand that you are not in a position to make a commitment here today, and I do not take it that way. I would certainly encourage you to do everything you can with minister Holloway on this issue. I also make a point which the member for Goyder has just reminded me of: it would be far more sensible to provide an exemption, even just a temporary one, than to provide grant funding to give taxpayer money to a club to give it back to the government. If an exemption could be provided it would be exactly the same outcome without having to spin the money around, and does not take that money away from other worthy grant recipients.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think that is a good point, and I am happy to take it on notice. It may be possible; I am not sure, sitting here right now. There is probably a difference between the larger and the smaller clubs, so that would need to be taken into account, but I am very happy to raise that concept with the appropriate minister.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: That's great; thank you, minister. We will work on that together.

Mr TRELOAR: My question refers to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.26, and the Vacswim program. I am sure we would all acknowledge that this program is very important for young people. Could the minister update the committee on the total number of participants in last year's program? Could the minister also advise what the government's funding commitment will be for Vacswim this year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the member for Flinders; he is certainly correct that Vacswim is one of the most important programs for which the office has responsibility. We are able to get a lot of kids participating, as well as instructors and parents; it really is something we can all be extremely proud of. The advice I have received is that there were 13,900 participants in the 2010 program, which was held at 133 locations across South Australia. For 2010, the advice I have received is that we spent \$533,000. We have not determined what the figure will be for the next Vacswim; we are still working through those numbers. But it might also be an opportune time to

thank all of the participants. Obviously, with numbers like that, we have thousands and thousands of children and parents, hundreds of instructors, and each year it is a fantastic program.

Mr GRIFFITHS: As a supplementary to that, minister: I understand it might be difficult to ascertain what the expenditure might be in January 2011, but I presume that there is reasonably good historical data that indicates there is a consistent number of children who attend Vacswim. I know all the members on this side, and I am sure the members of the government, would like to be able to reassure parents in their electorate that there is no diminution of support from the government for that and that all the existing Vacswim locations in place in January 2010 will be supported again in January 2011. Are you able to confirm that?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is a pretty big confirmation.

Mr GRIFFITHS: As much as humanly possible; I do respect that sometimes it is hard to get instructors. I have dealt with that also but, on the basis that they are available, is there an expectation from within your department to provide the same number of spots, and therefore opportunities, for young people to learn these important basic skills?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: This is why I go around saying that you are the shining star in the Liberal Party.

Mr GRIFFITHS: If only that were true! Sadly, it is not.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It is true, it is just that your colleagues don't respect it. I have some good news for you. The tendering process for 2011 has occurred and we have selected YMCA. I am advised that YMCA wants to grow the number of venues. I do not want to be held to account except to say that we would be hopeful that YMCA can meet its expectations.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Ambitions are wonderful things, but are they intended to be provided with additional dollars to help those ambitions become a reality?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I do not know what the budget will be. I am advised that we have their business plan but we are still working through that to determine what level of support they may require but, as I say, YMCA wants to grow the number of sites. We would see that as a good thing so, although I cannot give you a cast-iron assurance right here and now some months out, we are probably working towards the same thing that you are hoping for, that there will not be a reduction in sites but rather an additional number of sites compared with 2010.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Thank you, minister, for that answer. I appreciate that, and I am sure the community will appreciate it also. I refer to Budget Paper 6, page 52. It is a question about the Campbelltown Leisure Centre, which both the Liberal and Labor parties made commitments during the election process to support with some \$3 million. I understand that project's continuing is dependent on federal funds coming through. Indeed, is the minister able to provide the committee with an update on whether you have had any success in attracting federal dollars for that?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Not at this stage, but we are still hopeful. As you would be aware, at the last election, matched by your party, we talked about \$3 million for Campbelltown and \$5 million for Port Augusta. They are going to be great projects; they are going to be sporting hubs. This is something that we need to continue not only to grow those two projects but look at other potentials around the state as well.

I recently met with the member for Stuart and the mayor, and we are really excited about Port Augusta. I have also recently met with Paul Dilulio from the council, and I am sure you would have had discussions with him as well. We have talked about making some impression upon the federal government. We would hope, as I know you do as well, that we can encourage the federal government to make a significant financial contribution to this worthwhile project.

Mr GRIFFITHS: That contribution from the state, is that contingent upon dollars coming from the feds; that is, you will not make any payment at all until you are guaranteed of money being available from the federal government?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, our \$3 million commitment is not conditional on federal support. That is correct, isn't it? Sorry, I may have got that wrong. I got that incorrect, so I may need to clarify that. The money put forward by the government is conditional on the contribution coming forward from the federal government, but the council has said that, if that commitment is not forthcoming from the federal government, it will look to rescope the project and then come back to the state government; obviously, if that occurs, it will be a different scenario. Depending upon what they come up with, I would want to ensure that the government still made a contribution to the

project. I just want to clarify that the amount of money paid in 2010 for Vacswim was \$468,000, and the amount of money we have guaranteed to the YMCA in 2011 is \$533,000.

The CHAIR: After the break, we will move onto fire and emergency services.

[Sitting suspended from 14:05 to 14:20]

Membership:

Mr Goldsworthy substituted for Mr Griffiths.

Mr Gardner substituted for Mr Treloar.

Mr Pengilly substituted for Mr van Holst Pellekaan.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr E. Ferguson, Chief Officer, Country Fire Service.

Mr D. Place, Chief Executive, South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission.

Mr D. Norton, Director, Corporate Services, South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission.

Mr T. Pearce, Manager, Financial Services, South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission.

Ms L. Lew, Business Manager, Community Emergency Services Fund, South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission.

Mr G. Lupton, Chief Officer, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

Mr T. Norman, Business Manager, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

Mr M. Maywald, Acting Chief Officer, State Emergency Service.

Mr M. Blute, Business Manager, State Emergency Service.

Mr M. Hanson, Director, Public Safety Communications, Attorney-General's Department.

Mr J. Schirmer, Business Manager, Country Fire Service.

The CHAIR: I assume we are eschewing the niceties of introductory statements and going straight to questions. The member for Kavel.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Chair. Yes, we have negotiated the fact that neither the minister nor I will make an opening statement and we will run, hopefully unabated, for about an hour and a quarter.

I refer to Budget Paper 6, Budget Measures Statement, page 48, South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission, referring to savings initiatives, administrative restructure for 2009-10. As \$9 million over four years is being taken out of that budget, how many FTEs are to be lost as a result of the government policy to sack public servants?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I can provide the shadow minister with the following information: SAFECOM has experienced a reduction to its budget following the 2010-11 budget decision. The advice that I have received regarding the figures that the shadow minister asked for is that, in the year 2010-11, the FTE staff reduction will be 11.2; in 2011-12, it will be 22.7; in 2012-13, 32.4; and in 2013-14, it will be 34.5.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That is obviously a cumulative figure?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, that is correct.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Is that out of the three agencies plus SAFECOM combined, or out of SAFECOM itself?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is out of SAFECOM itself. As I have said previously, regarding the other agencies, on the advice I have received, there are no cuts to the CFS nor to the SES and a very small cut to the MFS.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Going on from that, minister, I refer to page 61 of Budget Paper 6, Metropolitan Fire Service, Departmental efficiencies 'will save \$1.6 million over four years'. How many senior positions will be lost from the MFS as a result of the government policy to sack public servants?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that the figure in 2010-11 for a full-time equivalent staff reduction is two, and then another two in the year 2013-14, giving a four-year total of four.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Do you have any idea at what level they will be?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes. I think that can be provided by the Chief Officer, Mr Lupton.

Mr LUPTON: The positions have been identified as senior officers or corporate management positions. There is not an exact number for one or the other, but they are four senior positions. Within the MFS there are approximately 12 positions that would fall into those categories, so it would be four of those.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Would commanders be at that level?

Mr LUPTON: Yes.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: So, four commanders are to go?

Mr LUPTON: Not necessarily four commanders, but that would be the scope—or corporate managers.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Just going back to my previous question, given that there are 34.5 FTEs to come out of SAFECOM as a total in 2013-14, how many staff are there employed in SAFECOM at the moment, minister?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that there are 106 FTEs.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I refer now to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.114, Operational Preparedness. Will the SACAD (South Australian Computer Aided Dispatch) system be in place by the end of this year and, if so, what is the budget allocation to see that take place?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that the total cost of the project, from 2008-09 to 2012-13 is \$40.9 million and is within the budget approved by cabinet. Operational cut-over to the new systems in each of the agencies is currently on target to be delivered on time and within budget by mid-2011, prior to the start of the 2011-12 high danger season.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: There have been some delays in the implementation of that system. I would not be incorrect in making that observation, minister?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, I think that is a fair assertion by the shadow minister. There have been some delays. The advice I have received is that this has mainly been related to the complexity of the project and also the extensive testing that is required to ensure that this works as we expect it to work.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the same budget paper, page 5.131, Performance Commentary. How many MFS personnel are employed in the state?

Mr LUPTON: The actual FTE count is 923. The way it works, one FTE counts for 10 retained persons. We count 26 full-time positions in there, which is 260 retained positions. If you actually did a head count, it would be a little over 1,100 employees, but as far as the way it is measured by government on the FTE count it is 923.5. It does fluctuate from time to time because we have recruitment and attrition and, because we have an establishment number we have to maintain due to our industrial agreements and our establishment numbers to ensure appropriate response, we sometimes hire more and go over that number, but we always make sure we never go below that number.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: How many have undertaken the NRT—the nationally recognised competency-based training schemes?

Mr LUPTON: Across the MFS?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

Mr LUPTON: The MFS uses a staff development framework, which is a competency-based training framework that goes from recruit trainer right up to district officer. South Australia has pioneered this training framework across Australia, and there are deliverables for

each level. The way the system works, everybody is trained prior to going into the ranks. In other words, you cannot put in a station officer as a station officer until they have met their competencies. The short answer is everybody. I could take the question on notice and give you exact numbers, but at any one time there are hundreds of fire service personnel involved in the various levels of training.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We will get further detail for the shadow minister.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Going from the budget paper at page 5.131 and looking at the targets, under the performance indicators the targets have dropped off this year from the 2010-11 target of 300 compared with 483 for the estimated result last year. What are the reasons for that? It is shown in the more complex table headed 'Performance indicators': establish and maintain effective career development and management systems. The first dot point is 'Total number of personnel enrolled in NRT'. The 2010-11 target is 300 and the 2009-10 estimated result was 483, and even back in 2008-09 the actual was 360. I am interested; it is not a trick question, but what is the reason for that?

Mr LUPTON: In the process of implementing this framework over many years and raising the educational standard of the workforce, there has been a need to qualify everybody. In our workforce we have people who stay for 30 years, so when the framework was first introduced those qualifications were not achieved, so that, as well as qualifying new people through the system to the new ranks, we have also had to try to qualify people initially. We project the numbers we would expect, based on the training delivered, as to how many we need to deliver. I interpret that as being that we are catching up on some of the people who have to meet their competencies and have had to deliver less training in that area.

The other thing that is hard to predict is that some of it is voluntary training, and when we try to anticipate what people might take over and above what they are required and try to get ahead of it, we have to estimate those numbers as well. So, it is not an exact science, but the goal is to have everybody trained to the competency, which we do, and also to be able to budget for it, because it is quite expensive, as you could imagine.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you for that. If we move over onto the next page (5.132), again in the table of performance indicators, under the Sub-program: Response, of the 18 per cent of MFS arrivals outside the seven-minute call-out target in the metropolitan area, and the 27 per cent of MFS arrivals outside the 11-minute call-out target for regional areas, are these reasons reported and monitored?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I will get the chief to respond to this one.

Mr LUPTON: The simple answer is, yes, we look at all our responses and the reasons if they take longer than the response standards that we maintain. One of the challenges we have is that factored into these response times are also what we call priority 2 responses, which are not always emergencies, and marine responses, which can take a considerable amount of time. So, it can make the responses, I guess, blow out or extend over and above normal. A good example of this would be that we responded to the recent ship sinking and fuel spill in Port Lincoln over the weekend and it took 10 hours for the MV *Gallantry* fireboat to get there. That would be captured in these statistics, so it would make them seem longer than normal. The other thing is that we never get any that make it any shorter.

So, yes, we do look at them, but that percentage is supposed to factor that in. It is a standard response time in urban fire services across Australasia, in fact it is used worldwide, to try to get there within the seven minutes, and at 75 per cent, which is a fairly high performance indicator, of all emergency services it is the highest standard. So, we are meeting the 75 per cent. That is our commitment, or guarantee, to the community that we are going to be effective and be able to make a difference when we get there.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you for that answer. Is any of the reason for this issue of meeting call-out targets related to station locations? I remember going back a few years ago when the new Paradise station was being proposed and built, there were some issues raised concerning the response time to reach some of the suburbs in the north-eastern area, particularly those on the other side of the river up around Highbury and the like. That station has been built and, obviously, it is resourced and cranking along as any MFS station does, but is there an issue in relation to the location of stations as a cause of not reaching these call-out targets?

Mr LUPTON: Just a clarification, because my reading of our performance indicators is that we are actually meeting our percentages. Your question is true: if the stations were not properly

located and if our forward planning was not done properly then, yes, there would be a significant impact upon these and that is why we have a long-term capital plan and we are always reviewing our response times. That has accounted for some of the construction in the eastern suburbs in recent times, starting off with Golden Grove and then back through with Beulah Park and the infill with Paradise and the shifting of Ridgehaven and Glynde stations, to get a better coverage because of the growth that has been experienced out through the north-east corridor. If we had not taken those steps and built those new stations, then I think you would have seen a considerable falling back of the response standards, but my interpretation is that we are actually meeting those. Our standard is to get there 75 per cent of the time.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Are there any plans for new stations to be built further out in the north-eastern suburbs to take into account continued residential growth?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that at the moment our priority is to look at readjusting our response between the CFS and the MFS for Salisbury and Dalkeith. Into the future, we will also look at the new operation of SACAD and the data that comes from it. Obviously if, when and as circumstances change, if recommendations were made to me as minister from the MFS I would act appropriately, but at this stage there are no plans for the areas you talk about—as I think has been covered in part by previous questions to and responses from the chief. There have been a number of new stations, in both metropolitan and country areas, and they are all functioning well. Obviously, we are pleased to have delivered them.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I now move onto questions relating to the CFS, and I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.149, Statement of comprehensive income. These questions relate to the recent announcement by the Chief Officer of his decision to leave us to move back to his home state of Victoria. Minister, when do you expect that a new chief officer will be appointed? Will it be before this fire season or after it?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It will be as soon as is practicable. I cannot necessarily specify a date, but you would be aware that, just a few days beyond Mr Ferguson informing me of his position, we advertised both within South Australia and nationally. Obviously, it is a priority, but we are going to get it right. We do have, of course, a very good deputy. Mr Ferguson will be with us until 14 November. We not only have a very good deputy in Andrew Lawson but we also have a very good management structure and a fantastic volunteer base.

So, despite the fact that we are disappointed that Mr Ferguson is leaving, he leaves with our good grace. He has been a fantastic chief officer, as I am sure the shadow minister and other members would testify. We congratulate him on his new role. I acknowledge to the parliament that, for me—and others, although I can only speak on my own behalf—it has been a pleasure as minister to work with someone who is so good and so professional and who is able to manage his own staff and the volunteer base superbly.

Euan has been here for nine years. He might like to speak in a bit more detail, but I know that this was a difficult decision for him. Perhaps the attraction of going back home was a factor. Maybe post-Black Saturday in Victoria and the new challenges confronting that state were aspects that he took into consideration. I know that he has thoroughly enjoyed his time here, as we have thoroughly enjoyed having him. As I said, he has been an ornament to the position. Needless to say, we will go through a process and put in place the best possible individuals on the panel to ensure that we get as good a replacement as is possible.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: When you say 'the panel', do you mean an interviewing panel?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think that is what I am talking about.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Or a panel of prospective candidates?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Sorry, I am talking about a panel that will be put in place that would have the responsibility of short-listing, interviewing that short list and making a recommendation to me. As best I recall, I do not have a recommendation at this stage as to who should be on the panel but it would be a process similar to that which we used for the SES. David Place, as the head of SAFECOM, will chair that. We have discussed the types of individuals.

We would be looking at potentially—and I probably should not go into the detail because I do not have any recommendation, but I know what is in my mind—for police, the volunteers association and the MFS to be represented. That is just to give you two or three examples; it would probably be a bit bigger than that, so there are going to be some other individuals as well. But they are the types of organisations that I would imagine would be represented on the panel. The

advertisements have already gone out, and we will fill this position as quickly as possible, but we will not rush it and make a mistake.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That is a good idea. I also add that I think the Chief Officer, Mr Ferguson, has provided exemplary service to the state in his role. Can you tell me how you have gone about your advertising? Have you put an ad in *The Australian* and *The Advertiser* and have you run advertisements in all the major interstate newspapers as well?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have received is that so far we have advertised in *The Advertiser* and *The Weekend Australian*, and that will continue. Also, there is a national executive search on, and we are using Stillwell for the SES position as well because we are confident in that company's skills. So, Stillwell is undertaking a national executive search and using forums you would expect it to use, and I can give you that detail if needed. We have not ruled out going international; that is also something I have an open mind about.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Minister, did you offer the Chief Officer any incentives to stay for this fire season and leave for Victoria afterwards?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am not sure that was necessarily an option. Realistically, the Victorian government wanted the Chief Officer as soon as possible—sooner, in fact, than he is going. We had to be a bit realistic about this in terms of the corporate world. It is not Euan's fault, but it is not ideal timing—that is a given—but we figured that the timing had to be fair to our taxpayers and to Euan, and we had to take account of his new employer. As I said, the Victorian government would have liked it to have been sooner. I looked at the potential to make it later, but I am not sure that would have been ideal because later would have put us slap-bang into the bushfire season. The date is 12 November. We had all those machinations occurring, and we are going to work through them.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Minister, can you expand on what you said about having to be fair to our taxpayers? What does that mean?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: As I said, my advice is that the Victorian government would have preferred Euan to go earlier than 12 November. I did not agree with the date the Victorian government put forward. As I said, I had a couple of alternatives and, obviously, one was the one we arrived at, which Euan was happy with. I could have bumped it out. Potentially, I may have been able to bump it out a couple of more weeks, but that would have put us closer to the bushfire season. What I am saying is that there is no perfect date for Euan to go, but we have arrived at a sensible compromise.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: But when you say taxpayers, does that have some financial implication around that? Do you mean South Australians or do you mean that there is a financial implication to the taxpayers?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, I do not mean that at all. That might be a minor factor, but that was not in my consideration. My consideration was to make a decision as to when it would be best in the circumstances, keeping in mind that Euan had made a decision to go, and which date would be the least problem for South Australia and the taxpayers, and I am not speaking in a financial sense but in terms of our needing to arrive at a date that would least disadvantage the taxpayers. So I was not going to agree to the earlier proposition that was suggested by the Victorian government, which would have seen Euan go before 12 November. I could have possibly—whether that would have been acceptable to the Victorian government and/or Euan, and I am not sure—gone for maybe a later date but chose not to, because that would have put us closer to the bushfire season.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: But you really have not answered my initial question.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: What was that?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: What did you do to try to keep him for this fire season?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think I have answered it. You might not like the answer, but I think I have answered it. When I was informed, out of courtesy, by the Chief Officer that he had accepted a job in Victoria, the next thing we spoke about was when he would depart South Australia. As I have said, there was a date suggested to me that the Victorian government would have liked the Chief Officer from South Australia to start in Victoria. I chose not to accept that date and I then had a couple of alternatives, which I have already outlined to you. One is we could have landed at or about where we did land; or, if we wanted to, I suppose, stick strictly to the contract,

and we could have forced an individual to be here longer than he wanted. That does not seem an ideal way of doing business, to me.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Putting it in another manner, and I will help the minister, there was no real room to negotiate because Mr Ferguson had accepted the position in Victoria and came to you and said, 'I have accepted the position: I want to go,' end of story?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, I think that is a fair way of putting it.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That is what you could have said.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, because you were talking about when he was going to leave.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No, I asked: what incentives did you offer to keep him for the fire season?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I did not offer any incentives because the decision had been made. Mr Ferguson came to me, having made his decision with his family, and informed me of that decision, and I had to respect that decision. The only thing that was open to negotiation was—

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The finish date.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, when he was actually physically going to go.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Are there any costs involved in the chief officer resigning before what I understand is his contract expiring?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I know the shadow minister is not talking about the advertising, because we have already covered that. He is talking about leave entitlements and things like that. The advice I have received is that, like any employee, there would be long service leave and annual leave entitlements. I do not have numbers or figures for that, but that would be like for any other employee.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: So there is no additional cost involved, apart from leave and superannuation and things like that?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I do not believe so.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: So the contract allows the chief officer to resign at any time of his choice, basically?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, it is a standard state government contract which allows for either party to terminate.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I want to talk a bit about how the positions will be backfilled. I understand the deputy chief officer—who I know very well and have a great deal of respect for, and he is actually a constituent—will backfill the chief officer's role. Who is going to fill the deputy chief officer's role and then who will backfill that position, and so on down the line?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is a fair question. I will start, but I will—

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: My understanding is that the CFS is not over-resourced in terms of its human resources numbers. I have to say that I have some concerns that we are going to run pretty thin on the ground, so to speak.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It is not as thin as you imagine: my advice is that there are 124.5 staff. I will kick it off and then let Euan go into a bit more detail, because he can obviously talk about the backfilling. However, I appreciate your comments about Euan and also about Andrew Lawson. Andrew has 25 years' experience with the CFS, several international and national deployments, and he is a very seasoned and well-credentialed operative, so he will be the acting CEO.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: CO.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Chief Officer, yes; sorry. I will get Euan to talk about some of the other detail you wanted in regard to backfilling.

Mr FERGUSON: We are putting arrangements in place, as the minister has said, for the deputy chief officer to be acting chief officer. There is an acting chief officer, Rob Sandford, who also fills the position of manager operations services. He will act up as the deputy chief officer, and we will be calling for expressions of interest for an existing staff member to act as the manager

operations services to backfill Rob Sandford. At the same time, we will be calling for expressions of interest for an acting assistant chief officer to take the operational on-call role. We expect that to come from the senior ranks of the CFS. It may well be a development opportunity.

I think it is very important to reinforce that we structure both our day-to-day business and, in particular, our operational command and control arrangements in a way that, if any one individual becomes injured or ill or is absent, there are at least two people who can take on that role. In fact, between myself, Andrew Lawson and Rob Sandford, we frequently have arrangements where they act up for a short period of time whilst I am interstate.

We regularly have major operations throughout the state where I leave the office—when it is appropriate to do so—and visit the fire ground and might be out of communication. It is very frequent during major incidents where I move to the State Emergency Centre so that I can be in the same place as the Chief Officer of the MFS and the Police Commissioner, and Andrew Lawson effectively runs the CFS. So, I just want to reassure the member that Andrew, in fact, has had much experience in a range of these operational roles, including acting as the chief officer whilst I have been out of contact or attending to other matters.

Regarding the filling arrangements that you referred to, there will be a backfilling. Ultimately, we will come to the end of the line, but we also have a number of people in the organisation who have been doing casual work in our State Air Desk. So, when it comes down to who replaces the person at the end of the line, we have a cadre of casual employees whom we can call on. So, I am confident that we will have arrangements in place to fill all the required positions during my absence, until the new chief officer is announced.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to page 5.146, under the heading of Operational Preparedness. Will the bushfire management areas and committees be in place and operating satisfactorily prior to this year's fire season commencing? I understand that the bushfire management areas have been worked out but a number of the committees are yet to be appointed. I will just give some explanation. Last year the fire danger season started on 1 November in six districts. This year's fire danger seasons are likely to be announced in a couple of weeks, so we only have a couple of weeks to get the bushfire management structure in order, really.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the shadow minister for his question and I acknowledge that he has previously asked me this in parliament, I think, from memory. We have nine committees. The advice that I have received is that four have already met. Further advice is that the other five will have met by the end of October, that meetings are scheduled. That is the advice that I have received. I am expecting that to occur. As well, of course, in the interim, pre-existing committees continue to function and provide advice on bushfire management.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that nine areas have been established, even though, when we were debating this legislation in the house last year, a figure of 16 was highlighted. That has been compressed down to nine. Four of these committees have already met, and five are to meet by the end of the month. So what you are saying is that the members of those five committees have all been appointed?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I could not guarantee that, but what I have been advised is that for those five that have not currently met, meetings have been scheduled, and quorums are in place for those meetings. It may still be that, from area to area, there is the odd appointment that has to be finalised. I am not saying that is the case; I do not know that detail. What I have been advised is that four have already met and that the remaining five will have met by the end of October, that their meetings have been scheduled and that they have quorums in place to be able to meet.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Minister, that is quite astounding. You are saying that you do not know that detail. This was a key plank of the review into the South Australian fire and emergency services that took place as a consequence of the establishment of that commission. The review process went through, we debated this in the house over 12 months ago, the state Liberal opposition agreed to it, and now you are telling me you do not have that detail. Give us a break.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Four of the committees have already met. I have given an assurance, on the advice provided to me, that the other five have meetings scheduled, that they will meet by the end of October and that they have quorums in place. If any of those areas still have individuals to put in place, obviously we will do all we can to assist and encourage: we will work with the councils and with the Farmers Federation. There is no need to get overly excited about it. All those groups will have had their meetings by the end of October.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I am not getting excited: I am just concerned about being stuck halfway between the old system and the new structure. What is the reason for the delay, given that you said in the house last year (and I specifically remember this because I asked you the question in committee on the bill) that it would take about 10 to 12 weeks to establish the areas and committees. On 8 September last year you stated that it would take 10 to 12 weeks from the time the bill was assented to. The Fire and Emergency Services (Review) Amendment Bill was assented to on 13 October, so it is pretty well 12 months to the date that the bill was assented to. Instead of 12 weeks, it has taken 12 months. What has caused the delay?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: In an ideal world we would have required some agencies to provide their nominations in a more timely fashion. Sometimes these are the types of impediments you have to work with. As I said, four have already met and five are due to meet by the end of October and their meetings are scheduled. You are wanting these committees to be up and running before the bushfire season, and the advice I have been given is that that will occur.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: But not with the full representation on the committees. Potentially, you will not have all the appointed members on those committees before the bushfire season starts, because it is clear from your answer today that, while they have a quorum for those five committees, you do not have the full membership filled.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The advice I have been given is that the CFS has done everything possible to get the nominations from the various agencies. There may be still more nominations coming in, and I would encourage the organisations, if they have not already done so, to ensure that their nominations are put forward.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Changing tack slightly, will the government continue with its 'Prepare. Act. Survive.' message or will it change it for this coming fire season?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The government will continue with its 'Prepare. Act. Survive.' policy and I will get the Chief Officer to give a little more detail.

Mr FERGUSON: Through the budget papers, you will see that there is a reflection of the additional funding provided by government specifically for the 'Prepare. Act. Survive.' program. The current status of the program is that for the 2009-10 financial year \$5.2 million was provided. Generally the campaign has relied very heavily on community service announcements, but the current status is that the campaign is focused at three levels: first, community awareness; secondly, at neighbourhood level, with neighbourhoods being prepared to act; and, finally, at an individual level, with individuals being prepared to act.

Of that \$5.2 million, \$2.3 million has been allocated for an updated series of television, radio and print advertisements, and that includes a 12-page newspaper lift-out; \$940,000 was used to boost the number of community educators and enable a 20 per cent increase in the number of community fire safety groups, and for the last budget year a 28 per cent increase in groups was achieved; \$740,000 was used to update the *Bush Fire Survival Plan* and other bushfire safety publications; \$600,000 was allocated to produce and deliver 220,000 bushfire-ready DVDs to residents in bushfire-prone areas; \$380,000 was used for enhancements to the CFS website; and \$220,000 was used for work in establishing the policy on Neighbourhood Safer Places, and we have had very positive feedback from our market research on the activities we have undertaken in the last 12 months.

At the moment the 'Prepare. Act. Survive.' campaign continues, and the honourable member would probably understand that we are in Bushfire Action Week; and additional government funding has been provided to continue the number of community educators that we have, and that will, again, go into television, radio and print advertisements, and some greater enhancements to the CFS website (which are active at the moment) and, obviously, continuing our community engagement. That funding continues on beyond this current financial year. So, I think the answer to the member's question is a resounding yes.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The other members (the members for Morialta and Finniss) have some questions, but I have just one left to ask. On page 5.141, targets/highlights, the very first dot point: can you tell us where in the budget is the allocation of funds and how much has been funded to achieve the first target—'Adopt or adapt, where appropriate, the Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission findings to South Australia and identify relevant remedial actions'?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: As the shadow minister would be aware, we established the Bushfire Task Force soon after the bushfires in Victoria. Mr Euan Ferguson has chaired that committee, and it has had a range of people on it, primarily from across the various departments of

government. Perhaps I can get Euan, as the chair of that committee, to speak a little more about what the task force has recommended, and that, of course, will lead into the financial commitments that we have made post the Victorian bushfires.

Mr FERGUSON: I need to reinforce that the bushfire task force has a very broad representation at senior level from many government agencies and also a number of non-government agencies. Many of those agencies are bodies that we would not deal with in our normal bushfire planning matters. The bushfire task force was formed shortly after the Black Saturday bushfires. It is a subcommittee of the State Emergency Management Committee. The Bushfire Task Force started its work discussing what the implications of those bushfires were for South Australia. On Monday 17 August 2009 the royal commission released its interim findings. The bushfire task force worked through those interim findings and identified 63 actions that were relevant for South Australian agencies. On 31 July 2010 the royal commission delivered its final report, and that contained 67 recommendations.

So there are two bodies of work that the bushfire task force has been dealing with: 63 actions relating to the interim recommendations and 67 recommendations from the final report. Those 67 recommendations related to bushfire safety policy, emergency and incident management, fire ground response, electricity-caused fire, deliberately-lit fires, planning and building, land and field management, organisational structure, research and evaluation, monitoring and implementation, and reflections. It is important to recognise that not every one of those related specifically to the CFS, or indeed to emergency services. A number of them related to the electricity industry and a number related to planning arrangements within this state, and so on.

However, to answer the question, as part of this process agencies have been appointed as the lead agency for implementing an action or recommendation, and other stakeholder agencies have been identified. Through the task force, agencies have also identified whether or not additional funding is required for implementing a particular recommendation. In most cases agencies have indicated that recommendations that have not yet been implemented can be accommodated within the individual budgets of those agencies. Where that has not been the case, it has been referred to the chief executive or the minister concerned.

Mr GARDNER: In relation to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.146, Operational Preparedness, I note that the previous member for Morialta, in the *Hansard* of 14 February 2008, when talking about the Montacute CFS station, built in 1958, said that the new premises were now long overdue. During the election campaign flyers went out on behalf of the Labor Party praising the previous Labor member for having 'secured a new land lease and station for Montacute CFS' and elsewhere, and saying that 'due to Lindsay's persistence a new site had been leased and building would begin this year'.

I understand that in July, after the election, the CFS advised the Adelaide Hills Council, in a letter dated 9 July, that planning assessment for the new station, prepared by the CFS, was submitted to the Adelaide Hills Council. The CFS has now recommended that the site is inappropriate, and in August 2010 its intralog said that the project was on hold until site issues were resolved or an alternative site identified, and that the project manager was awaiting resolution of all outstanding issues before proceeding. For my constituents, can the minister advise if and when the promised station at Montacute is planned to be built?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: There are some site issues. It has been delayed; the member is correct in his reference to that. There are some details being worked through, and I will quickly get Euan to bring those to the attention of the house.

Mr FERGUSON: Montacute is an exceptionally difficult location to find land suitable for a fire station. After six years of trying, we have identified what we believe is a viable site, but there are issues which have been identified in terms of the bushfire safety of the location and also access/egress issues. We are working through those issues at the moment, but I can confirm that there is a budget allocation of \$400,000 for 2010-11 and a further \$100,000 for 2011-12. The project will probably be spread over two financial years.

The briefing I have is that there is work that needs to be done before the project can progress and planning approvals are obtained, and there is urgent work going on to address what is required for the current proposed site. We are investigating having a variation to our normal standard design for a fire station, which might accommodate the unique features of the particular site we have.

Mr PENGILLY: Before I ask my question, I also support the comments of the minister and the member for Kavel in relation to Euan. I am going to miss Euan, and I wish him well in Victoria. I

have worked closely with him over the last few years. We have had a number of fires and other incidents and I guess none bigger than the 2007 Kangaroo Island fires where we worked closely together.

Euan has always been above politics and has been able to carry out his job terrifically. Most of the politics in the CFS seem to be at brigade and group level these days rather than at an admin level, if it is; I do not know too much about it. I have always found him to be scrupulously honest, and I think Victoria's gain is a huge loss for us. However, nobody lasts forever, and I will have a bit more to say at another time. I would like to congratulate Euan on his job.

This is a purely parochial question, referring to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 5.146, in a similar vein to the member for Morialta's. Can the minister advise me when the Delamere fire station will be replaced? It is a matter of great importance to the local residents down there. We have had numerous incidents on the southern Fleurieu; it is dangerous how it is. There needs to be a land acquisition—I want to know the status of that—and I would like an assurance from the minister that the capital works program for that fire station is in this financial year.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the member for Finniss and appreciate his comments about the Chief Officer. I know, because we have spoken before, that he does genuinely have a very strong appreciation and affection for the Chief Officer, so I know he speaks from the bottom of his heart, as he does about the Delamere fire station. There is largely good news; he will not be totally happy, but it will take him part of the way. A site has been identified, and a contract for the purchase of the land was signed just yesterday. We are seeking approval, through SAFECOM, from council. It is not listed yet for capital works because those other things have to occur, but it is regarded by the CFS as being a matter of some urgency, so it is looking positive.

Mr PENGILLY: So, the minister will follow it up and make sure that we get it before June next year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thought you had only one question for me.

Mr GARDNER: In relation to the proposed fire siren in the Athelstone area to warn those residents, this obviously follows on from the fire at Black Hill about a year ago, during the last fire danger season, which occurred during the middle of the night when residents were obviously unaware of the danger. Today's *East Torrens Messenger* states:

Before the March state poll sitting Morialta member Lindsay Simmons promised a Labor government would act on a new fire siren. 'It gives people the option to take control over their lives, whether it be to turn on their sprinkler system, whether to evacuate children, old people and pets,' Ms Simmons said at the time.

This was a significant issue during the state election. The Messenger article also states:

A spokeswoman for Emergency Services Minister Michael Wright said it was up to the CFS and Campbelltown Council to find a site for the siren—not the government. She also said a new siren required a development application and there was no government money set aside to pay for it.

Minister, will the government provide a siren for the residents of Athelstone, as promised by the previous member for Morialta; and, if so, when?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: My advice is that the cost is not the issue but that the trouble is finding a location the neighbours are happy with. At this stage, it does not appear that an alternative site has been found. We think the Campbelltown City Council has a role to play here, working with the local area to find a suitable site and convince the neighbours of its suitability.

Mr GARDNER: Well, minister, the Campbelltown mayor, Simon Brewer, wrote to you in May suggesting a site the council identified at Wadmore Park, and the Athelstone CFS informed me that they have suggested a site owned, I believe, by the Department for Environment and Conservation on Addison Avenue, closer to Black Hill. So, two sites have been identified, and I have been told by the council and the CFS brigade that they have been suggested to your office. Do you have somebody coordinating the location of this site or are you waiting for everyone else to get together and choose a site between them and then inform the government?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am happy to look at the correspondence that you refer to but, at the end of the day, it is not my decision and it is not the government's decision. This should be decided—

Mr GARDNER: Well, there was an election commitment by the Labor member.

The CHAIR: Order! The member for Morialta will not interrupt. He is already well over time and I have indulged him in this one question. Perhaps we can get through the answer and we can finish.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: If you keep talking about the previous member, she will knock you off at the next election. You ought to start looking forward and to the future.

As I was saying before you rudely interrupted me, this is a decision for the local area. What the local brigade and community should be doing is working with the council and the Region 1 CFS commander and working through the issues to make sure that a location that is recommended has the support of the local CFS volunteers, the brigade and the local community. I would not have thought that you would be coming asking me. It is not for government to dictate where the site should be: it is for the local community to decide that.

The CHAIR: The time having expired for further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments adjourned until tomorrow.

At 15:42 the committee adjourned until Wednesday 13 October 2010 at 10:00.