

Legislative Council

Thursday, 19 May 2011

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Barry House) took the chair at 10.00 am, and read prayers.

“LOCAL CONTENT REPORT: MAY 2011”

Statement by Minister for Commerce

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan — Minister for Commerce) [10.01 am]: Yesterday afternoon I tabled the “Local Content Report: May 2011”. I want to add some brief comments about that report. The report gives an accurate summation of the local industry participation in major resource projects within the state. Although the report illustrates some areas of concern, there are also significant examples of successful adaptation to the current global economic climate. The continuing development of an environment that encourages local content is a high priority of the Liberal–National government. It is a key determinant of the current and future performance of the Western Australian economy.

The Premier and I are finalising the government’s review of the existing local content policy. A new perspective and approach is required to deal with increasingly complex market conditions. Let us face it—we live in an increased globalised economy. The challenge WA faces is how we adapt to ensure our competitiveness. This will not happen through legislated mandates imposed by government. It will happen through government-led dialogue to connect project proponents with local manufacturers. The Department of Commerce is already working closely with major project proponents who are developing high-value resource projects within Western Australia. The dialogue encourages project proponents to engage with locally based manufacturing and service companies on potential opportunities to work on their projects.

The government wants to provide local suppliers with a full, fair and reasonable opportunity to participate in the large resource market. We are developing a new approach to local industry participation, and we are listening to and understanding the concerns of all stakeholders—they have not fallen on deaf ears. I am confident the local industry participation policy review, which I will finalise and release soon, will provide improvements to the capacity utilisation of the state’s manufacturing and service industry.

Consideration of the statement made an order of the day for the next sitting, on motion by **Hon Ed Dermer**.

PAPERS TABLED

Papers were tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

STATE DEBT, AND INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES

Motion

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan) [10.04 am] — without notice: I move —

That this house expresses its concern at the Liberal–National government’s inability to rein in state debt and calls on it to prioritise essential basic infrastructure that is key to the future development of this state, rather than indulgent projects like the Premier’s new palace.

Yesterday, a very interesting article appeared in *The Australian Financial Review*. The article was written by Peter Kerr, who I am sure is known to many. The article highlights the way in which state debt is progressing in Western Australia. It also highlights the number of the projects that were listed as election commitments by this government that still have not been funded. The article does not highlight the fact that the cost has blown out for many of the projects in which this government is engaged. Those increased costs have not been incorporated into the budget. Hopefully, when the budget is handed down this afternoon, we will find that those figures have been incorporated. However, I am concerned that when those figures are incorporated, the figure that the Barnett government has set as its limit on borrowings for the state—namely, \$20 billion—will be well and truly exceeded.

It is important for members to understand, just as a bit of background to this debate, that the net debt figure that is always quoted by the Barnett government is the figure for total public sector debt. That figure is \$19.886 billion. That sits just below the self-imposed cap that has been set by the Barnett government of \$20 billion. What is more interesting is that in 2013–14, net debt will be \$21.364 billion. That is about \$1.5 billion more than the headline figure that is often quoted. That figure of \$21.5 billion is the figure that will be used by the rating agencies and by Treasury when they do their calculations on some of the key aggregates that they use in the budget forecasts. The net cost to revenue ratio and the net financial liabilities to revenue ratio use the figure of \$21.5 billion. However, the only way we can ever get that figure out of the Barnett government is by pursuing it through questions and through the estimates committee. That figure of \$21.5 billion is the real

debt that will need to be repaid by us and future generations of Western Australians—our children and our grandchildren—as a result of the spending binge of the Barnett government.

It will be interesting to see, when the Barnett government brings down its budget today, whether projects such as Roe Highway stage 8, which is listed in the budget at a cost of \$550 million, will still be listed at \$550 million, or whether it will be listed at \$700 million, which is the cost that Main Roads has given to this government for the construction of that project. The Barnett government has run around and talked about the gateway project being worth \$600 million, yet we know that the Barnett government has known for many years that it is not worth that amount. I had a briefing probably 18 months ago during which I was told that that figure was not accurate, and that, as I understand it, the real figure is closer to \$950 million. The problem that we then face, of course, is that the Barnett government asked the federal government for \$480 million, or 80 per cent, of that \$600 million, and the federal government promised that amount. However, one of the arrangements with the federal government is that—the Howard government was far worse on these matters—once a figure is asked for and granted, the state government has to pick up the excess costs. Therefore, why did the Barnett government ask for 80 per cent of \$600 million if it knew that the cost was going to be \$950 million? The state will now have to pick up the other \$470 million. Will that be shown in today's budget papers?

An article in yesterday's *The Australian Financial Review* listed other projects such as Royal Perth Hospital and the Museum that have not been factored into the costs, but, more importantly, on top of all of those things, we now see a massive build-up, a backlog, of basic infrastructure in key areas across the state that is not being funded by the Barnett government.

What are the government's priorities? What is it actually spending this money on that has resulted in this \$21.5 billion state debt as of the last budget? I suspect that by this evening we will be talking about at least \$25 billion worth of state debt. The Barnett government is spending it on political projects that get it a headline, such as the new palace and new ministerial offices, which, when tallied up, will cost almost \$100 million. The Barnett government is spending it on projects like the Oakajee port, which it need not do: the private sector said that it would build the port and hand it back to the state of Western Australia at no cost to the state; the state would still own the port, but the private sector would fund it. Nevertheless, for political reasons, and no other reason, the Barnett government decided to throw money into that port. It is not throwing funding into the proposed port at Anketell, which the private sector will build. We have been told that the private sector will build the Esperance port expansion. However, that will not happen at Oakajee, and this is so the Premier can make a political point. As an aside, in my view the Premier has completely stuffed up and delayed the Oakajee project because of the changes he made to the agreement reached between the previous state government and Oakajee Port and Rail. He has actually made it harder for that project to go ahead, but that is a debate for another day. That is another project that has blown out. I do not know whether we will see that recorded in today's budget papers, or whether we will get this game that the government plays; that is, it says that it has not formally made a decision in cabinet, so the project is not incorporated into the budget papers. But we all know the cost of that project will be higher than the \$600 million-odd that has already been committed. That money will be used for purely political purposes.

If all the rumours are correct, and I believe they are, another example of the Barnett government's intention for political reasons to spend more money on a project than is required is the football stadium. This is an endeavour to try to score a headline and to differentiate this government from the former Labor government for political reasons. Everyone agrees that we need a football stadium, but why would the government put forward a proposal that will cost us 50 per cent more to build than the other two other options? If the government does not want to go to Subiaco, it can go to East Perth. The East Perth proposal will cost 50 per cent less than the expenditure on the Burswood option for no net gain other than trying to play politics.

The Barnett government's funding of all these projects will crank up a massive amount of debt that Western Australians will have to pay off for years to come. This government has taken state debt from \$3.6 billion, and it will now be paying a yearly interest bill of \$2 billion as a result of the debt that it is wilfully incurring and cranking up. I could understand it if the debt were being incurred to build the basic infrastructure that a growing state like Western Australia needs. I recently heard a presentation that Bernard Salt gave at the Australian Council of Public Accounts Committees conference that highlighted the growth that is occurring in places like Western Australia. It is worth members who were not fortunate enough to have attended that conference getting a copy of that Bernard Salt presentation because it highlighted all the demands we face. A major cohort of young children will pass through our education system in Western Australia over the next 10 years, and new primary schools will be needed, but they are not being built. Instead, a new palace is being built for the Premier; \$500 million more than is needed is being spent on a football stadium; and \$500 million of state money is being spent on Oakajee, although it will probably be closer to \$1 billion by the time it is finished. The Roe Highway stage 8 project will now cost \$700 million; once finished, that will not do anything, as the government's own modelling shows, to fix the traffic problems in the southern suburbs. Nevertheless, the government undertakes these projects because it thinks it is a smart political move and because it thinks it is good politics.

Several members interjected.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The government will somehow try to run a lie to the people of Riverton that this project will fix their traffic problems. Show me the modelling that shows it will fix the problems. I do not know what the noise from the other side is, but it is mumbling again.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That noise is unruly and out of order. That will be the standard for the rest of this debate.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The other project, of course, is the Perth foreshore project. The government has put forward a plan that will cut off Riverside Drive, and it will cost the state an absolute fortune to fix that problem. That is being done, again, just so that the government can be different and it can play politics. That proposal will cost us an absolute fortune, but the government will not release its traffic modelling and it will not tell us how much extra it will cost to fix the problems created by its foreshore development.

Those are all sexy, headline-grabbing issues, but what about the other issues? I have talked about primary schools that need to be built. Let us see whether they will be included in the forward estimates of the Barnett government today. In the meantime, debt skyrockets through the roof.

Let us talk about the basic things like water. Let me make this very clear, because I warned the government about trains two years ago, and I am going to warn members two years in advance about water: if this government has not committed to stage 2 of the desalination plant at Binningup in today's budget, we will be on water restrictions in two years unless God intervenes and it rains again. The government's only chance is to gamble that it will rain. If the long-term weather forecasts floating around at the moment are correct, we will be on water restrictions in two years. If this Barnett government was acting responsibly, it would bring in water restrictions. That will be necessary because it did not make the decision to commit to stage 2 of the desalination plant in this budget. The government will make a commitment to build a new palace for the Premier and new ministerial offices across the road that all up will cost in the order of \$100 million.

Perth's population is growing at two to three per cent a year, and the Public Transport Authority's estimate is that there is about a four per cent growth in public transport use every year. Even though the PTA warned the government two years ago that new rolling stock would be needed, did it provide it? No. In March this year, did we see overcrowding on our trains? Absolutely. What was the government's first defence? It denied it even existed. But when it became impossible to deny it anymore, it suddenly found four extra rail carriages in the back shed. Has the government ordered new carriages? No. Even if it ordered them through the budget today, it would be two years before we would see the first of those carriages on the Perth rail network. I hope that it is in the budget today, but if it is not and the government has included in its budget its sexy and fancy projects to get a headline, the government will have let down the people of Western Australia. We need to order those railcars today, because the first one will be delivered in two years and the rest may take up to five years to be delivered.

The Minister for Energy appeared before the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations and talked about power in the Pilbara. There will be a shortage of power to service the communities of the Pilbara in 2013.

Hon Simon O'Brien: This government won't run out of power like yours did.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The reason we ran out of power was that the Liberal government failed to invest in power in the 1990s, and this government is doing the same thing. The problem with the Liberal Barnett government is that it does not understand that a lot of basic infrastructure requires the government to think beyond tomorrow's headline. If there is a problem with water today, it is not because a decision was not made yesterday but because it was not made two or three years ago. If there are not enough trains on the railway line, it is not because a decision was not made yesterday but that a decision was not made in 2008 when the government was told that it should have bought more. The electricity network failure and the lack of power in Perth and the Pilbara are not the result of a decision not made yesterday; they are the result of the government not making the decision to invest in upgrading and maintaining the network between two and five years prior to that. The Minister for Energy knows that BHP Billiton will end its contract with the government and he knows that it needs a new power station. Let us see whether that project is in the budget this afternoon and will drive up state debt. The former Minister for Transport had a fixation on building Roe Highway stage 8 because he thought it would be a smart political move.

Hon Norman Moore: You sound just like a typical North Metropolitan Region member who doesn't know anything about the South Metropolitan Region. That is your problem.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I know that the Leader of the House's favourite electorate is the South Metropolitan Region.

Hon Norman Moore: Get on the highway sometime and have a good, hard look. You don't know. It is typical of a northern suburbs member.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I put a challenge to the Leader of the House. Does he think Roe Highway stage 8 is more important than fixing the Nullagine road?

Hon Norman Moore: Get off the grass! They both need to be done.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Which has the highest priority? I reckon we need to fix the Nullagine road. Maybe if the Leader of the House worried more about his electorate than the electorate he lives in, he might realise that fixing the Nullagine road needs to be a priority. I believe that it is important to fix the roads around Port Hedland and Karratha and I thank the federal government for funding those projects. Where is the money for the Eelup Rotary that this government promised it would provide to build a flyover at Eelup? The government has come up with a cheap solution. It will not even spend the \$30 million that it promised to spend during the last election to build the roundabout. I cannot wait to see whether the government will deliver on its election commitment regarding the Collie Coalfields highway. That is basic infrastructure for regional Western Australia. I can talk about the projects in not only the North Metropolitan Region, but also across that state that I believe should be a higher priority than the Roe Highway stage 8 project and will actually do something to fix the road issues. Let us talk about making Gnangara Road a dual road, or putting a second lane on Reid Highway between Beechboro Road and West Swan Road. The Labor government completed the first stage of extending that from West Swan to Great Northern Highway. The next stage is to take it from West Swan through to Beechboro Road.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There will be speakers later in this debate who will expect to be heard in silence and have every right to be heard in silence. They should pay the same courtesy to the current speaker.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: This government has two problems. The first problem is that its priorities are wrong. It has invested its infrastructure money in the wrong projects and is building up massive state debt. There are plenty of projects that we need to build, and I accept that we need to borrow money. However, we need to borrow money and invest it in the right projects that will grow and advance the state rather than in projects that will grab the government a headline for a day. That is the first problem with this government. The second problem is that this is an uncaring government. It will try to make a song and dance today in an effort to present itself as a caring government, but it will still be the government that cut the Redress payments and got rid of paupers' funerals. That is the sort of government this is, and it knows it. Its priorities are wrong and it does not care. That is dangerous for the people of Western Australia.

Hon Michael Mischin: What about prison vans? Tell us about the penny-pinching that went on there.

Point of Order

Hon ED DERMER: I have been sitting here listening. I understand the value of interjecting when a member makes a point and the speaker either responds to it or chooses not to. However, there is a distinct difference between an interjection and a member who tries to deliver a speech from his seat. About half a dozen members opposite are trying to deliver a speech from their seat. They are forgetful that they will have the opportunity to respond when the current speaker sits down. I, for one, am having difficulty hearing Hon Ken Travers because of the noise coming from the other side.

The PRESIDENT: Hon Ed Dermer makes a fair point, when one reads the standing orders. It is my job as the Presiding Officer to interpret and conduct the debate according to those standing orders, and that is what I will do without fear or favour. It does not matter whether it is Hon Ken Travers or another member on his feet; the debate will be conducted courteously and without unnecessary interjections.

Debate Resumed

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I want to highlight one final area in which this government has resolved to borrow up to its limit to pay for unnecessary projects such as the Premier's palace. Recently the government decided to lease 500 new houses for Homeswest. Why is it doing that? It is because it does not have the money to build new houses. The government must fudge the books. That will mean extra houses in the short term, but the net long-term cost to the state will be higher. This government is imposing yet another impost on future generations to try to hide its mismanagement. If the cheapest option, as the Premier said, is for the government to own Hale House, why is it not the cheapest option to own Homeswest housing? The Premier is absolutely right. If we are to have the Premier's palace, we should own it. He does not want to own the Homeswest homes.

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan — Minister for Finance) [10.27 am]: I do not support this motion or the glib one-liners behind it. Later today I will have the very great privilege of delivering a speech on the 2011–12 budget. Members will then see examples of fiscal responsibility and good management. I will be addressing questions that relate to state debt and infrastructure spends and a range of related matters. That is for later today. In moving his motion, Hon Ken Travers seems determined to have a trial run of what he thinks will be in the budget and is testing some of the lines the opposition has been rehearsing in the back rooms. I hope by this afternoon or next week, when the opposition gives some sort of response to the budget, that it will deliver a

better response than it has delivered so far. When the member criticises the government and offers it gratuitous advice, he exposes his own naked throat. Even the most superficial example of Western Australian political history and state government economic management makes that very, very apparent.

In touching on questions of debt, the fact is that debt is going up in this state at this time. It is increasing under this government for some very good reasons—it is paying for a significant part of the state's large asset investment program; the rest of which is being paid for by operating surpluses. We believe that the people of Western Australia deserve to have the infrastructure they need to function well as a community and as a wider economy. We are not shirking a responsibility to make sure that that infrastructure is provided. In the Labor years, when it was enjoying unexpected multibillion-dollar surpluses for several years running, did it invest? I do not think so. In order to get its headline, their one day of publicity, what the former Labor government announced was something in the future by saying, "We've put some money in the forward years to pay for it." The funding was not provided in that current year to deliver it then, but on the never-never. When we came into government and looked at some of the proposed asset investment programs, we found they were all grossly underfunded. It is not right for the opposition of today to turn around and say it had all these programs funded. Why have they not been delivered? The previous Labor government did not fund them, it did not start them and it did not deliver them. We are the government —

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Following the example of the Whip from the other side, I suggest the interjections are out of order

The PRESIDENT: You are quite right. You are as right as Hon Ed Dermer was in raising that point of order. As I explained, everybody will be treated the same.

Debate Resumed

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: We are investing. We are picking up the fragments from the former Labor government's infrastructure policies that should have delivered a heck of a lot more than it did, but in fact raised expectations that are very, very expensive to deliver.

I remind the house that the sorts of cost blow-outs we were seeing in major projects with the former Labor government often exceeded 100 per cent. In fact, the average cost blow-out was well over 100 per cent for major projects. Have a look outside at Perth Arena down the road. There are any number of projects where we can see massive blow-outs that are directly attributable to the fiscal mismanagement of the Carpenter and Gallop governments. In contrast, we have reined in that pattern of mismanagement. We have realistic figures in our budgets, and we are delivering. That is why, in pursuing our policy of delivering the infrastructure that Western Australians need, there is a rise in state debt. We make no apology for that. Substantial investment in infrastructure reflects the very important role that the public sector's capital spending has in supporting WA's economic and social development, and ultimately in generating jobs.

The question of net debt is something that is probably not very well understood, but the government has had a clear policy, since we adopted it in the 2009–10 budget, of maintaining net interest costs on our debt below 4.5 per cent of the total non-financial public sector revenue. A key part of our policy is to maintain the AAA credit rating—the AAA credit rating that a former Labor government lost, the AAA credit rating that a former Liberal–National government regained and the AAA credit rating that this Liberal–National government is also determined to retain. The AAA rating was lost in the wake of the infamous mismanagement and corruption-riddled WA Inc era. I am sure members opposite do not want to be reminded of that! But the ratio of net interest costs to revenue was above five per cent during the early 1980s when we came into government. If we can maintain a 4.5 per cent ratio, we are well inside the AAA benchmark that was restored, as I say, during the time of the Court government in the mid-1990s. That achievement is demonstrated in the midyear review, which clearly shows that our overall debt levels are well under the 4.5 per cent upper limit. If members want to look at the 2010–11 government *Mid-year Financial Projections Statement*, on page 36 they will see the graph that clearly shows we are well under that criteria of manageability, and indeed members will see this afternoon that we intend to stay there and are doing the things necessary to stay there.

Hon Ken Travers: All your blow-outs.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I have already addressed the question. Blow-outs are the Labor Party's province. We have brought infrastructure spending and project management under control. If Hon Ken Travers wants to debate the Labor Party's record versus what we have achieved in the past couple of years, and are continuing to achieve, I will debate that with him any time he likes. I am more than happy to do that. We are doing it against a very challenging financial background, with a decline in a number of parts of state revenue collections, as Hon Phil Edman has helpfully brought to the house's attention through some of his very perceptive questions.

Let us look, though, at the investment side. Let us look at what we are actually getting for the money because this is a point that was not really alluded to very much; that is, whether we are spending on the right things and whether we are spending enough. The former Labor government's average spend for its infrastructure program was \$3.2 billion per annum. Hon Ken Travers and I were both here for all those years. This Liberal–National government will spend an average of \$6.6 billion over six years. That figure is taken from the midyear review; it is not a leak from this afternoon's budget, I might add. We plan to continue to spend a very significant amount of money as part of our asset investment program. We are doing it not as Hon Ken Travers was trying to glibly entertain with references to palaces and so on in his remarks, but on the assets that Western Australia really needs, such as an all-time record investment in hospitals.

Again, looking back at the midyear review figures, members will see that we spent \$4.3 billion on improving, expanding and maintaining the state's electricity infrastructure, and \$3.8 billion on our wastewater and drainage services including works on the Mundaring water treatment plant and the southern sea water desalination plant, which I will admit was one thing the former Labor government got right in going down that path. We will spend massive amounts, well over \$3 billion, on the construction of public housing and other dwellings, and the development of land throughout the state so that people in the private sector can also get on. Yes, significant amounts will be spent on public transport, roads, public schools and a range of other projects, including, significantly, over half a billion dollars on port infrastructure. Labor's challenge, I guess, is to nominate which public investment projects it recommends we cut.

Hon Ken Travers: I have given them to you.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: How about the school projects? Which schools does Hon Ken Travers want us not to go ahead with? Which transport projects does he want us to discontinue—the Broome boating facility perhaps, the Baldivis secondary school? Any number of a huge number of projects are at the opposition's disposal. We want the opposition to get up and say to the community, "Here's where we would slash these funds. Here's how we're going to cut \$20 billion debt: by simply slashing expenditure projects on capital." That is the prospect Hon Ken Travers was advancing. Show us the shopping list of \$20 billion worth of projects that the Labor Party, if in government, would get rid of.

Hon Ken Travers: I gave you heaps.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: He told us about one which is funded; not notional ones where funding has not appeared in the budgets yet, like stadia and what have you, but ones where it has appeared. We are doing something about Hale House. Perhaps the opposition would just leave it to rot; perhaps it would not maintain that heritage building in the parliamentary precinct. That is the big thing the opposition wants to seize on. That is about a thousandth of the expenditure the opposition would have to find to meet the targets it is pretending it might have. Mind you, it does have some form in cutting expenditure for infrastructure projects. To use Hon Ken Travers' pet project of the Coalfields highway, I recall that when the Gallop government came to office, the Court government was halfway through a two-phase project to upgrade the Coalfields highway. The first phase had been completed. The second phase was funded and ready to go, like the Nullagine road, the Wiluna–Meekatharra highway and all the other projects the Labor government and its Treasurer, Mr Ripper, summarily got rid of when they came to office. Our government is now investing in the continuation of the upgrade program for the Coalfields highway, when the member's government did nothing. A story by Calla Wahlquist on page 7 of the *Bunbury Mail* of 20 October 2010 was headed "We dropped the ball on Coalfields: Labor". That quote was attributed to Labor. The opening words of the story were —

SHADOW transport minister Ken Travers admits that Labor dropped the ball on the Coalfields Highway when in office ...

Hon Ken Travers now has the gall to get up and start berating us.

Hon Nick Goiran: Can I frame that?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: It certainly needs to be remembered.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Members opposite want to talk about the Premier's new palace. That is juvenile stuff. Hale House does need attention. It is right over the road from Parliament—it is part of the parliamentary precinct. The government has to deal with the issue of maintaining that heritage building and making sure that it is available for good public uses. The government is exercising its responsibility to do just that. If the opposition wants to do something else with the building, it should tell us what it would do. It can take the money allocated to that and apply it notionally to something else if it wants to. The opposition does not want us to spend money on Hale House. It would not want us to do that twice. Why do we not do it 40 or 50 times, because that is the amount of money Labor wasted in government on failed capital projects, as it drafted them, such as the Office of

Shared Services? That is another problem we have to fix. Before members opposite start glibly talking about these matters, they need to look to their own record, because people will there find the real story and will see through this very hollow rhetoric.

HON MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM (Agricultural) [10.43 am]: I congratulate Hon Ken Travers for bringing this issue to the house. The most significant point that has been raised thus far is that of state debt. The minister can denounce that statement as much as he likes, but I will put one very important figure in front of members: if state debt blows out to something in the order of \$20 billion to \$22 billion over the next couple of years, that equates to an increase in our state debt of \$11 million or \$11.5 million per day over the past four years. The Minister for Finance says that that is all right, there are very good reasons for that and we do not have an issue. Debt is going up, but that is all right! In the same breath, the minister is not prepared to even acknowledge that there is the capacity or that there should be the capacity for some sort of fiscal restraint. That is the sort of thing a Minister for Finance needs to be looking at, in my humble opinion. That is the sort of thing he needs to be stating. It is all very well to say that we need to improve Hale House. That is fine. The government is entitled to have a policy, but the Minister for Finance should not come to us and say that we can afford \$11.5 million a day and that he, as Minister for Finance, does not have anything to worry about because it falls within the 4.5 per cent, so everybody is happy.

Hon Simon O'Brien: That wasn't exactly the turn of phrase I used.

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: I will stand corrected by looking at *Hansard* later.

Hon Norman Moore: You've got to do something about him; he is just hopeless.

Hon Sue Ellery: You do something about him!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon Norman Moore: Your bloke takes a point of order all the time over any interjection. It is just pathetic!

Hon Sue Ellery interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The tone of the debate was set by a couple of points of order. That is the way it will be run. If members do not wish to have debates run that way, there are other alternatives. I try to run the debate according to the mood of the debate and the mood of members. This mood has been set by those points of order. That is the way it will be.

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: Thank you, Mr President. This issue of state debt blowing out to \$20 billion or \$22 billion over the next year or two, to my way of thinking, underpins this motion. It is a very serious motion, particularly as we approach the new Treasurer's first budget. Repayment of that debt is something that we are going to have to factor in sooner or later. No-one can tell me that the mining boom will continue ad infinitum. If and when that boom ceases to exist, we will still be faced with a massive debt. It is increasing by \$11.5 million per day now; what is it going to be in two, three, four, five or 10 years' time if we continue this fiscal irresponsibility? This underpins Hon Ken Travers' excellent non-government business motion.

Another issue the minister perhaps needs to take on board is that of the GST take, which is something a previous conservative government orchestrated on behalf of the people of Western Australia. The only thing that seems to be saving us at this point in time is the royalties taken from the mining industry, but as I said, the mining industry and the boom associated with it will not last forever. Anybody who thinks it will is dreaming.

A number of other issues underpin this motion, one being the big range of human infrastructure issues around the state. I recently was in Geraldton to note the significant issues associated with hospital staffing problems at Geraldton Regional Hospital. All the local member could say was that it was Labor's fault. There is a staffing formula in our state hospitals. That is very much a human infrastructure issue that needs to be addressed. That is the sort of thing I would like to see in this year's budget. Many other issues underpin this motion, but those few, in my humble opinion, encapsulate the issues we have.

I will move on and look at some of the issues associated with what the government is spending its money on. People are debating Hale House, but the other significant concern mentioned by Hon Ken Travers is the spending on Oakajee. The completion of this project seems to be going out by almost the day or the month. It is going further and further down the track. The Chinese want that project to be delivered now. They do not want it in 2014, 2015 or 2020—they want it now. The way things are going with the interference of the Premier, that is not going to happen. If that is the case, it is going to be a sad indictment of the Western Australian government and, indeed, of Western Australians by association.

The other excellent point Hon Ken Travers made was about the football stadium funding. If the government wants to save money or wants to look at where else to put the money, particularly in response to human infrastructure problems, it should have a look at the blow-out in the anticipated spending associated with the football stadium—an extra 50 per cent over and above what might apply for better and more appropriate sites.

That is a huge issue for members on this side of the house. The state needs and, indeed, must have a skilled workforce, and there are significant issues with that human infrastructure aspect. Fairly obviously, if we are to maintain growth in the mining sector, issues such as a highly productive, efficient, technologically advanced and mobile workforce that is educated is going to be an enormous prerequisite. While I am on the issue of education, I note that one of the comments made by the Minister for Finance was that Labor did not invest appropriately. The minister did happen to mention education.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Sixty-five schools.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM: Members opposite should look at that figure. There is no better example of investment in human and social infrastructure, together with the associated physical infrastructure, than that which occurred in the education system under Labor in its eight years in office. The education building program that this party put in place when it was in government makes any other investment by the conservative government pale in comparison. Members should look at the schools that were built and at the investment made during the years that Labor was in power.

There are also other physical infrastructure issues that the budget needs to address. Given that I have only a couple of minutes remaining, I do not intend to go down that particular path. Fairly obviously, the point I am trying to make is that Hon Ken Travers' motion refers to physical and human infrastructure issues.

I do not have a lot of time left so I would like to mention one of my pet concerns—that is, the provision of a better, more sophisticated and bigger capacity energy infrastructure system for Geraldton and the Mid West. I would love to say later on today that the minister has got it right and has decided to spend money to put the 330-kilovolt line from Eneabba all the way through to Geraldton, with its capacity to then sustain the Mid West, but I do not like my chances. That is the one infrastructure issue that this government could put in place to ensure the economic future of the state. Again, that is what this non-government business motion is all about—the future development of the state. The state's Mid West is the place to be; it is the place to invest. Without a 330-kilovolt powerline all the way through to Geraldton, the capacity to develop Geraldton as the renewable energy region of Western Australia represents a lost opportunity of enormous proportions. There is so much potential there. There is also the commitment to the people who have already made investments and have moved to that particular part of the world to set up new industries and to invest in people, land, factories and the like. A big problem occurred in Geraldton last Christmas. Geraldton nearly ran out of energy. In some respects people did, because power supplies were cut on a number of occasions. Industry managed to survive, but if industry is going to develop and is going to deliver for the people of Geraldton and the Mid West, and, indeed, the whole of Western Australia, this particular project is a must.

I also would like to have talked about issues such as tier 3 railway lines, but I see that my time has come to an end. I once again commend Hon Ken Travers for an excellent non-government business motion.

HON NORMAN MOORE (Mining and Pastoral — Leader of the House) [10.53 am]: It is interesting that we should be debating the budget ahead of the budget being delivered, so I suggest that this debate is slightly premature—by about three hours. However, that is not to say that the opposition is not entitled to raise these matters at this time. I would have thought that opposition members would save their arguments until they know what is in the budget, as opposed to adopting the strategy of Hon Ken Travers, which is to predict what might be spent and what might not be spent and then start making judgements about that. For example, he talked about an extra \$500 million for a football stadium. I do not know of any decision that has been made to build the stadium in any particular location, but the honourable member obviously knows more than I do.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The rules do not change; they are the same for everybody.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: On that matter, Mr President, I think it is a very sterile place when there are no interjections. I give a commitment that I do not intend to take points of order as I did today. I did that today only because the Labor Party Whip does it all the time. If he wants this to be a chamber in which nobody interjects, that is his business. I will not take the same view again. It is ridiculous to keep doing that.

Hon Kate Doust: You do it when it suits you.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I have never done it before. I did it today because the honourable opposition Whip decided to do it to one of our members.

I want to take a couple of moments today to talk about hypocrisy. This motion refers to the so-called Premier's palace, which I always find quite amusing.

Hon Kate Doust interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: It is a similar argument to the one we heard a long time ago about the belltower. The funny thing about the belltower is that everybody says that we should have made it bigger and louder and that we should have spent more money on it. That is what they all say now. However, the Labor Party ran a campaign —

Hon Kate Doust interjected.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Hang on! Ed, would you please take a point of order on your deputy leader, and save me doing it!

Hon Ken Travers: Can I take a point of order on the leader for interjecting on himself?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I agree with the Leader of the House that some interjections are fine during debate, but when the standard is set, I have to apply those standards across the board in an even-handed way. We will continue this debate under those same conditions.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: The leading protagonist in the argument against the so-called palace is Mr McGowan, the member for Rockingham. As a matter of interest, Mr McGowan was a minister in the previous government who discovered that the office he was being given in Governor Stirling Tower was not quite up to the level of refurbishment for, and expectation that he had as, a minister, so he had his office refurbished—for \$700 000! That was at a time when I believe the government of the day knew it would be moving out of Governor Stirling Tower because the lease had expired.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: By way of contrast, the then Attorney General, Mr McGinty, refurbished the office that I now have. I think he got the furniture from Ikea for about half that price, because it is a reflection of that price. It is pretty average, but it is better than I used to have so I am quite comfortable. I am not complaining. Mr McGowan would have us believe that doing up a heritage building, and ultimately saving \$1.2 million a year in rent, is somehow or other a bad deal and will be a palace. It is in fact fixing up a heritage building that should have been fixed up a long time ago. We fixed up the other part of the Hale school site and made it the Constitutional Centre. People said that that was a very good thing to do. Making Hale House into a place that the people of Western Australia can be proud of is a good investment, but it is a better investment because it actually saves rent of \$1.2 million. I say to Mr McGowan that when he wants to get on the high pedestal that he has put himself on, he should reflect on his own expenditure —

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am sorry, but I have to apply the rules.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I say to Mr McGowan that when he wants to take the high moral ground on these sorts of matters, he should look at his own behaviour as a minister and look at how he blew \$700 000 on his own office refurbishment when he knew that the government would have to move out of the building in a couple of years.

I want to mention a couple of other issues very quickly. I advise Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm that the problems at Oakajee are not being caused by the state government. Indeed, the contribution that we have agreed to make, along with a similar contribution by the federal Labor government, which also sees it as a good public investment, is not the cause of the problems; the problems are the result of the bidding process that was introduced by the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, who set up this competitive arrangement that eventually came down to a Japanese versus Chinese competition. The problem with Oakajee is trying to get all the different pieces of the jigsaw puzzle to come together at the same time and some of the difficulties with the Jack Hills mine. Do not try to blame the state government for this. Our contribution, matched by the federal government, is a significant investment in public infrastructure, because Oakajee will not just be a private port; it will be a port available to anybody who wants to use it. That is why we have made an investment and that is why it is a very good decision.

Hon Ken Travers interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm also raised the issue of mining royalties and how they will not always be there, and the member is quite right. However, instead of telling us about mining royalties in this place, the member should send a letter to the federal Treasurer who, first of all, had the bright idea of a mining super profits tax, which just about drove everybody offshore. That idea was applauded by the Canadian Treasurer who said it was the best decision ever made for the Canadian government. Canada is our main competition for resources funding. And we still have the mining resource rent tax hanging over our head. Those

decisions made by the member's federal government are more likely to have an impact on the mining industry than anything else I know of. Therefore, members opposite should be very careful about blaming people; they should look to where the fault actually lies.

Another point that I will quickly make is to reinforce the views expressed by the Minister for Finance about Labor's commitments to future asset investment. The classic example is the Perth Arena. I do not know how many times over the original budget that project is now. I think it was originally about \$150 million and now it is something like \$450 million.

Hon Simon O'Brien: It is \$483 million.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: It is \$483 million. I thought it was a good decision to make that investment. When I was a minister last time I hoped to build a soccer stadium on that site, which the then Gallop government could not deliver. However, that is another story. A decision was then taken to build the arena there and I thought it was a great idea. However, it has blown out from \$150 million to \$483 million and it is still not finished. It is as though somebody is making it up as they go along. It is like a great big jigsaw puzzle and people are trying to find the pieces to put in. It is a classic case of the complete mismanagement of the asset base of this state by the previous government and we are wearing the pain of that by having to find the money to fund the arena.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Finally, the Office of Shared Services—what an absolute disgrace that was! For Hon Ken Travers to get up in this place —

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: You should fix it—you've been in for three years!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: The viewpoint was that we are so far in that we just cannot get out. The previous government blew hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I can understand why the member is trying to defend it because it was a friend of hers who came up with the bright idea. It was an absolute disgrace and it still is.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: The previous government left this government with some seriously hard decisions to make about that, yet members opposite get up and start giving us lectures about financial management. In the short time that I have had, I have given just two examples of the previous government's absolute total incapacity to deal with the state's finances—just two of them! If I had about an hour and a half, I could fill it up quite comfortably with the rest of them. Therefore, this motion deserves to be tossed out and consigned to the scrap heap where it belongs.

HON JON FORD (Mining and Pastoral) [11.03 am]: I congratulate Hon Ken Travers for bringing on this motion as well. Before I start my contribution, I will comment on a couple of things that the Leader of the House just said.

I will start with the Office of Shared Services. Not one contemporary business anywhere in this country would tell members that bringing together common services is the most inefficient way of delivery. The companies I worked for in the private sector constantly looked at ways to build efficiencies for common service delivery in areas such as information technology, human resources and supply. It is a bit rich for the government three years into its term to lay the entire blame for the way a system has been delivered at the feet of the previous government. It is a bit rich that the government suddenly announced that just prior to the budget three years into its term, but that is another issue.

Sure, the investment in Hale House may be a great investment in time, but the issue at this moment is whether the state can afford it. As Hon Ken Travers and Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm mentioned, we have ballooning debt. In simple terms, the more debt we grow, the less we can invest strategically in infrastructure in the future, particularly in operational expenditure—related structures—that is, more police, more staff for hospitals and more teachers. That is the problem we have.

I will talk not in my shadow role but in my role as a local member, particularly for the Kimberley and also the Pilbara. I will give members examples of some of the problems we get in not picking winners in necessary basic infrastructure. Last week I was in Kununurra and I met with the Ord River co-op. We have heard a lot in this

house about the expansion program and what is going on in the Ord River region. We are glad that the current government is building on the investment that the Gallop and Carpenter governments put into that area—that is great. However, I will tell the house what is wrong. During the last wet season, the area was locked out; it was not only landlocked but also locked out by the ocean. The only way to get supplies into Kununurra was with aeroplanes and the area was locked out for a substantial time. Do members know why? The state ship had broken down, and no ships could get into the port. The ship is so unreliable in delivering bulk, such as superphosphate, that people actually pay for trucks to bring it up because they cannot rely on the ship at the moment to bring the super up for the agricultural region. Therefore, they are just topping up by using trucks, which tells us that something is basically wrong with the prioritisation of the government or that it has not even noticed. We are talking about a huge expansion. We hear federal people talking about the region being a food bowl and we talk about extending it across into the Northern Territory, but we cannot deliver basic commodities into the town in a consistent and reliable manner.

The Pilbara has the same situation. I raised the matter when we were in government, but the situation is still the same three years into this government's term, which, with the royalties for regions program, should have no problem resolving the simple matter. Great Northern Highway is the main road into the Pilbara. About 140 kilometres south of Newman is a roadhouse called Kumarina. It is on an island; it is actually in the fork of a creek. We need only have a widdle in that creek and it floods. I was trying to think of a parliamentary term to use for that.

Hon Simon O'Brien: That's a pretty impressive widdle, I have got to tell you!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think that is nearly unparliamentary.

Hon JON FORD: It does not have to be at Kumarina; typically, it is further out in the desert, and it regularly happens. Although that area provides the state with huge economic investment and return, in the last wet season roads were cut off from the north, south and east, so it was landlocked. This is without doubt the biggest economic area in Australia. It is as simple as putting a culvert, about the length of this Parliament, across to fix it. Still, nobody has done that. Therefore, we end up with cars being trapped in there, and with the roadhouse being isolated. I have been at the roadhouse—it is a funny place to build a roadhouse—when people have had to carry fuel from the roadhouse in 20-litre, 40-litre or 60-litre plastic drums because it has been isolated from the road.

Hon Ken Travers: And the Leader of the House says that we should build Roe 8 and forget about this major highway!

Hon JON FORD: That is right. The former Minister for Transport has talked about how important the Nullagine–Newman road is from the government's perspective. However, whenever we have raised the issue of safety on that road, he has given us the department's reply, which is that that road is generally fit for purpose. I can tell members that that road is not fit for purpose. During the recent rains, the one single ribbon of tar that goes up the centre of Great Northern Highway became the main artery for every truck, vehicle and courier van that was going to the north west because they could not travel on the Nullagine–Newman road. The Nullagine–Newman road is now the main artery to get to Cloud Break and Roy Hill. It is also the back road into Yandi and Munjina—BHP will tell us that it does not use that road, but it does—to get to mining area C. As a local member, when I am flying to Port Hedland, and particularly to the Kimberley, I actually fly right over Newman, and I am able to get a good aerial view of that road. That thin ribbon of black is absolutely dotted—it looks like a dashed line—with truck after truck after truck, coming and going both ways. Even though the wet season has been finished for some time, most of the traffic is still being pushed onto that road. But all it takes is a slight amount of rain and that road has to be closed, even to light vehicles. I was talking to the Kennedys just this week. They are concerned about the impact of even slight showers. Also, the mustering season is coming up at the end of this year, and that will add another dimension with road trains with cattle on them.

Hon Ken Travers: And the Leader of the House says we should build Roe 8 before we fix the Nullagine road!

Hon JON FORD: That is right.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think that what I have said about interjections applies to interjections from the member's side as well.

Hon JON FORD: I will finish by talking about Pilbara Cities. I heard a report on radio today about a boost for housing in Port Hedland. I think the government was talking about 130 houses. What the Pilbara, Port Hedland and Karratha need is thousands and thousands of houses. The problem is that the Pilbara is running out of water. I am waiting to see what is in the budget about the provision of water for the Pilbara. That is only for the current population. It is not for the expanded population under the great Pilbara Cities vision. It is the same with power.

We hear a lot about the training opportunities in the Pilbara. The simple fact of the matter is that young people who want to be apprentices in the north west cannot do that unless their parents have a house, or a job that comes

with a house, in that district. That means that a huge number of training opportunities are not available to many young people, and adult trainees, in Western Australia because no housing is available.

HON LJILJANNA RAVLICH (East Metropolitan) [11.12 am]: I, too, want to support this motion and put on record my concern about the Liberal–National government’s inability to rein in state debt, and the fact that this will be an enormous problem for future generations of Western Australians. I find it incredible that this state government has managed to get itself into a position in which it looks as though—all will be revealed this afternoon—state debt will exceed \$20 billion. It has been projected that state debt may be as high as \$23 billion, or around that ballpark figure. Why does this state government have a projected debt of that magnitude, when the national debt is only \$50 billion? I cannot work that out. There must be something wrong with—definitely not me!—this government and the way it is managing the finances of this state. The total debt level of the federal government, which has to implement policies and programs and develop infrastructure across the whole nation, is \$50 billion, and it has been absolutely caned for it. It therefore does not make sense to me that this state government can get to a debt level of upwards of \$20 billion, on its own, with no effort from anyone else. I hope there is a good reason for that. There is no doubt that revenues have been coming in for the state government from royalties, and from robbing the people of this state through incredibly insensitive price hikes in utility charges. Power, gas and water charges have been going up, and we know they will go up again in the budget that will be handed down this afternoon.

The Leader of the House has talked about the mismanagement of the finances of this state by former Labor governments. I want to put this on the public record, and I want the Leader of the House to listen to this very carefully. The biggest mistake that was ever made by any government in the history of this state was made by the Court government. I will tell the Leader of the House why I say that. Richard Court took himself to Canberra, as the Leader of the House knows, and he signed up to the goods and services tax package. He did not know what was in that package—he had no idea—because the details were going to be worked out after he had signed it, and this state has been robbed!

Hon Norman Moore: But you were opposed to the GST! We would not have had the GST at all if you had been in government! There would have been no money for the state at all from the GST if you had been in government! You cannot have it both ways!

The PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The Leader of the House should not talk while I am talking, because I listened to him, and he should listen to me.

The PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: If ever there was a case of total incompetence, that is it! It would be like signing a major contract without actually reading it! Who in this house would be stupid enough to sign a major contract without reading it? When Richard Court signed that contract, he made sure that every Western Australian, every year since then, has been missing out on major revenue for this state.

Hon Norman Moore: You opposed the GST! This state would not have had any of that money at all! Your memory is failing you!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That is a major opportunity cost for the people of this state. However, we never hear the Leader of the House talk about what Premier Richard Court did to this state, and about his lack of understanding of the impact that would have on this state.

I do not have a lot of time. There is no doubt that this level of debt is not good for the state. As I understand it, the debt equates to about \$8 000 for every man, woman and child in this state. It is not as though this growing debt is being used to fund infrastructure. Therefore, we need to know what it is being used to fund. We know that infrastructure projects will not be funded, and yet there will be increased debt. There will be no freeway expansion; there will be no foreshore development; there will be no sports stadium; there will be no Royal Perth Hospital rebuild; there will be no upgrades to the power facilities; and there will be no strategy for water.

Hon Norman Moore interjected.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I doubt that very much; there have not been any so far, so we can only live in hope, Leader of the House.

Hon Norman Moore: You’ll have to wait until this afternoon!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: No new houses will be built for the thousands and thousands of people on the waiting list. There will not be anything for them. There will not be anything for my people who desperately need housing.

Hon Simon O’Brien: In Cottesloe?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That was a very cheap shot!

Hon Simon O'Brien: That was a very expensive shot!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That was a really, really cheap shot that was below the belt and totally unwarranted!

Several members interjected.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: There will not be any additional moneys to build infrastructure to deal with the whole issue of mentally ill people who need accommodation.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Won't there?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: There will not be any investment in mental health facilities.

Hon Simon O'Brien: I'm going to be looking you in the eye when I'm doing some speaking this afternoon!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The minister has put on the public record that by 2013, 67 000 skilled migrants will be coming to this state and moving into the regional areas up north and all around, and they will be accompanied by their families in many cases; we know that no special provision will be made in those places and that there will not be an upgrade of transport, no additional housing will be built, and there will be no investment in additional schools and so on and so forth. But at the end of the day, Hale House is being refurbished, and that seems to be important.

Hon Norman Moore: Is that the only thing in the budget?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That will be in the budget. It will be interesting to see whether the panic room will be in the budget.

Hon Adele Farina: The panic what?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The panic room. For members who have not heard, a part of the original plan was a panic room.

Several members interjected.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Will Hon Norman Moore go into the panic room?

Hon Ken Travers: No, the Premier will when Hon Norman Moore turns up!

Hon Norman Moore: I spend a lot of time in there when I hear you start talking! That is what it is for—to give us a bit of relief!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: This is very, very serious.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Look, it is becoming a chat now between members across the benches, rather than a debate.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I will be looking very, very carefully to see whether additional funding has been allocated for Hale House, and I will be interested to see whether any moneys have been allocated for the Premier's panic room. It would be good to know why he actually needs one, given that he has done so little.

HON PHIL EDMAN (South Metropolitan) [11.23 am]: I just wanted to add something very quickly in relation to the neglect of the previous government.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Phil Edman has about two minutes.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: I just wanted to add to this debate by mentioning the neglect of an area by the previous government. The Town of Kwinana was neglected for some 30-odd years, and only recently, under the Barnett government, are we finally putting the necessary infrastructure into that area, at a cost of \$6 million.

Hon Simon O'Brien: We are revitalising the whole town centre.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: We are not only revitalising the town centre, but also putting money towards a youth centre and a knowledge centre. There has not been anywhere for not-for-profit organisations to be based, and they have had to work out of homes in places like Medina. Kwinana has been pretty well neglected. I live in that area, and I am pretty proud about the amount of money that will be put into that area for those types of initiatives. The point should be made that it does not matter which electorate in Western Australia we are talking about, at the end of the day the Barnett government is really trying to make a difference in everybody's lives in this state.

Hon Kate Doust: They are; people can't pay their power bills! That is a pretty significant difference!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon PHIL EDMAN: But most importantly—we will see this at two o'clock—the Barnett government is making Western Australia an even better place to live.

Government members: Hear, hear!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The mover in reply has five seconds.

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan) [11.24 am] — in reply: I would love to! The Nationals will help the government spend it, but the government is left to defend it! Well done, the Liberal Party!

Hon Ljiljana Ravlich: Good finale—strong finish!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Motion lapsed, pursuant to temporary orders.

FISH RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2011

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Hon Norman Moore (Minister for Fisheries)**, and read a first time.

Second Reading

HON NORMAN MOORE (Mining and Pastoral — Minister for Fisheries) [11.25 am]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

The amendments contained in the Fish Resources Management Amendment Bill 2011 have been prepared to improve various aspects of the legal and administrative framework for the sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and the aquatic environment in Western Australia. A number of the amendments have been prepared as a result of the review of the Fish Resources Management Act 1994, undertaken by the former Minister for Fisheries. Specifically, the amendments modify the objects of the act to give more prominence to the aquaculture industry, and introduce a risk-based framework for the assessment of aquaculture licence and lease applications and the management of aquaculture activities, including the capacity to designate aquaculture development zones in Western Australian waters. Aquaculture has been included within the definition of “fishing activity” for the purposes of part 3 of the act. This amendment will assist aquaculture development in commonwealth waters adjacent to Western Australia, once the Primary Industries Ministerial Council agrees on jurisdictional issues.

Western Australia has been tasked by PIMC to be the lead jurisdiction in making recommendations to PIMC in this regard: to reduce the categories for which exemptions may be granted under the act and provide an increased capacity for the minister to delegate his powers under the act to the chief executive officer of the Department of Fisheries; to provide express powers for fisheries management plans to include provisions that may be necessary for the protection of aquatic mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians from fishing activity and increase the range of matters that may be stipulated within a management plan in accordance with contemporary fisheries management requirements; and to modify the offence and penalty provisions relating to the contravention of commercial fishery management plans. Importantly, as a result of these amendments, fisheries and marine officers will, for the first time, have the option of issuing infringement notices for unintentional or inadvertent breaches of a management plan once the regulations have been amended. As the act currently stands, there is no option but to prosecute these offences through the court system, sometimes resulting in penalties disproportionate to the nature or gravity of the offence. The amendments will increase the economic benefits to the commercial sector by enabling “stranded” units of entitlement to be temporarily transferred to other authorisation holders in the fishery. As the act currently stands, at least some entitlement must remain attached to an authorisation, thereby causing entitlements to be “stranded” in unusable quantities.

In the rock lobster industry the amendments will allow fishers to access the full rock lobster catch limit—the quota—in any given year. This will allow the fishery to achieve an estimated \$3.5 million in additional catch value without increasing the catch limit available to the industry. A ministerial exemption has been granted for the 2010–11 rock lobster fishing season. The amendments will clarify the position that commercial fisheries authorisations may be treated as property and become part the estate of a deceased individual; modify and enhance a number of offence, inspection and evidentiary provisions in the act, including the creation of a new offence relating to the trafficking of high-value fish species; modify the confidentiality provisions contained in section 250 of the act, to enable the department to provide information relating to the operation of an authorisation to persons acting for or on behalf of the authorisation holder, other relevant government

departments, and state and national law enforcement organisations under specified circumstances; and provide various new head powers to enable the making of regulations, including for the granting of new categories of authorisations including the licensing for Aboriginal bodies corporate engaged in commercial fishing for species such as mud crab, trochus and bêche-de-mer, the licensing of masters of commercial fishing vessels, permits for the collection of brood stock for use in the aquaculture industry, the management of customary fishing, fish restocking, and the protection of fish and other aquatic animals and the marine environment from incidental harm through fishing and pollution.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

BUILDING SERVICES (REGISTRATION) BILL 2010

Report

Report of committee adopted.

COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING (SPECIAL POWERS) BILL 2011

Second Reading

Resumed from 18 May.

HON KATE DOUST (South Metropolitan — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.32 am]: Last night I began talking about the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill 2011. I had started to talk about the number of people who will be arriving in our city in late October to attend that four-day meeting and the forums that will be held prior to and post the four-day meeting. I also touched upon the fine balance that needs to be achieved between the concern for the security of the people who will visit Perth to attend CHOGM and maintaining the rights of the individuals who live here, as well as the manner in which the additional police powers need to be finetuned to reach that balance. As I alluded to last night, I have a number of questions that I am sure the parliamentary secretary will be able to answer either at the end of the second reading debate or during the committee stage. That is a recap of the initial comments I made last night, to inform members who perhaps were not in the chamber at the time.

More than 50 sovereign heads of state will participate in CHOGM, there will be more than 3 000 delegates and a substantial media pack, as the parliamentary secretary told me last night, of about 1 000 people. We now know that Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip will also attend CHOGM, so I imagine there will be an even more heightened security concern during that period. Later in the debate, or perhaps in the committee stage, it might be interesting to make a comparison between the amount of money invested in and the level of security supplied to the Queen's visit to southern Ireland for the first time and her visit to Western Australia in October. Although there are different circumstances surrounding each visit, it would be an interesting comparison to make. WA Police will provide a leading role in the provision of security for the event and substantial additional resources will be required to provide assistance. I understand from the briefing that police will be sourced from the other states and also New Zealand. I am interested to know what progress has been made in determining the number of those additional police officers. During the briefing, the officers were unable to tell us how many police would be brought over from those places and whether those police officers would be required to undertake any training or accreditation to work in Western Australia. If I recall correctly from the media reports, I understand that about 200 police will be brought in from rural and regional areas to work in Perth at that time. I will ask the parliamentary secretary more specific questions about the involvement of the police from those areas. I also have questions about how local police stations and local staffing numbers in the metropolitan area will be sustained during that period.

The minister's second reading speech states —

CHOGM creates serious challenges to police and others to ensure the smooth running of the event and the safety and security of the delegates and the community in general. A major concern is that, in addition to providing a forum for the attending nations to discuss matters of mutual importance, CHOGM provides an opportunity for persons aggrieved by the actions of one or more of the participating states to publicise their particular cause. The behaviour of anarchist groups at the 2010 G20 meeting held in Toronto, Canada, provides a vivid example of the challenges that may confront police and other security officers during and in the period leading up to CHOGM. Overt displays of public disorder are just one of the risks. Other risks such as acts of terrorism must also be guarded against. Security at similar events held in Australia in recent times has been greatly assisted by the enactment of special powers that provide police and other security personnel with additional powers to assist their functions.

A range of large-scale events have been held in Australia over the past few years, including the 2000 Sydney Olympics, the 2002 Queensland CHOGM, the 2006 Melbourne Commonwealth Games and the 2007 Sydney

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Conference. I imagine that the Sydney APEC conference is the conference the parliamentary secretary referred to in reference to the infamous security breach by *The Chaser's* team. I am sure that incident provided great mirth and amusement for many people who watched not only the program, but also the aftermath. I am sure that that type of incident will not happen here.

Hon Giz Watson: You never know your luck.

Hon KATE DOUST: Indeed. I do not know whether *The Chaser's* boys are on the list that we will talk about at a later stage of the debate.

Hon Peter Collier: They didn't get to the royal wedding. They got banned.

Hon KATE DOUST: The English do not have the same sense of humour as us. I sometimes do not know whether they can take a joke.

Hon Giz Watson: They are on ABC2, which is interesting.

Hon KATE DOUST: Is that right? I will have to look at that. However, I am deviating.

I am sure we will talk about *The Chaser's* team when we talk about the list and that other members will also want to talk about it. I believe that is the incident the parliamentary secretary was referring to and that everyone involved quaked in their boots when *The Chaser's* team gained access to APEC.

Special time-fixed legislation was necessary for each of those large-scale events. We are told that this legislation will have a very specific fixed time and will expire on 5 November. The Labor Party wanted to be very sure of that before we gave our support for this legislation because of some of the concerns we have about some aspects of it. We wanted to ensure that the legislation would terminate on a specific date so that the government would not be able to continue those aspects of the legislation about which we have concerns. This bill provides security powers for police and authorised officers to use in designated secure areas. I will talk about that in more detail because we would like to know what progress has been made to finalise the detail of where those designated security areas will be. This bill provides additional powers to police to close roads for the purposes of conveying dignitaries, and coercive hearing powers to assist in gathering evidence of suspected offences aimed at disrupting the event or harming delegates and property. We will come back and talk about that as well.

The bill will enable police and authorised persons to exercise certain powers in designated areas, including stop and search, mainly near sites where Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting activities are occurring. We will have more discussion about that aspect of it as well. It also enables police from other jurisdictions to perform Western Australian police officer functions during CHOGM. It permits the publication of a list of excluded persons who will be prohibited from accessing declared areas. I was advised that during the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation meeting about 61 people were on an excluded list. The advisers said that they anticipated on this occasion there would be only about a dozen people on that list, but again we will talk about that later because I do not know how the list has been structured, what numbers have been obtained, or how people have been contacted to ascertain whether or not they will be here.

The bill creates an adjunct to exercise these powers for certain offences. It empowers the Corruption and Crime Commission to conduct hearings for the purposes of securing evidence of offences. These hearings can be held for individuals aged 16 years or over. We have concerns about that. I flag now that although we will ultimately agree with this legislation, we will not support these clauses during Committee of the Whole. We will explain why when we get to those points.

In comparing this legislation with the APEC laws in New South Wales, it has to be said that this bill goes further than what was considered necessary for APEC, especially with the deployment of the CCC. We do not understand why on this occasion the CCC has to be engaged. A particular concern is the assertion that these specific powers can be used in the case of juveniles. In the Minister for Police's second reading speech he justified that by stating —

The inclusion of juveniles is a departure from the provisions of the Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003 and has been made in recognition that some of the groups likely to engage in extreme acts are known to recruit juveniles and indoctrinate them to their cause.

I am not too sure whether he has evidence that these types of situations are occurring or are likely to occur in Western Australia, or for this particular occasion. I hope that when we get to that point the parliamentary secretary is able to provide us with evidence that backs up the minister's statements.

The stop-and-search powers conferred are essentially the same as those that currently exist in the Criminal Investigation Act—namely, allowing people who refuse a search to leave a declared area without sanction. Many of the powers conferred are conferred not just on police officers, but also on authorised officers. These so-called officers are not police from other jurisdictions, but other persons authorised by the Commissioner of Police. We need clarification about what type of person is contemplated to be conferred with this classification. If it means non-police personnel such as security officers, then it is objectionable and was not considered necessary in the

New South Wales example. In principle, we will support this bill, but we have a lot of questions. We will not agree to some aspects of the legislation when we go through the committee stage.

There has been a lot of comment in the media, particularly from the Premier and also from the Minister for Police, about this bill being delayed. This bill was given a fairly extensive working over in the other place. A range of ancillary matters were raised. The government has had to try to deal with that. We will not slow this bill down, but we will do our job by raising matters and seeing where the government has gotten to in addressing the canvassed issues. As I mentioned last night, although the government in the Assembly was reluctant to acknowledge or agree to changes, or to acknowledge the flaws in this legislation, I note that since the bill left the other place and came into this place, 15 amendments have been placed on the supplementary notice paper to tighten this legislation. That is a fairly good acknowledgement that when this legislation came into the Parliament, it was not well drafted and not well thought out. It was just another piece of flawed legislation that came from the police minister. Time and again, when we deal with the Minister for Police's legislation in this place, we have to fix it. This is just another example. I hope that when this bill leaves our chamber and heads back to the Assembly for final tick-off, the police minister acknowledges that he could have resolved these matters when the bill was debated there. The Minister for Police needs to thank the shadow Minister for Police, Margaret Quirk, for her diligence in raising these matters and trying to improve his legislation. I hope the parliamentary secretary conveys those views to him. Rather than the Minister for Police just saying no all the time and, "It's my way and I'm not prepared to change", perhaps he needs to do what a number of other ministers do and actually discuss and negotiate to make sure we get the best legislation out of this place that we possibly can.

Another issue that arose was the homelessness issue. I will pick up on some of the media commentary that came out of the debate in the Assembly when a member asked what would happen to homeless people whilst CHOGM was occurring. The Minister for Police at the time made some fairly flippant and inappropriate comment that got him into a fair amount of hot water. The Premier has tried to pull him out of that situation. There are real concerns about what will happen to homeless people. We have seen a rally here at Parliament House. A reasonable number of homeless people expressed their concerns and want action taken on their behalf. On Tuesday another group of people gathered at the front of Parliament House, again calling on the government to address these issues. It has been quite interesting to see different arms of government say, "Yes, yes, we'll do something about it", but even last night, during the regular committee report stage of debate, Hon Ljiljana Ravlich asked Hon Robyn McSweeney whether she will move homeless people out of the city during CHOGM. I noticed with interest that whilst Hon Robyn McSweeney said, "Yes, we will be doing that", the parliamentary secretary shook her head vigorously to say no.

Hon Robyn McSweeney interjected.

Hon KATE DOUST: My question to the parliamentary secretary—not to the minister—because she is the one handling this bill, is: what is the truth? What will the government do to assist the homeless, and not just for that period? Why are we leaving it so late anyway? These are issues we should be dealing with. I was interested in the difference of view —

Hon Donna Faragher: I can clarify that for you.

Hon KATE DOUST: Please do.

Hon Donna Faragher: It is easily clarified. It was dependent on how you took the question from Hon Ljiljana Ravlich.

Hon KATE DOUST: Is that right?

Hon Donna Faragher: I am very happy to explain it.

Hon Sue Ellery: There is homeless and there is homeless.

Hon KATE DOUST: Maybe there is; I do not know. I always thought if you were homeless, you were homeless!

Hon Donna Faragher: It is an issue in terms of "security" areas as opposed to "restricted" areas.

Hon KATE DOUST: So if a person lives in what is a —

Hon Donna Faragher: I will respond in due course.

Hon KATE DOUST: So, some homeless people will be looked after but not others?

Hon Donna Faragher: No, no, no. Just wait and I will be able to allay your fears.

Hon KATE DOUST: I will be interested in that. If the parliamentary secretary wants to apply pen to paper, I will give her some of the other questions I would like answers to.

Hon Donna Faragher: I am at the ready!

Hon KATE DOUST: Very good.

It was a real concern that perhaps people in cabinet were not talking to the people handling the legislation about what they should be doing for the homeless. What is the dollar cost to government to provide accommodation for that group of homeless people the government will select and choose to look after? Where will they be housed? When will they be housed in these alternative arrangements? Why can it not start now? Why leave it until October? I am not too sure what the government's response to the rally on Tuesday was; whether the Premier or the relevant minister met representatives of the group. I would like to know from the parliamentary secretary whether the government has deigned to meet those people. If they have organised themselves and said, "Enough is enough; we really need to have something done to assist us", it is very important that the government talk to these people about the best options to get them into appropriate accommodation.

It is pretty significant that these people have actually organised themselves and their concerns. When I met with the advisers I was thinking about the areas that would be cut off. People who regularly walk through, live in or work in the city know that there are particular areas that people who are homeless go to every day. Some of them have been going to certain places for years and years; it is just where they go. When I worked in the city many, many years ago, one fellow always stayed at the back of the offices in the laneway right near the terrace. How is the government going to identify the individuals who need that assistance?

Hon Adele Farina interjected.

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes, I know; it is very complicated. I will be interested in the response. Anglicare talked about rental properties being out of the reach of these people. Given the dire situation with Homeswest—the lack of availability of homes and the extensive waiting list to get people into accommodation—I do not know what the government will do to appropriately house these people during this period. I do not know whether arrangements will be made for hotel or hostel accommodation. I am not too sure what is going to happen.

Hon Ed Dermer: I wonder what happens at the end of the period.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is the question. I am not too sure what happened in Sydney. The parliamentary secretary might be able to provide some advice on how other states have managed arrangements to assist the homeless when restrictions have been applied on access during these so-called special events. We have heard stories about significant events such as the Olympic Games and the Commonwealth Games being held in some other countries and the homeless being bussed out of or forcibly removed from the cities. That type of situation is of great concern to me. I would not want to see that type of arrangement happen in Perth. I will be very interested to hear from the government about how it will work out who will need to be accommodated and what it will do if those people do not want to move. It will be very difficult to encourage a lot of people to do anything different, particularly those who may have mental health issues and are in a routine in a familiar place.

Hon Adele Farina: They are going to need counselling.

Hon KATE DOUST: They are going to need counselling. There are a whole lot of issues. It is very important that the government engage with these people, and not just for this particular event. This is a very good opportunity to try to provide some long-term planning to assist these people back into appropriate accommodation and to provide whatever other support they need. Maybe we sometimes need events like this to act as a wake-up call to address these issues. I know I always talk about this in other debates, but we are in a period of sustained boom or economic wellbeing in Western Australia. Sometimes we need events like this, when we are doing really well, to make us think about the people who have the greatest need and that we should be doing something to help them. I do not believe that the Western Australian community is receiving the benefit of this boom. The homelessness issue is a clear example of that. It is not limited to just the city; it is now sadly spreading out to our suburbs. Perhaps some country members could talk about this issue at some point. Maybe we should again have a debate on homelessness to see how people are tracking in other places as well. It is a significant issue for the government to deal with. I hope that the government has taken the police minister to task following his appalling response. I am sure that many of his colleagues on the government benches would have been dreadfully embarrassed by the manner in which he handled himself on that occasion, because I thought it was just a shocker and really reinforced the shallowness of that individual in the way in which he addresses these issues.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Who is that?

Hon KATE DOUST: The police minister, Hon Rob Johnson.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Say no more!

Hon KATE DOUST: Unfortunately, I have to say more. I will go through some other matters that have been canvassed. It has been quite interesting to track this issue through the media and to see some of the matters that have arisen in that regard. There has been a lot of criticism, and not just from us, about the involvement of the Corruption and Crime Commission and about the stop-and-search laws. The police minister has been highly critical of Labor for supporting this bill but not the other piece of legislation. The vast majority of us do not

support the stop-and-search legislation. I see Hon Wendy Duncan nodding, so I take it that she still does not support that legislation. As I said, we will support this bill only because we know that it is for a fixed period and for a significant event, so it is quite contained. We understand the significance of this type of meeting occurring in Western Australia. In *The West Australian* of 24 January this year, Hylton Quail, president of the Law Society of Western Australia, said that there was absolutely no need or justification for increased police powers during CHOGM because WA police already have expansive stop-and-search powers. He went on to say —

“There is absolutely no need to abolish the requirement of reasonable suspicion to deal with CHOGM or any other event,” ...

He has been quite consistent and sound in his thinking as the representative of the legal fraternity in this state. I think he has quite clearly articulated the concerns of a range of people in our community. We believe that the police already have sufficient powers under the legislation to manage these types of events. The concern is that the government may have been using this as another opportunity to further erode people’s rights in our state.

Margaret Quirk, the shadow Minister for Police, has expressed her concerns, which I will go through. She said that the legislation, whilst similar to the laws adopted in New South Wales for APEC in 2007, needed to cover a range of issues including the description of areas subject to heightened security measures, the access and entry of persons to those areas, the nature of powers to be exercised by police in those areas, the recognition of police personnel from other states, and other provisions such as road closures and the imposition of airspace restrictions. I thought that was interesting, because I had not really thought about airspace restrictions. That might be another matter on which the parliamentary secretary might provide information to us. How will that be dealt with during that time?

Hon Adele Farina: That will be really interesting.

Hon KATE DOUST: There is a heavy flow of air traffic at both our airports. Members need only stand outside this building to see planes constantly flying in and out.

Hon Adele Farina: And circling.

Hon KATE DOUST: Indeed, they do. It is an interesting question whether any restrictions will be placed on flights in and out of the city and whether planes will have to change their flight patterns or whatever.

Hon Adele Farina: And the impact on commercial airlines as well.

Hon KATE DOUST: They are the ones I am referring to. I had not even thought about the smaller planes. It would be interesting to know the impact on Jandakot airport. Smaller planes fly out of there. Our emergency services fly out of there, including the Royal Flying Doctor Service of Australia. We cannot always predict when planes will need to take off from and land in that area. It will be interesting to see what information the parliamentary secretary has about the impact on that. I thought that was quite an interesting point raised by Margaret Quirk.

There is also the issue of cost. Although I understand that some of the costs will be shared by the federal government, some costs will be picked up by the state government. I note that in the briefing I had I was advised that the government had already set aside more than \$12 million for the police service, which is a significant amount of money for such a short time, and that the government anticipated that more money may need to be allocated.

Hon Giz Watson: Is that the state government?

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes, the state government.

Hon Giz Watson: The commonwealth is putting in \$58 million.

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes. I was going to go through some of the state figures. I had the briefing a few weeks ago. Given that the budget will be handed down today, quite possibly by the time we reach the committee stage of this bill—maybe later today—we might know how much more in dollar terms the government has allocated to CHOGM for the police service, for other activities or for work that needs to be done. As well as the \$12 million for the police service, an article in *The Weekend West* of Saturday, 9 April 2011, indicates —

The State Government initially allocated about \$5.6 million over two years for WA’s involvement in the event, later budgeting for a further \$25.5 million.

I think I know where some of the dividend money from the utilities is going —

This includes \$1 million to the Royal Agricultural Society as compensation for the loss of the Queen’s Birthday public holiday during the Royal Show, \$2.2 million for a Government House upgrade and \$12.2 million for police services, which it expects will be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

The parliamentary secretary might let us know whether that is going to happen or whether the feds have said, “No, this is your share; thank you very much.” As I have said, the parliamentary secretary might be able to

provide that information after the budget has been brought down. I would be interested to know what other costs are associated with CHOGM and what other costs the government will have to pay for. At the end of the day, it is all taxpayers' money and we want to make sure that they get a good bang for their buck.

Hon Adele Farina: We don't yet have a total cost because no allowance has been made for the cost of dealing with the homeless.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is right. That needs to be taken into account as well.

Another concern has been raised in the public arena about CHOGM. We have been told that CHOGM will go for the four days that have been listed, and we know that the public holiday has been changed from early in the month to the end of the month because the government is trying to reduce as much as possible the flow of traffic into and out of the city, which is a very sensible thing to do. But, at the end of the day, people will still want to do things in and around the city. I assumed that it was just going to be those four days—that people would attend the forums and the meeting and then leave. But I understand that there will be a range of activities before and after CHOGM. We need to have clarity. Will some form of restriction apply before and after the meeting, such as restricted access to the city, road closures or restricted access to venues? Has a plan been put in place for dates, places and areas? How will that be communicated to members of the public, who clearly think that it will just be for the four-day period? I would hate people to be caught out a few days beforehand if they find that they cannot get into the city because a road has been blocked off or they cannot access a train station. These are questions that people want to know the answers to. That is a busy time of the year, not just for people who live and work in the area. I had this discussion with my colleague last night on the way home. It is also a very important time for year 12 students who have end-of-year studies. A lot of students from the bush come in to do additional study in the lead-up to their tertiary entrance exams. It would be good to know how those issues will be managed. Although roads will be closed, can the parliamentary secretary provide any advice about the train stations in the city? The Esplanade station is right next to the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre, which I understand is where a number of these events will occur. Will that station be closed or will access be restricted for a period? It is a very busy train station, as is the William Street train station, with people travelling to and from the city for work. Even though the city will be shut down over that weekend, people who work in the retail sector and who use public transport will still need to get to work.

Hon Adele Farina: And there are people from regional WA who get dropped off there as well.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is right. I would hate for people who work in the city to be impacted on in a negative way because they may not be able to get to work or they may get there late because of changes to train or bus services. I do not know about the parliamentary secretary, but I have worked in the retail sector and it does not matter what circumstances are in play; the boss always wants workers to be on time. I would hate for people who work in the retail or hospitality sectors to be issued with counselling notices or warnings because they could not get to work on time. I would like some assurance from the government that measures will be put in place to ensure that those people are able to get to their workplaces. I know that the government wants coffee shops, restaurants and other shops to be open so that the people who are in Perth for CHOGM can enjoy their time in the city. But I would not want the workers to be penalised just because they cannot get to and from work. I do not know whether that issue has been addressed, but it would be interesting to know how the government intends to educate people or what alternatives the government has put in place to assist people in that situation. Having read the comments in these articles, I know that some retailers and coffee shop operators are worried about the impact on their businesses over that period because some of their staff may not be able to get to work. It will be interesting to know what the government's plans are for managing those situations.

Another matter that I want to raise relates to the other events. I know that, apart from the leaders meeting and the foreign ministers meeting, there will be a range of activities in and around CHOGM. We have been given the very useful document "CHOGM 2011", which sets out all the parallel events, including the commonwealth business forum, the commonwealth people's forum and the commonwealth youth forum. The government has made announcements about funding for a \$2.45 million eight-day arts and culture festival during CHOGM, of which a very generous \$1.45 million came from Lotterywest funding and \$1 million from the state government. That will be quite a significant event. The parliamentary secretary might be able to tell us exactly where that event will occur, or perhaps it will be a number of events scattered throughout Perth and Fremantle. I also understand that there will be some fairly significant sporting events. It was explained to me that there would be netball and hockey events. Of course, we excel at both those sports. I imagine that the hockey will be held at Curtin University. I am interested to know where it will be. Again, if the hockey is at Curtin, will that also have fairly serious security measures applied to it? Will it become a designated place? I am just thinking about those sorts of issues. I imagine that the netball will be held in the very new wonderful facilities at Floreat. There is also a schools program. There is a range of activities and it is important that we understand—I need to understand—that this will not simply be isolated to the CBD, as most of us think it will be; it is fairly obvious that some of these events will be scattered. Therefore, not only will the CBD be in lockdown, if we like, but also other parts

of Perth will be. If they are designated areas and the police can close roads, it will come as a bit of a shock to people and will impact on how they get around their own city for that period. A people's space has been announced, which the Premier talked about.

The Premier yesterday announced some funding for people to participate in the commonwealth people's forum. I understand an announcement was made about —

Hon Donna Faragher: By me, as a matter of fact, on behalf of the Premier.

Hon KATE DOUST: By Hon Donna Faragher! My apologies, parliamentary secretary; it had the Premier's photo on the press release, not yours. The parliamentary secretary is so much more attractive than the Premier that I am surprised they did not put her name there!

Hon Donna Faragher: I was in the body of the press release.

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes, the parliamentary secretary was; that is why I missed it. I am sorry.

Hon Donna Faragher: You didn't read the press release!

Hon KATE DOUST: I saw Hon Gary Gray's name, but I missed the parliamentary secretary's.

Hon Donna Faragher: That's disappointing.

Hon KATE DOUST: I know it is disappointing. We will just have to do things to raise the parliamentary secretary's profile! We will have to look after her.

I understand that about 40 Western Australians will have the opportunity to attend this forum. I think that about 130 people will go to this forum.

Hon Donna Faragher: It is 250.

Hon KATE DOUST: The parliamentary secretary's numbers are better than those online. I think it is great that people have the opportunity to participate in these forums. Earlier today I looked at the type of matters that would be canvassed in these workshops. They are quite interesting. I understand that in these workshops people will deal with issues such as governance and democracy. When we think about it, in our own commonwealth we have some interesting challenges right now. Zimbabwe was discussed at length at the last CHOGM meeting and I imagine that it will be discussed at length again. I do not know whether that discussion had any positive impact for the poor people of Zimbabwe who have to deal with their president, but it is good that these issues are talked about. People at the workshops will deal also with gender and women's rights, education, technology and innovation. I had a quick look at the report from the last CHOGM, which talked about the need for incubators. I will quote from that report at the committee stage because these are things that I have picked up from it that I think are great. It will be really good for Western Australians to have input into discussions on the need to have science or business incubators in the community and the value that they have in picking up on natural resources and renewable energy. I am not making this up; it is all in the report from the 2009 CHOGM. I hope that our 40 representatives really get in there and push those messages because they are the science and innovation messages that I would like to push to this state government. There is a need for incubators to encourage business in the science community and to provide that financial support to tap into our natural resources and to engage in the area of renewable energy more than we do. I think these are all really interesting areas.

Hon Adele Farina: Perhaps they should also discuss the value of committees in democratic societies!

Hon KATE DOUST: We will probably find that as I go through the list!

People at the workshops will also deal with issues around Indigenous people, cultural identity, peace and security. As I said, I imagine that is a significant issue, unfortunately, for a lot of people throughout the commonwealth. We would not even know where to start with the types of problems that they deal with. Other issues discussed will be around economic development, trade and finance, climate change, the environment, disaster management and human rights. Again, that is another significant issue that we all need to take on board. Therefore, the matters that will be canvassed during the forum are very important. I noted, however, an interesting comment that came out of the CHOGM review. Given the types of matters and the thoughts about democracy and governance—the ground rules, if we like—were established in about 1965, we perhaps need to rethink how this is managed; perhaps the models and the types of discussions needed to be updated. I thought that was a very interesting comment. Although I realise that the feedback will probably be more of a federal nature, I hope that the people funded to go to this forum, such as people from rural and regional areas—I imagine that quite a few will be sponsored to attend this forum—will provide feedback to our state government. If we provide that support, I hope there will be a return to our state government and that the state government will actually pick up on and utilise that information to draft better legislation than some of the stuff we have had to deal with and to have better plans for our future in some of those areas that I have canvassed.

What grabbed me with the parliamentary secretary's press release, even though I missed her name, was that the money being provided to support these people to attend the forum will come from Lotterywest. I think that Lotterywest does a fabulous job and it is a great way to provide assistance to organisations, charities and sporting and community groups that might need the extra dollars or to give them the kick-start for a project. I went to the launch of the Western Australian medical research facility yesterday. Lotterywest kicked in about a \$5 million grant for that building, which I thought was fantastic because Western Australia as a community will gain great benefit from that research funding. However, I am not too sure about Lotterywest providing funding for this forum. I thought that, as this is a government event, if the government wanted to provide support—in the form of a sponsorship, I would imagine—for people to attend the forum, it probably should provide that money from another source because Lotterywest funding really should go to charitable organisations. This is a government event —

Hon Donna Faragher: It's not a state government—I'll clarify —

Hon KATE DOUST: I would like clarification. I make it quite clear that I have no difficulty at all with people receiving support to attend this event. I think it is good because it means that people who may not normally be able to afford to go will have that opportunity. I am not too sure whether Lotterywest was the appropriate vehicle to tap into on this occasion because really its charter is to provide assistance to charitable or not-for-profit organisations. My worry is that once we start doing this, it becomes very easy for a government with a shortfall or a gap somewhere to go to this pot of money. I would not like to see that happen. I have no difficulty with support being provided, but I want to clarify why it came from Lotterywest and not another avenue, such as consolidated revenue. That is the question I wanted to ask and I just want that clarified.

Another issue that has been canvassed is the stop-and-search aspect of this legislation. I know at some time during the committee debate we will come to the actual clauses about the police being able to take possessions. Comment has been made about the police being able to remove mobile phones and laptops when they are conducting a search. The police minister was quoted in *The Sunday Times* of 17 April about these matters, and he said that, during CHOGM, the police will have special powers to search mobile phones and laptops, and to search emails and text messages. The article goes on to say that —

While Mr Johnson said he did not expect mobile phones and laptops to be searched “as a general rule”, he admitted they could be searched “for the purpose of promoting the security and safety of people attending CHOGM”.

I would like to know under what circumstances that could be done.

Hon Adele Farina: And how will the police make that decision?

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes—how will the police make that decision? If the police are doing a stop-and-search, will they say to people, “We want to look at your mobile phone, and we want to look at your emails”? How will the police determine which people they will ask for that information?

Hon Adele Farina: And will there be any requirement for reasonable suspicion?

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes. I thank Hon Adele Farina very much for that assistance.

Hon Donna Faragher: Will you be making a speech on this, Hon Adele Farina, or not?

Hon Adele Farina: I might.

Hon Donna Faragher: I just want to know whether I am answering questions from both of you.

Hon KATE DOUST: She is just filling in a few gaps for me occasionally, so it is very helpful.

I want to know how the police will make that decision. We would not want the police to be asking everyone for their mobile phones or their laptops. That would be quite onerous. Is the purpose of this provision simply to deal with those people who are on the list, or will it be more widespread than that? In that same article, concern is also expressed by the director of Civil Liberties Australia that these wide-ranging powers will set a dangerous precedent. One of our colleagues in the other place, the member for Forrestfield, has also raised the concern that if people take their computers or mobile phones into a CHOGM-restricted area, they will risk having their emails and files searched. It will be interesting to know whether people who go into a restricted area will have to surrender their mobile phones and laptops until they exit the venue. For some types of events—not any that I have attended—these sorts of measures have had to be put in place. The parliamentary secretary might be able to provide some information about that matter.

I am pleased to know that while Her Majesty the Queen of England will be in Perth for CHOGM, she will be turning the first sod for the proposed foreshore development. I cannot remember whether I read that in the paper, or whether I heard the Premier announce that, but I thought that would give me an opportunity to say a few things about the Perth foreshore plan. It is also very interesting, given that those plans have not been finalised

yet. Can the parliamentary secretary confirm whether the Queen will be turning the first sod for the proposed foreshore development?

Hon Donna Faragher: Forgive me, but I am not the Queen, and I would not know.

Hon KATE DOUST: I know, otherwise the parliamentary secretary would not be sitting here! I am not making this up. I think I read it somewhere.

Hon Donna Faragher: All that I have been advised is that the Queen will be in Perth for CHOGM as head of the commonwealth.

Hon KATE DOUST: The next issue I want to raise is police numbers. An article in *The West Australian* of 16 May states that about 200 police officers from country Western Australia will be seconded to Perth for CHOGM. I imagine that will leave some regional areas fairly short of police officers. It will be interesting to know how regional police stations will be staffed during that time. If 200 police officers are to be brought in from the bush, will cars, bikes and other equipment also be brought in from those places?

Hon Adele Farina: And where will they be housed?

Hon KATE DOUST: That is my next question. I thank Hon Adele Farina very much for that. Where will those 200 police be accommodated during the time they are in Perth for CHOGM? I understand also that 700 police will be brought in from the eastern states and New Zealand. Where will those officers be accommodated? It will be an interesting dilemma for the government, because it will have to find accommodation for not only the homeless, but also the 900 additional police who will be brought to Perth for CHOGM. Some accommodation may be able to be provided at the training facility at Joondalup—or perhaps they will be offered a few swags and they can place themselves in local lockups! It will be interesting to know how the government will deal with those matters.

Hon Norman Moore: I like this enthusiasm for CHOGM!

Hon KATE DOUST: Was the Leader of the House interjecting on me?

Hon Norman Moore: No. I was just making a comment to myself.

Hon KATE DOUST: I heard it!

Hon Norman Moore: I'm sorry! I'll whisper in future!

Hon KATE DOUST: Thank you! We have every right to ask questions to ensure that this is good legislation. The Leader of the House was not here when I said this, so I will say it again. This legislation has come into this house with 15 government amendments attached to it. That clearly demonstrates to us that when this bill went into the other place, it was flawed. The government has now acknowledged that, because it has picked up all the issues that were canvassed in the other place and is now seeking to amend the bill. We will support those amendments.

Hon Norman Moore: I am just interested in your enthusiasm for this event!

Hon KATE DOUST: I will continue to ask questions to make sure the government gets this legislation right. If all these people from the commonwealth want to come to Perth for CHOGM, great! I am enthusiastic!

Hon Norman Moore: You sound so negative!

Hon KATE DOUST: I am not. That is just the spin from the Leader of the House. He is perennially grumpy!

Hon Norman Moore: You are normally not negative at all; you are normally very positive. But today you are being very negative.

Hon KATE DOUST: I am not. The Leader of the House is just very grumpy, and that puts a colour on his vision.

Hon Norman Moore: I am not! I am smiling at you!

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes—and I am dancing on the inside, leader! So we are both happy people!

Hon Robyn McSweeney: Isn't that nice!

Hon KATE DOUST: It is nice!

Hon Norman Moore: Just get positive! Be enthusiastic!

Hon KATE DOUST: I am so pleased the Leader of the House has joined us today!

Hon Norman Moore: Just be enthusiastic about it!

Hon KATE DOUST: I am indeed. But we have questions about this legislation. The parliamentary secretary is very diligent. I am sure that she will come back to us with fulsome answers about this legislation, because she is

keen to make sure that this is good legislation, and that this event goes off—I was not going to say with a bang —

Hon Adele Farina: That would be a problematic statement!

Hon KATE DOUST: I know!

Hon Giz Watson: We used to be able to make jokes like that!

Hon KATE DOUST: Yes. That is the difficulty. We cannot make jokes like that any more, because people may take it the wrong way.

I have been talking about the extra 200 police who will come to Perth from regional areas, and the extra 700 police who will come to Perth from the eastern states and New Zealand. Concerns have been raised about the staffing levels in metropolitan police stations during this time. There are already some concerns about staffing levels in some locations after certain hours. How will the metropolitan police stations be staffed during this time? Will staff and equipment be taken away from those stations? Will a sufficient number of police be available to the community to deal with general issues? I imagine that while CHOGM is taking place, there will still be the normal run-of-the-mill activities in the community, and there will still be break-ins, car accidents or assaults. I would like to know what plan has been pulled together to ensure that there will be adequate police numbers in and around this city to look after the ongoing needs of the community. I raise that because comment was made in May to the media by sources within the police force that there is concern that at the same time that the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting is happening, police would be drawn in centrally and not be available for other events happening at the same time.

I understand that one of the events that happens at that time of year is the annual regional bikies run. I understand the police are worried because they usually dispatch quite a number of police to deal with that bikie run, but they may not necessarily have the personnel available this year because they will be focused on CHOGM. I am sure the bikie run will be quite peaceful and quiet—I am not too sure how that works—but the concern is that there will be insufficient police to manage not only CHOGM, but also the other events that will be happening. I will be interested to know whether that has been canvassed as an issue, and how police will deal with those sorts of ongoing problems.

There has been a call for people to volunteer for CHOGM, and a couple of information forums have been held on CHOGM for, particularly, volunteers. I think that will be an interesting opportunity for people to not only develop skills, but also demonstrate their knowledge of the city. It will be a great way to promote the state, and I think that is very good. I would be interested to know the sorts of issues that arose out of those forums, the concerns, if any, that were canvassed, and the sort of information that was provided to people. I would like to know, also, whether the call for volunteers has been finalised.

Hon Donna Faragher: No.

Hon KATE DOUST: No?

Hon Donna Faragher: I will respond more formally in my reply, but the call for volunteers has only recently occurred, and that is still open; we are calling for around 500 volunteers. The public forums were for anybody who wanted information about CHOGM. We need volunteers for the daytime and the night-time, and I will provide further information in my response. There will be, in effect, two sets of volunteers.

Hon KATE DOUST: Was the general CHOGM information forum well attended?

Hon Donna Faragher: There were two; there was one in the morning and one in the evening. I went to the evening one, along with your colleague Margaret Quirk, MLA.

Hon KATE DOUST: It might be interesting to see the sort of issues that came out of that forum.

We have talked about police numbers and equipment—guns, cars and motorbikes, and all those sorts of things. From reading *The Sunday Times*—which is a good source of finding out what is happening with the police in Western Australia—I understand that a number of police motorbikes are sitting in a holding yard. They were purchased for about \$300 000 and they will be used during CHOGM, and then they will be put back in the holding yard. I did not understand that. I thought: “Well if they have been purchased, why aren’t they being used; and why aren’t they being used continuously?” There is obviously a need for them, and the police must feel quite frustrated by that. I thought it was interesting that these motorbikes, which I understand cost about \$21 000 each and are fitted with radios, lights, specialist equipment and highly visible paintwork, will only be used during that very short period. I thought: “What a waste of a resource; what a waste of a dollar”, if members like. Why are they not being used now and continuously until they need to be replaced? I would be interested to know why they will be brought out only for that event.

Hon Adele Farina: How many are there?

Hon KATE DOUST: I think there are 16; whatever \$300 000 divided by \$21 000 is will give the member the figure.

Another issue that needs to be canvassed and has been raised in the media is the concern of cab drivers about the impact, in terms of access to the city, upon their industry during CHOGM. I understand a plan was to be developed that would indicate the roads that would be restricted. Has that plan been developed, and has it been articulated to the taxi industry and on to the drivers, because they will want to make sure that they are able to continue to make money? They do not want to be prevented from being able to work during that period. Has the plan been completed; and, if it has, has it been fed back into the taxi industry for a response or for it to be passed on to the drivers so that they know what they will have to do?

Hon Donna Faragher: As I understand it, there have been conversations with the taxi industry—I can get more detail.

Hon KATE DOUST: I would appreciate more detail.

Hon Donna Faragher: Having said that, the roads that will be blocked for the three days have already been identified in the forums and the like, but I will go through that in my response.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is another issue: will they be able to be on the road during this time if the roads are going to be blocked off?

Hon Donna Faragher: Obviously not in the areas that are blocked.

Hon KATE DOUST: With 50 heads of state and 3 000 dignitaries in town and coming in from airports, I imagine there will be fairly significant roads blocked off so that they can go straight through from the airport to the city or to their hotel or to the meeting. I imagine that they will not travel in just one car or van, and that there might be friends or their own security guys or whatever travelling with them in a convoy, so the roadblocks will be fairly continuous. It will not be just stopping access to the road for 20 minutes or half an hour here or there; I imagine that it will be continuous in the days leading up to the formal meeting.

Hon Donna Faragher: I will respond in my reply.

Hon KATE DOUST: I think people really want to know how this is going to work and what level of disruption there will be in getting in and out of the city. Do we just avoid Perth totally over that period of time, or do we all start walking in because it will be so much easier? I raise this matter because when we were on a family holiday in Washington in 2005 we going somewhere on a bus with the kids when the bus stopped. When I asked what was going on, I was told that maybe the President or one of the cabinet people might be coming out and so they stopped all the traffic, and that it had happened the day before and they had waited for two hours for the car to come out and give it a clear way through. I am not the best person for waiting on transport; I am the sort of person who would get off the bus if those things happen. I just wondered whether that is what is going to happen here. If these people are coming through, will everything just stop so that they can have total clear way? I saw vision last night of the Queen's convoy going through some part of Dublin, I think, and it was totally blocked off. I do not know whether Hon Wendy Duncan saw the same image, but it just stood out in my mind that there was this cavalcade of black cars and vans that just seemed to go on and on for quite some time, and there was nothing else around. I appreciate that in that situation people had to be kept far away, but I wondered whether everything will be totally blocked off in Perth. If it is not going to be like that, then people need to be told what it will be like because it is a worry. I am starting to think that maybe the best thing would be to look at one of those "Winter Escape" magazines that we get in the newspaper and head off somewhere during CHOGM because I think it is going to be really hard for a lot of people!

Hon Adele Farina: The South West is wonderful at that time of the year!

Hon KATE DOUST: CHOGM is five months away and it will be a long weekend, but out of curiosity people will still want to see things or people may have to work, or there might be people who will be participating, and I think the government needs to explain really clearly how this bill and how this event will impact upon people not only for the four days, but also in the lead-up. I think the lead-up, with people coming in and going out, will cause the greatest amount of difficulty for access. I think that is where we need the clarity and information from the police about how access and egress will be managed from the city during that period of time. I do not think, based on the media reports, that the message has been clearly articulated.

I will refer again to the second reading speech. I understand that the \$12.2 million will fund a number of things. It will fund the establishment of a 24-hour command centre; the costs associated with additional vehicle, maritime and air support capabilities; and the recruitment of additional WA police officers. I ask the parliamentary secretary to tell us exactly how many additional police officers this money will fund. It will also fund the use of personnel from the Australian Federal Police and police officers from the other states and territories and New Zealand. Obviously the funding for those people will go towards housing them and their transports costs.

The second reading speech went into great detail about part 3 of the bill and what the police and security staff will be able to do. I will refer to some of these matters, about which I have a couple of questions. The second reading speech states —

Pursuant to part 3, police and other security personnel will have the ability to —

establish checkpoints, cordons and roadblocks around security areas for the purposes of stopping and searching persons, vehicles or vessels, and controlling the access to and movement of persons, within a security area;

refuse entry to a security area if a person refuses to provide their personal details, a reason for entry to the area and/or to submit to a search of the person and things in their possession, including a search of any vehicle or vessel in which they may be travelling;

require persons within a security area to provide their personal details and a reason for being in the area;

At the briefing I raised the point that some of these areas will be restricted or blocked off because they are areas through which the cars in which the dignitaries will be travelling will pass. Many areas in the CBD have been infilled with residential accommodation, particularly at the southern end of the city. A lot of people will be coming and going over those few days. Some of the residents park in and around the CBD. What information will be provided to them about how this event will impact on them and what they will need to know and do? If an area becomes a restricted area and the roads are blocked off, the residents will need to carry ID on them, which is not something that people do all the time, particularly young people. What sorts of education programs or advertising will the government engage in to make people aware of what the requirements will be and to make them aware of what is an appropriate form of identification to carry? Is it simply a driver's licence with a photo, or is it another form of photographic ID? The government is seeking to provide officers from the Corruption and Crime Commission with powers to ask juveniles questions—that is, people between the ages of 16 and 18. Many young people do not carry any identification on them because they either do not think about it or do not have it. They would not have student identification if they did not attend a university or TAFE. It is a fairly sensible requirement to make that information available to people so that they will know what identification they will be required to provide. Pursuant to part 3 of the bill, police and other security personnel will have the ability to —

stop and search a person who is in a security area, including things in their possession, as well as search any vehicle or vessel in which they may be travelling;

require the surrender of, or to seize and detain, prohibited items. Prohibited items will be prescribed and will include items such as weapons, noxious substances, spray paint cans et cetera;

Will the prohibited items be listed in regulations or will they be in directions or some other form? What form and what types of items will be listed as prohibited? Police and other security personnel will also be able to —

dispose of unclaimed, seized or surrendered prohibited items in accordance with the Criminal and Found Property Disposal Act 2006;

give reasonable directions to people in a security area to promote, when necessary, the security and safety of a CHOGM event, people attending the event, the public, or to prevent or control a public disorder;

close roads in or leading to or in the vicinity of a security area or roads along a route being used to convey participants in CHOGM to or from their accommodation, airport, venue, facility or event;

The last provision I mentioned goes back to the matter I raised earlier about the extent of road shutdowns and their impact. Police and other security personnel will also be able to —

remove vehicles, vessels or things from a security area or a closed road and take them to a police station or other place where they may be conveniently detained. Notice is required to be given to the owner of any of these things as to their location if the owner is known;

Will the person whose vehicle is removed be required to pay the cost of reclaiming the vehicle if the vehicle has been moved to a police station without the owner's knowledge? I refer in particular to the residents of the CBD. A person might park the car on the street that is subsequently closed and the police move it. Will the owner of a vehicle have to pay to get the vehicle back if the person was not around or was unaware that the street would be closed? Finally, police and other security personnel will also be able to —

remove excludable persons from a security area. Excludable persons are persons who are on the excluded persons list or who fail to comply with a lawful requirement made under the Commonwealth Heads of Government (Special Powers) Act—the CHOGM act. The excluded persons list will include persons identified as posing a serious threat to the safety of persons or property in a CHOGM security area.

This provision relates to the list of excluded people that we have talked about regarding APEC. I am interested to know about the proposed list of excluded people for the CHOGM event. I do not want people's names, just the number of people who are anticipated to be on the list during this event. Certain individuals, as a matter of habit, go to these types of functions and are nuisances. I am not saying that they are there because of potential terrorism or security issues; they are just there to create a nuisance, be it at a cricket match, a concert or some other type of public meeting. What measures have the police taken to identify, contact and make those people aware that they are not welcome or invited to CHOGM? What response has been elicited from those people? Has the number of people on the list been narrowed? Where are we up to with that? We talked quite jovially about *The Chaser's* team earlier. Is *The Chaser's* team on the list? The Minister for Police is probably not a fan of them. He probably does not watch the ABC; I do not know. Is *The Chaser's* team on the list? They are the sorts of things we want to know. Also, how will people —

Hon Robyn McSweeney interjected.

Hon KATE DOUST: I missed that one.

Hon Robyn McSweeney: I said it would be funny if they were.

Hon KATE DOUST: There will be hundreds of police and I imagine there will be other security. How will these people be identified? If all these people are coming in and out of various venues—there will be sporting activities, arts and cultural activities, the people's forum, the youth forum, the public space forum and a range of other activities; there will be lots of movement—how will these individuals be identified? How will police or the security staff at these events know who is on the list and how will they identify them at that venue? There is also a privacy issue I am curious to know about. It is all very well to have a list, but what is the mechanism? Is there some sort of training or briefing given to the people working in the various venues about which people are on the list? I am interested to know how that is all being worked through.

I am probably not going to talk about the CCC issue a lot. One of my other colleagues has more experience than I do dealing with that type of matter. I am interested in the parliamentary secretary's argument as to why the CCC needs to be brought into this. We are of the view that police already have sufficient powers to manage these types of events. We have real concerns particularly about young people being brought in and questioned by the CCC, given some stories we have heard about how the CCC manages its inquiries. I imagine it would be quite intimidating for anyone brought into that situation. We have concerns. We will spend more time going through those when we get into committee and ask more specific questions as to why the decision was made to bring in the CCC.

A range of issues have come about as a result of the debate in the other place and as a result of people in the community and the legal fraternity looking at this piece of legislation and questioning why police will have enhanced powers for this period, particularly stop and search; looking at why the CCC has been brought into play; and discussion about the impact on people living within the city during this period. We all know an event such as this cannot be held without some sort of impact. How will it be managed so that it is not such a great burden? That is why we need to know what the plans are. At what point will the government or police inform us of their plans so that everyone knows where they stand? I think that is quite a sensible question. That is not being critical of the government; it is saying, "What are you doing with it?" It is all very well to have this, but how is it going to happen so that people can still get on with their lives during that period? As I said earlier, this is quite difficult. There have been issues at some large gatherings. Some groups take opportunities to protest. I do not recall any of that type of activity at the Brisbane CHOGM, but the parliamentary secretary —

Hon Donna Faragher: We would probably all agree that CHOGM is generally not seen in the same light as a G20 summit or the like.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is right.

Hon Donna Faragher: We are actually coming together in great collaboration.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is right. It is of a different nature, probably of a more sedate nature. That is why it is interesting that in his second reading speech the Minister for Police referred to the Toronto events as though we would be dealing with the same sorts of issues. I do not think that is the case at all given the nature —

Hon Donna Faragher: But we cannot be complacent.

Hon KATE DOUST: No, we cannot be complacent and we should not be complacent, but we also should not use it as an opportunity to go too far overboard and restrict people's rights or use it as an opportunity to further restrict rights. We have to achieve the correct balance; that is, provide appropriate security and ensure people's rights are sustained. Police powers should be appropriate to deliver both those things. That is why so many issues have come about. Sometimes the approach to this type of legislation is difficult. As I said earlier, some ministers are very sensible and are prepared to sit down and say, "We've got this bill; have a look at it. If there

are issues, let's deal with it." That is a much more sensible approach than saying, "We've got this legislation but we're not going to change it", and all these other matters arise. It will take some time now, in the best of all worlds, to work through all the amendments. Sometimes questions come about through other questions.

We agree with the principle of having legislation in place to provide that balance and security. We have concerns about aspects of it. We do not support the CCC part of it because we do not see that as being necessary to provide that security and that balance on this occasion. We have questions about the expense, and particularly the issue that has been thrown up inadvertently about accommodating the homeless. It is a great opportunity for the government to do something really positive on a long-term basis. It will be an interesting debate as to how we manage it.

The Leader of the House is wrong if he says I am being negative or not supportive of CHOGM. I am. I am doing my job; I am trying to be thorough. I know that other speakers will probably be even more thorough. I see this as being positive. We want to showcase Perth and Western Australia. I have always been very parochial about my state. I have always thought we are living in the best place in the world. We have the best of everything to offer. But we have to do it properly so that people can move freely and appreciate how good it is here. We will agree with this legislation but we want to make sure our questions are answered. We want to ensure the bill that comes out of this place is good legislation and works. We want to make sure that our public is educated as to what will actually happen during CHOGM. It will be an interesting task for government to make sure people understand not only how CHOGM will impact on them during that period, but also the real benefits to the Western Australian community that CHOGM will provide. With those words, we will agree to the bill. We look forward to the parliamentary secretary's response to all those questions. I do not know if the parliamentary secretary will be able to provide those responses today —

Hon Donna Faragher: I will be able to provide some in my summing up, and during the committee stage.

Hon KATE DOUST: I am sure Hon Simon O'Brien, who is reading the budget, will be able to provide us with a few more answers as well.

Quite frankly, I think I will take the option of leaving town while CHOGM is on because it might be the best way to deal with it. I imagine a few people will exodus the city. I see Hon Colin Holt nodding. He will be heading bush! It will be an exciting event. It is a great thing that people from all these other countries will come to Perth to see what we have. I look forward to that happening. I look forward to the government fixing up this legislation so that it is better.

HON GIZ WATSON (North Metropolitan) [12.59 pm]: The bill before us is the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill 2011. The purpose of this bill is to give police officers, certain other persons, and the Corruption and Crime Commission special powers with respect to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting to be held in Perth in 2011. The bill will also amend the Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003.

By way of background, delegates from 52 countries are expected to come to Perth in October to attend CHOGM. Based on attendances at previous CHOGMs, it is expected that in the vicinity of 3 000 to 4 000 delegates will come to Perth. Then, of course, there are the police officers who will be brought in as well.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm

The PRESIDENT: I believe that Hon Giz Watson has the call on order of the day 12.

[Leave granted for the member's speech to be continued at a later stage of the sitting.]

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Hon Norman Moore (Leader of the House)**.

[Continued on page 3682.]

ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

Tabling of Budget Papers

Hon Simon O'Brien (Minister for Finance) tabled the budget papers.

[See papers 3310A–F.]

Consideration of Tabled Papers

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan — Minister for Finance) [2.02 pm] — without notice: I move —

That pursuant to standing order 49(1)(c), the Legislative Council takes note of tabled papers 3310A–F (budget papers 2011–12) laid upon the table of the house on Thursday, 19 May 2011.

[The Minister for Finance read the following speech.]

INTRODUCTION

Mr President, the Liberal–National Government’s third budget is framed in the context of a growing Western Australian economy, but also in an environment that remains uncertain globally, and contends with uneven levels of economic activity domestically.

This is a budget about fundamental choices.

In preparing the 2011–12 State Budget, the Western Australian Government faced one immense structural challenge, and, in the face of that challenge, had to make a central and pivotal decision about the best approach now—for the future of our State’s economy.

The problem is the rapid and massive decline in Western Australia’s share of GST grants. In short, Western Australia’s prime source of revenue for building the State’s future, our mining royalties, is being effectively transferred out of Western Australia by the Commonwealth through the Commonwealth Grants Commission (CGC), in an unprecedented way.

The pivotal decision has been whether, in the face of a collapse in GST revenue over coming years, do we as a State Government wind-back our infrastructure investment program, or do we stay the course and continue to invest in the critical social and economic infrastructure that we require to prosper and continue growing.

This budget will make real changes in people’s lives by transforming Western Australia through the delivery of major social infrastructure, and also by providing better services to benefit all Western Australians.

Mr President today I am proud to announce a \$442million surplus in the 2011–12 State Budget. This surplus enables us to continue the biggest ever investment in infrastructure in the State’s history. But also Mr President, on top of this infrastructure investment, I am pleased to announce more than \$1billion will be dedicated in this budget to services for those most in need in our community.

This historic and unprecedented \$1billion investment by the Liberal–National Government will provide social housing, support for seniors, children and families, people with disabilities and other support services to those who are often overlooked—those who are the most in need of the Government’s support.

Declining GST Share

Let me start this speech by returning to the challenge this Government faced in preparing this budget—our rapidly declining share of GST revenue.

Mr President, the GST was to be a growth source of revenue for all States of the Federation.

However, the GST grant system is now largely a mechanism by which Western Australia is losing its prime source of economic revenue, mining royalties.

The formula by which Western Australia’s share of GST grants is returned to us is neither simply understood nor transparent, and it now produces results that are largely inexplicable and wildly unfair.

To the extent that any explanation of the current system is possible it is, essentially, that those States which increasingly raise their own revenue from growing the productive sectors of their own economies, such as Western Australia and Queensland, are penalised in the form of lower GST grants.

Ironically, unproductive revenue raised from pokie machines is excluded from this penalisation process, but productive revenue raised from mining royalties is included.

The CGC was set up to redistribute GST revenue fairly across every State. However, because the redistribution process heavily penalises those States that raise mining revenue, the CGC is now, in reality, a body which exists to redistribute the mining revenue generated in Western Australia and Queensland.

The forecast distribution of Western Australia’s royalty revenue away from Western Australia, is now nothing short of outrageous.

Right now Mr President, our best estimate is that in 2014–15, the final year of our forward estimates, Western Australia will receive back in GST grants only 33 per cent, or one-third of our population share.

When compared to what we would receive back if a 100 per cent population share were returned—this redistribution represents a loss in revenue of \$12.3billion over the five years to 2014–15. Whereas Victoria will generate only \$50million in mining royalties in 2014–15, it will receive \$3billion after accounting for the GST redistribution.

On the other hand, Western Australia will generate \$6.7billion in mining royalties in the same year, but receive only \$1.2billion after GST redistribution.

This means that Victoria will generate \$8per capita in mining royalties but receive through redistribution \$500 per capita. Western Australia will generate \$2,650 per capita and receive back less than \$480 per capita.

Critical Decision

Mr President the critical question in this budget was: what is the best approach now, for the future of the State's economy.

In the ultimate analysis this Government considers the interests of the people of Western Australia, and the economic future of the entire nation, are best served by a two-fold strategy.

First, we must not let the loss of \$12.3billion bring our economy to a halt, rather:

- we must bring in successive surpluses; and
- we must find further savings in the budget.

We must combine these surpluses and savings with targeted borrowings to build the infrastructure that our economy requires to keep growing, and which Western Australians require in order to benefit from that growth.

Second, and at the same time, we must pursue the most important economic campaign in the State's history—being the campaign to reform the GST system, and return to Western Australia a fair portion of the revenue that would otherwise be lost forever.

The choice we have made is to combine hard earned surpluses and even harder to earn savings, with targeted and prudent borrowings to fund the State's economic future, while we fight for a return of our GST revenue.

This is the right strategy—but it is not a strategy that can be sustained indefinitely.

Without the return of a fair portion of the State's mining royalty revenue, the State Government will lack the capacity to grow the industries that benefit all Australians.

In this sense, a very important consideration of this year's budget is the analysis of risks and benefits that may be experienced in our future, on page 61 of Budget Paper Number 3.

What we reasonably anticipate is that in 2013–14 the CGC will have brought in a new GST system. We expect it will produce a floor of about 75 per cent of our population share of the GST. Therefore we expect extra revenue of \$1.8billion in 2013–14 and \$2.5billion in 2014–15. These amounts will allow for reduced borrowings and will be used to progressively reduce existing debt to less than \$18billion while maintaining strong infrastructure investment.

If that change does not occur in that year, the State Government will then have no choice but to wind back infrastructure investment to decrease debt.

Budget Aggregates

Mr President, turning to the budget aggregates – conditions in the State's resources sector are robust, with growing demand from emerging economies generating high terms of trade and a substantial pipeline of investment activity. Noting however, that the Commonwealth Government's proposed carbon tax and Minerals Resource Rent Tax present serious risks to this outlook.

Also, while increasing commodity prices have boosted the State's royalty revenue this revenue stream is, in large part, illusory as it is taken from the State in our massively reduced GST grant share.

Revenue conditions elsewhere in the economy are also subdued. Households remain cautious in their spending. Activity in the established housing market has also been much weaker than expected. People are less willing to buy or sell their houses, meaning transfer duty revenue has been revised down by \$435million, or almost 27 per cent.

Our farmers and pastoralists have been affected by drought in the State's Wheatbelt and floods in Carnarvon. And a number of industries are being challenged by the high Australian dollar.

Nevertheless, the overall outlook for the State's economy is positive. In the coming year, the economy is forecast to grow by 4.5 per cent, underpinned by strong growth in business investment and exports. Growth thereafter is projected at 4 per cent per year.

This growth will underpin further improvement in the State's labour market, with the unemployment rate projected to remain at or below 4.5 per cent over the forward estimates period.

Against this backdrop Mr President, we will deliver a hard earned surplus of \$442million for 2011–12. This budget also predicts further operating surpluses of \$768million, \$787million, and then \$471million.

Mr President, as I mentioned earlier, the centrepiece of the Liberal–National Government’s budget is the massive \$1billion package to support our community. At the same time we will also deliver significant, additional infrastructure investments to build the State and sustain growth into the future. In this context, the budget has four features. It:

- targets spending to deliver quality services for all Western Australians;
- delivers major social infrastructure for future generations;
- invests in the Western Australian economy now to keep the growth going into the future; and
- provides increased accountability through disciplined financial management.

TARGETED SPENDING TO DELIVER QUALITY SERVICES FOR ALL WESTERN AUSTRALIANS

Sustainable Funding and Contracting with the Not-for-Profit Sector

Mr President, the Liberal–National Government will support our community to ensure all Western Australians benefit as our society prospers.

The budget provides an unprecedented \$604million for sustainable funding and contracting with the not-for-profit sector.

This historic level of funding will ensure a continuity of care and services which reduce stress on families, improve the quality of life for those receiving care, and helps the not-for-profit sector workers deliver even higher levels of support.

There is an unfortunate distrust by some of any service not delivered by a body ultimately controlled in some way by the public sector. This Government sees itself as a provider of services – but also sensibly recognises that Government is not always best placed to deliver services.

This Government supports the many hundreds of not-for-profit organisations that work every day to deliver services and care to those who most need assistance. The Government also recognises the imperative to build the capacity of this sector for future growth, so the people working in it can focus on the welfare and wellbeing of the people for whom they care and support.

Mr President, some of the lowest paid workers in our community are employed by the not-for-profit sector, yet they do the hardest of work. They care for the deaf and blind, for children and for adults with profound intellectual and physical disabilities, those who have been injured in accidents, those who suffer debilitating mental illness. And, Mr President, they do it better than employees of a large bureaucracy will likely ever do. The ability of the not-for-profit sector to continue to grow and prosper in servicing our community is now assured by this key funding decision.

Of this \$604million, \$491million is being allocated in this year’s budget to provide sustainable funding to the sector for their services. This represents an average 25 per cent increase in funding for human services contracts by 2014–15. It addresses a shortfall in funding that the previous Government failed to address, and sees this Government plan for the future.

At present the Disability Services Commission provides more than 65 per cent of its services through the not-for-profit sector (and demand is growing). If, in the future, other human service delivery departments of government come to look more like the Disability Services Commission, this will be a measure of our success.

Disability Services

Mr President, as part of our \$1billion Social Services Package this budget provides an additional \$41million to meet the expected growth in demand for disability services. This will allow the ongoing provision of a range of disability services including respite options, access to aids and equipment, and family and carer support.

The Government is also on track in the delivery of its election commitment for five out-of-home respite facilities; offering carers of a family member with a disability, the opportunity to find relief from their supportive role. The first facility opened in Broome in March 2010, and two other facilities at Rockingham and Joondalup are due to open by the end of this year and the remaining facilities have been earmarked for construction in the Wheatbelt and Gosnells areas.

Social Housing

Social housing also forms part of the State Government's \$1billion package to support the community, with \$151million provided for an additional 284 homes for those who are in most need—those significantly impaired by a disability, living with mental illness, or dealing with alcohol and drug related issues.

The budget also includes \$45million for accommodation support services for the Disability Services Commission, the Mental Health Commission, and the Drug and Alcohol Office. These services assist those in need with transitioning into community living and allow access to ongoing treatment and recovery programs.

In addition, \$5.4million has been allocated to build and operate a homeless shelter within two kilometres of the Perth central business district.

Families

The Government has also provided for families as part of our \$1billion Social Services Package in this year's budget. We are aware that many families are still feeling the pressure from the utility price increases.

This year's budget further recognises that many families need the Government's support through the utility adjustment period—that's why we have committed to increase the Hardship Utilities Grant Scheme (or HUGS) by \$6million, taking the total funding in the coming year to \$10million.

Child protection services in Western Australia will also receive a significant boost in this budget, with an additional \$51million.

In 2011–12, the Government will spend a further \$39million to enable us to respond to increased demand for core child protection services, and fund increased effort in prevention and early intervention programs for at-risk families.

We will also provide \$1million to the Youth Focus program, which provides access to free counselling and support services to young people at risk of depression and suicide.

We will also invest in the well-being of our children throughout the State with \$20million towards 'Sport for All', with specific programs to keep Western Australian children active, resilient and healthy.

Seniors

Mr President equally important is our responsibility to our State's seniors. Many seniors are continuing to contribute to their own retirement and in turn, making a vital contribution to the State's economy. In recognition of this, the Government is expanding eligibility for the Seniors Card, to encompass seniors who work 25 hours or less a week, up from the previous limit of 20 hours.

In recognition of the cost of living pressures faced by many seniors on low or fixed incomes, the Government is also increasing the Seniors Cost of Living Rebate at an estimated cost of \$40million. This year the rebate will be increased from \$105 to \$150 for singles, and from \$157 to \$225 for couples.

Importantly Mr President, a further \$26million will be spent in *Royalties for Regions* funding this year on the Country Age Pension Fuel Card.

Aboriginal Services

With respect to Aboriginal services, this budget includes:

- \$1.3million this year for the continuation of Aboriginal Community Patrols;
- \$2million to extend the Clontarf Hostel at Waterford;
- \$9million from *Royalties for Regions* towards the Aboriginal Justice Education Program; and
- \$10million in *Royalties for Regions* funding to establish the Aboriginal Community Emergency Response Fund.

Health Services

Mr President, to keep pace with the State's population growth and corresponding demand for health services across Western Australia, the State Government is providing an additional \$363million, to ensure we continue to have a world class health service. This builds on the substantial increase of \$1.1billion provided last year to accommodate increased demand.

Over five years, investment in new health facilities, equipment and spending on services will total a massive \$38billion.

We will also spend an additional \$75million for the education and training of junior doctors.

Through *Royalties for Regions*, the Government continues its investment in regional health, committing \$565 million to the Southern Inland Health Initiative over five years. This very significant investment in country health will improve health services, including emergency response and primary medical care, in inland rural communities in the Mid West, Goldfields, Wheatbelt, Great Southern, and South West regions of the State.

Mr President the Southern Inland Health Initiative will also, for the first time in the State's history, tackle head-on the lack of country doctors.

In 2011–12 the Government's *Royalties for Regions* program will also help country health care for Western Australians living in regional areas through contributions of:

- \$9million for the Patient Assisted Travel Scheme;
- \$6million for the development of St John Ambulance services;
- \$4million for the Royal Flying Doctor Service; and
- \$1.5million to support the Rural Generalist Pathways program.

Road Safety

Mr President, to improve road safety for every Western Australian, this Government will increase the amount of speed and red light camera revenue provided to the Road Trauma Trust Fund, doubling the current one-third proportion to two-thirds in 2011–12, and further increasing it to 100 per cent from 2012–13.

Mr President, talk about giving back 100 per cent of speed and red light camera revenue has been around for as long as the first camera. But this is the Government that is actually making it happen.

Western Australia Police

This budget also makes a major investment in information and communications technology infrastructure and systems for the Western Australia Police with additional funding of \$113million. This supports modern policing techniques and the increasingly intelligence-led approach to crime reduction.

DELIVERING MAJOR SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

Mr President, on top of our massive \$1billion injection to social services, we have also embarked on the biggest ever infrastructure program in the State's history to deliver projects for the benefit of future generations.

The State Government will apply a massive \$7.6billion in 2011–12 to expanding and upgrading the State's economic and social infrastructure, up from a record \$6.9billion in the current financial year.

Transforming Our Capital City

The Government is using the State's strong economic and financial position to invest a mix of revenue and targeted borrowings into infrastructure that will transform Western Australia over coming years, and deliver lasting assets for future generations.

Central to this is the transformation of our capital city. The long awaited redevelopment of the Perth foreshore represents an important shift to a more diverse, liveable, contemporary and globally competitive city. Net of land sales revenue, we will invest \$270million to see this exciting project finally come to fruition.

This project will benefit many generations of future Western Australians and works are scheduled to commence after the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in October.

As part of the City Link project, the Government has allocated \$57million over four years to accelerate development of the City Square. This will coincide with sinking the Perth to Fremantle railway line between Perth Station and Milligan Street and the construction of a new underground bus station at a cost of \$609million.

The Government has also provided funding of \$13million for the planning of a New Major Stadium and \$5million to plan for a new Museum.

This budget also allocates \$2million for planning of a new purpose-built Western Australian Institute of Sport Centre that will meet contemporary standards and the demands of competition well into the future.

Mr President, it's worth noting here that in October this year Perth will host arguably the biggest international event ever to be held in Western Australia. The Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting will ensure Western Australia attracts international attention, with the leaders of more than 50 countries meeting to discuss international security, health and environmental issues.

Health Infrastructure

This Government is also making an unprecedented investment in our health system, totalling \$4.5 billion over the next four years, including \$1.6 billion in 2011–12.

This investment covers 130 projects and rebuilds the State's public health system to better meet future demand.

In 2011–12 the Government will invest:

- \$542 million for the Fiona Stanley Hospital, which remains on time and on budget;
- \$107 million for the new State Rehabilitation Centre;
- \$94 million for the Albany Health Campus redevelopment;
- \$64 million for the Joondalup Health Campus; and
- \$26 million for the new Midland Health Campus.

The Government also makes the first down-payment on the New Children's Hospital in 2011–12, appropriating \$505 million to the Children's Hospital with construction expected to start in early 2012.

Education

The Government is continuing to invest in schools in the 2011–12 Budget, committing a further \$77 million for new school buildings. In 2011–12, the Government will invest \$850 million building and expanding our schools.

In addition, we have expanded the School Air Conditioning policy to include all public schools in the State. This means that around 480 schools in Western Australia will now be eligible to receive air-conditioning, at an estimated cost of \$52 million. Mr President, once again, many governments have talked about this issue, but the Liberal-National Government has resolved it.

We are also significantly restructuring our education budget with additional base funding of \$362 million over five years to provide the Department of Education with a more financially sustainable setting, as it moves towards more efficient and effective service delivery.

Kimberley Science and Conservation Strategy

The budget includes \$41 million for the implementation of the Kimberley Science and Conservation Strategy. This involves the creation of over 900,000 hectares of marine parks, whilst still allowing responsible and sustainable economic development in the Kimberley.

In addition, \$16 million from *Royalties for Regions* will be invested in the establishment and management of the Capes Marine Park and Dampier Archipelago Marine Park, including for research activities which aim to promote a sustained increase in the abundance and diversity of existing fish stocks in Western Australian waters.

INVESTING NOW TO KEEP THE GROWTH GROWING INTO THE FUTURE

Delivering Improved Transport Services

With the transformation of our capital city, demand for public transport services will continue to increase. In order to maintain the efficiency of services, the Government has taken action by committing significant additional funding for new trains, new buses and bus services. This includes:

- \$164 million to purchase an additional 15 three-car train sets with capacity to carry an additional 8,400 passengers; and
- \$40 million to purchase an additional 78 buses and a further \$134 million to provide more frequent, accessible bus services.

Extension of the Joondalup railway line to Butler is also progressing well, with \$46.5 million to be spent in 2011–12.

Improving Our Roads

The Government will also spend \$1.2 billion on Western Australia's road system this year, including \$30 million over the next two years to widen the northbound carriageway of the Mitchell Freeway, between Hepburn Avenue and Hodges Drive from two to three lanes.

Additional Training Places

The demand for skilled labour to service the State's industries places pressure on many sectors of the economy. To address this demand, the budget provides \$33million in 2011–12 for a total of 12,000 additional training places. Additionally \$54million will be invested through *Royalties for Regions* this year to develop skills and training facilities in the regions.

Skilled Migration Strategy

The Government will provide \$4million for the operation of the Western Australian Skilled Migration Strategy, to attract skilled migrants to the State.

Regional Centres Development Plan

Mr President while we are investing many hundreds of millions to transform our capital city, we are also injecting millions of dollars into regional Western Australia to ensure they plan and prepare for growth into the future. This year \$86million has been allocated through *Royalties for Regions* funding to develop regional centres in Western Australia.

Other Regional Initiatives

A further \$220million in *Royalties for Regions* funding will be spent developing the Mid West; \$147million will be invested through *Royalties for Regions* for the Pilbara Cities Program; and \$175million in *Royalties for Regions* funding will be spent on the Gascoyne Revitalisation.

Energy

Investment in energy infrastructure will total \$4.2billion over the next four years, with \$1.3billion in 2011–12, including:

- \$1billion on transmission and distribution capacity within Western Power and Horizon Power networks, to support growth and improve reliability and safety;
- construction of a new power station at Carnarvon, at a total cost of \$80million;
- two high efficiency gas turbines at the Kwinana Power Station at a total cost of \$263million; and
- the \$38million Grasmere Wind Farm in 2011–12.

Water

Mr President, \$861million will be spent on water and wastewater projects this year, as part of a \$3.6billion program. This includes the \$955million Southern Seawater Desalination Plant at Binningup, which is expected to be fully operational towards the end of 2011.

The Water Corporation will also spend \$10million over the next two years to extend the infill sewerage program in regional areas.

Events Funding

To expand Western Australia's events calendar, the Government is spending an unprecedented \$30million per year to manage and secure new events across the State.

INCREASED ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH DISCIPLINED FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Mr President the State's total revenues—from State taxes, mining royalties, GST revenue and other sources—will generate an operating surplus in each year of the forward estimates. However, these surpluses, while significant, are not sufficient to meet the State's total infrastructure expenditure requirements. We need to fund necessary investment by borrowing funds to invest in infrastructure that is essential for our continued economic growth.

In simple terms, the projected increase in net debt from \$13.4billion at 30 June 2011, to \$22.4billion by 30 June 2015 (or \$18billion if the GST floor eventuates), is absolutely necessary to allow key infrastructure development, including:

\$5.4billion for new schools, hospitals, roads and other centrally-funded infrastructure;

\$1.9billion for electricity; and

\$1.7billion for water, wastewater and sewerage infrastructure.

Mr President, providing for this investment at this time is the right decision. Whether \$22.4billion or \$18billion, either possibility represents an affordable level of net debt. At worst net interest costs will be just 3 per cent of revenue and net financial liabilities at 69.6 per cent of revenue in the final outyear. By all measures we are well and truly within the parameters to maintain the State's triple-A credit rating.

In the final analysis this Government considers the interests of the people of Western Australia and our State's economic future are best served by continuing our investment in infrastructure, while we work to have our GST revenue returned. This investment will be facilitated by continuing surpluses, budget savings and targeted borrowings.

In line with this strategy, the budget includes a \$3.5billion package of measures to decrease the borrowing component of continuing with our massive infrastructure program.

The State Government will move to increase the royalty rate for iron ore 'fines' to 6.5 per cent from 1 July 2012, and to 7.5 per cent from 1 July 2013, in line with the rate applying to 'lump' ore. This change reflects the fact that iron ore 'fines' account for the majority of the State's iron ore shipments, and are no longer considered an inferior product in the global market. This delivers a fairer return to the Western Australian community, as the owners of these resources.

It is envisaged that the additional revenue from this measure over the forward estimates period, estimated at \$1.9billion, will be quarantined for debt reduction purposes. This includes the *Royalties for Regions* component of 25 per cent.

The Government has also reviewed its Asset Investment Program and deferred spending totalling \$541million beyond the forward estimates period. Recent heavy rains in the State's north have allowed a postponement of the West Pilbara Desalination Plant and, to better reflect the expected project timelines, the cashflows on the Eastern Goldfields prison project have been deferred by 18 months.

Importantly, the Government is committed to driving efficiencies and reducing costs across the public sector. As part of a package of disciplined financial measures that reduce net debt by \$3.5billion over the next four years, the budget implements a 5 per cent efficiency dividend on Government Trading Enterprises such as Western Power, Synergy and the Water Corporation, to ensure they are operating as efficiently as possible. This efficiency dividend will only apply to discretionary spending such as salaries, advertising and travel, and will not affect service delivery to the community.

As we try to fix the mistakes of the previous Government in utilities prices, this efficiency finding process will help minimise costs faced by households. This measure is expected to reduce the need for further borrowings by \$515million over the next four years.

We are also targeting a further \$300million in savings from general government departments and agencies, including the *Royalties for Regions* program, and are continuing to keep a tight rein on salaries expenditure through our ceiling on full-time equivalent staff numbers, and our public sector wages policy.

These savings will not be achieved through an across-the-board efficiency dividend, but rather through a targeted review of specific programs and activities that no longer provide value for money.

This Government has a strong track record in delivering real savings. When we came to Government we set an efficiency dividend savings target of \$1.6billion over the four years to 2012–13, and we are on track to deliver a remarkable \$1,461million. Taking into account procurement and vehicle fleet savings, this figure rises to \$1,743million.

These new measures I am announcing today build on the Government's track record of disciplined financial management.

Since coming to office, the Government has facilitated the voluntary separation of over 800 surplus staff from the public sector, and this budget includes funding for another 400 voluntary separations in 2011–12. We have also implemented a very clear and fair public sector wages policy, and imposed a new discipline on growth in the number of public servants, ensuring that public money is being spent where it is most needed.

General government expenses are forecast to rise by \$1.8billion or 7.9 per cent in 2011–12, down from an average of 10.9 per cent over the last three years.

Expense growth in 2011–12 includes the impact of higher recurrent *Royalties for Regions* spending, additional funding for the not-for-profit sector, higher operating subsidies to the electricity utilities, the transfer of assets associated with the Ord–East Kimberley Expansion Project, and funding for the latest round of voluntary separations. Excluding these factors, expenses are estimated to increase by 4.9 per cent in 2011–12. Importantly, the Government has restricted the growth in the number of full-time equivalent public servants to just 1.7 per cent in 2011–12.

Fees and Charges

Mr President, the cost of providing essential services such as electricity and water has increased substantially.

The increase, particularly in electricity costs, has been driven by many factors, largely outside the control of the State Government. These include:

- the Commonwealth Government's renewable energy policies, which have imposed costs totalling hundreds of millions of dollars on the State; and
- the increasing cost of providing infrastructure across the State's large, dispersed network.

It is an unpopular reality that the costs of generating and delivering electricity need to be paid for. Either users pay for the electricity they consume directly through the price on their bills; or those same consumers pay indirectly by their taxes being used to subsidise the gap between the price they pay on their bills, and the actual cost.

Ultimately, massive taxpayer subsidies mean massive opportunity costs as billions of dollars going to electricity utilities cannot be spent on health, education, and law and order. At the same time, these subsidies hamper our ability to attract competition to the market.

So, this Government took the difficult and unpopular decision to reverse years of no price increases and move prices at least within sight of the costs of generation and delivery.

Undoubtedly that caused households pain, and it is in recognition of these difficulties that from 1 July 2011, electricity tariffs for residential customers will increase by only 5 per cent.

To further minimise the impact of this modest price rise on some of the more vulnerable households, this budget also includes, as mentioned earlier:

- a significant increase in the Cost of Living Rebate for Seniors Card holders totalling \$40million over the next four years; and
- an increase in HUGS of \$6million in 2011–12, taking total funding for HUGS in the coming year to \$10million.

Electricity tariffs for medium and large business customers will increase by between 9 and 30 per cent from 1 July 2011, in a move towards achieving full cost reflectivity and ultimately, a more competitive electricity sector.

Despite tariff increases over the past two years, taxpayers will still be footing the bill for an operating subsidy of \$1.1billion to Synergy and Horizon Power over the next four years. Let me say here that if, as some advocate, the expedient and dangerous decision was made to freeze electricity prices, this would have seen a total of \$3billion go to Synergy and Horizon Power over the next four years and increase debt by \$1.9billion.

Total water charges for a standard representative household will increase by 8.5 per cent from 1 July 2011. This equates to less than \$2 per week for householders using the average annual amount of water. The gradual move towards cost-reflective water pricing policies has helped contribute to the reduced consumption of this precious resource, which has fallen from 300 to 270 kilolitres per annum for a representative household.

Only by making the strong decisions can we send the right pricing signals and ensure that we have the funds necessary to invest in the State's water infrastructure. Even with these decisions, operating subsidies and concessions will be needed to ensure water remains affordable for pensioners and regional Western Australians. These subsidies and concessions are expected to total almost \$1.7billion over the forward estimates period.

Mr President, the Government has undertaken a rigorous review of its tariffs, fees and charges. Many major fees, such as Transperth's fares, have been maintained at or below the inflation rate. Furthermore, there will be no increase this year in:

- driver's license fees;
- compulsory third party insurance premiums;
- motor vehicle recording fees;
- Transperth 50 cent student fares; or
- stamp duty rates on insurance premiums.

And from 1 July 2011, the Government will be introducing a stamp duty exemption for transfers of private motor vehicle licences between spouses.

Overall, the standard 'basket' of tariffs, fees and charges is expected to increase by only 4.6 per cent in 2011–12, for the representative household.

CONCLUSION

Mr President, the Liberal–National Government has provided a budget that supports the people of Western Australia with services to improve lives now, as well as providing vital economic and social investment to ensure our prosperity is shared by future generations.

Our unparalleled \$1billion investment to support those most in need recognises the State’s responsibility to provide all Western Australians with access to the services they need to improve their lives.

Mr President the Liberal–National Government has delivered this extraordinary \$1billion Social Services support package on top of the biggest ever infrastructure investment in the State’s history. Western Australia is under-going a spectacular transformation that will shape our economy and our lives into the future.

It is through the strong decisions that the Liberal–National Government has made today that will enable Western Australia and its people to continue to be the Australian economic powerhouse into the future.

Mr President I am privileged to deliver the Liberal–National Government’s third surplus budget. I am privileged to deliver a budget that supports our community and builds the State.

I commend this budget to the Council.

Consideration of the papers made an order of the day for the next sitting, on motion by **Hon Norman Moore (Leader of the House)**.

COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING (SPECIAL POWERS) BILL 2011*Second Reading*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON GIZ WATSON (North Metropolitan) [2.41 pm]: We return to debating the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill. I was giving some general background on the nature of the event and the people who will be attending. We all know that the Queen of England will be coming and that there will be representatives from countries in the Commonwealth of Nations. Members might be interested to know that the commonwealth countries include 19 African countries, eight Asian countries, two in the Americas, 12 Caribbean countries, three European countries and 10 in the South Pacific. That is quite an extensive empire when we think about it! It is a gathering that will have representatives from a broad range of countries with a broad range of interests and agendas.

It is worth touching briefly on the purpose and relevance of CHOGM, and indeed of the commonwealth for that matter. It is worth noting that the first conference of this nature was in 1887, which was the first colonial conference of the then British Empire. Since that time all those countries ceased to be British colonies. Indeed, it was considered that the commonwealth might fade out altogether. However, it had a bit of a revival around 1949 when eight members of the commonwealth got together to establish in effect the modern commonwealth. Interestingly enough, by 2010 there were 54 countries. In fact, there might be slightly fewer than that, as I think Fiji is currently out. Some countries come in and out at various times.

Hon Kate Doust: Fiji and Zimbabwe.

Hon GIZ WATSON: Zimbabwe is out too; okay.

I guess it is tangential to the discussion about these special powers, but the relevance the commonwealth has in contemporary times has to be commented on. Much debate has been had about that and no doubt will continue. I thought it would be interesting to view the website the government established to encourage the public to engage with CHOGM. I do not know whether other members have had an opportunity to view that website. I saw it this morning and read a section where members of the public are invited to make comment on what CHOGM means to them. As of a couple of hours ago there were three comments. One was written by someone, probably from a government department, who made very encouraging noises about how exciting it was all going to be. Another comment caught my eye from somebody who goes under the name of “Gasgas”, and states —

Great, just Great... CHOGM coming to my home state.... Lots of hot air, lots of rich out of reality political piggies with their snouts in the trough spending my hard earned taxes but worst of all is that my buddy with whom i was going to enter the Gascoyne Dash desert race to be held on the same dates as CHOGM has had his annual leave cancelled for the entire period as he is a WA cop..... Now whos going to be my support driver?....

That did amuse me!

Hon Donna Faragher: That’s a very profound statement!

Hon GIZ WATSON: I thought it was very profound too.

Hon Liz Behjat: I thought you said there were three.

Hon GIZ WATSON: One comment encouraged people to participate. The third one, like the second one, was not very supportive but I cannot quite remember what it said. The one I read out is the one that caught my eye. However, I ask members to please visit the website and have a look themselves.

It is also worth noting that at the initiative of the last Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held in November 2009 in Trinidad and Tobago, a Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group was established. The group states —

Its mandate is to explore and recommend ways, in the context of promoting the Commonwealth's values and principles, that would sharpen the impact, strengthen the networks and raise the profile of the Commonwealth to ensure it "will remain relevant to its times and people in future".

That is because at the end of the fourth meeting —

... the Group stated: "The Commonwealth is in danger of becoming irrelevant and unconvincing as a values-based association" ...

There were therefore concerns even from within the commonwealth itself of the relevance of CHOGM to the commonwealth and to the people who participate in it.

It is also worth noting that the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting covers a range of issues. I note that Hon Kate Doust made reference to some of the topics. Again, the communiqué from that 2009 CHOGM gives us some idea of the range of topics it dealt with. It dealt with particular countries and their democratic functions. Notably, Zimbabwe was one. Others included topics such as disarmament and arms control, terrorism, combating piracy, human trafficking, human rights, the world economic situation, trade, investment and climate change et cetera. I have to say that personally I am a little torn as to the role and relevance of CHOGM. I will talk about that a little more.

Hon Donna Faragher: You should be positive about it.

Hon GIZ WATSON: I think we should do a cost-benefit analysis of these things.

I can see that some of the global challenges we face, such as questions of disarmament, environmental sustainability and climate change, require international cooperation and the opportunity to discuss those issues. If there is any reason that I would support the commonwealth as a kind of structure, it is that it provides the opportunity for a range of countries to get together.

Hon Donna Faragher: In a positive, collaborative way.

Hon GIZ WATSON: Yes, sort of collaborative.

Having attended commonwealth functions, particularly one in the United Kingdom, it is clear to me that there is still a fairly paternalistic flavour at commonwealth functions. Let us not pretend who set up the commonwealth and why it was set up. The reason for it is in the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group report. I will quote from the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group invitation for feedback on the directions of its recommendations, which was a document of 4 May this year. The document discusses enhancing the commonwealth's role in development and trade. It states the commonwealth's role as —

- Maximising the influence of Commonwealth member states acting together to advance Commonwealth priorities in organisations such as the IMF, WTO and World Bank as well as in the G20.

Let us not kid ourselves; the commonwealth was primarily set up as a means of continuing the trade advantages and trade agreements between those countries.

Hon Alyssa Hayden: It has also encouraged democracy though.

Hon GIZ WATSON: That was actually a secondary consideration. If the member reads the history of the commonwealth, she will see why it was set up. That criticism has been aired elsewhere.

To come back to Perth, in conjunction with CHOGM 2011 a range of business, civil society and youth leaders will participate in three major parallel events: the commonwealth business forum, the commonwealth people's forum and the commonwealth youth forum. There will be international sporting events as well as a people's space in Northbridge, which I understand will feature an uncensored speakers' forum. More on that later.

Hon Kate Doust: That is if you can get to it!

Hon GIZ WATSON: The bill allows a designation of core security areas by regulation and additional areas by order of the Commissioner of Police, with approval in some cases required by the Minister for Police, and with

restricted areas within the security area designated by order. Within the security areas, restrictions apply to who can enter or remain in the area and what items can be taken into the respective areas. This bill gives the police specific powers to close roads, to search people and seize items within these areas. Any orders made under the bill are not able to be legally challenged. The bill also prohibits claims for compensation during the CHOGM period. In cases in which an offence is subject to imprisonment of three years or more, the police will be able to refer to the Corruption and Crime Commission's special powers to conduct an investigation. This also allows for the publication of the excluded persons list that includes names of people who are considered by the Commissioner of Police to pose a serious threat to the safety of persons or property. That is the outline of the bill.

The Greens (WA) do not support this bill; we do not consider it necessary. We agree with the President of the Law Society of Western Australia that existing police powers are adequate to deal with the meeting. Although the briefings from offices and government public statements have assured us that the right to peaceful process will not be affected by these laws, I am still concerned about a number of aspects of this bill. My concerns can be summarised as follows: the ability of the Commissioner of Police to publish a list of excluded persons; the ability of the police to use special powers, including those of the CCC; the general discretion for police to use whatever force is reasonably necessary to exercise special powers; the potential to use subcontractors for law enforcement without any limitation within the bill about what they will do; the limited rights for owners of seized items; and the fact that some orders can be made for areas outside the CHOGM security areas. Although we might welcome the attention that Perth will receive by hosting this meeting of world leaders, I question the real benefits of such an event. CHOGM will be the biggest high-security event ever seen in Perth, and for what? The questions I raise about CHOGM include: What is the constructive role, if any, of the commonwealth? What relevance, if any, does such a meeting have? What will it cost in dollars and in convenience to hold the event? I had a quick look at the budget papers, probably not enough to get the full detail, but there is a substantial chunk of additional money provided to the WA Police budget for CHOGM and it is certainly highlighted as being a major expense impacting on police activities in the next 12 months. I think it is about \$26million. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary will tell us what is in the budget in that regard when she has the opportunity to respond.

One commentator summed up an earlier CHOGM, which was in India, as follows —

Forty two Heads of Government, with a battery of 600 advisers spent over one week wasting their time, to pass resolutions on international events which were vague, non-committal and without any direction whatsoever.

Such criticism is, arguably, still valid today. The last CHOGM in Trinidad and Tobago finished with a press conference on climate change. The final communiqué, which is 25 pages long, which I will not read out, contains 117 points, but I suggest it had little relevance in the political realities following CHOGM. The aforementioned commentator also said —

In fact all resolutions avoided concreteness and ended as meaningless pleasantries.

The highlight of the last CHOGM in Trinidad and Tobago was the “Port of Spain Climate Change Consensus: Commonwealth Climate Change Declaration”, which was point 68 of the communiqué. This declaration was made on 29 November 2009 and contained 14 points. I quote point 8, which states —

A global climate change solution is central to the survival of peoples, the promotion of development and facilitation of a global transition to a low emission development path. The agreement in Copenhagen must address the urgent needs of developing countries by providing financing, support for adaptation, technology transfer, capacity building, approaches and incentives for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and for afforestation and sustainable management of forests.

This statement very much reflects the Greens (WA) position on climate change, and I am pleased that the commonwealth leaders reached consensus. However, the agreement in Copenhagen, which the participants of CHOGM were all anticipating and committed to support, was not reached, despite the consensus of the meeting. The participants expressed at point 7 of the climate change declaration —

We believe an internationally legally binding agreement is essential. We pledge our continued support to the leaders-driven process guided by the Danish Prime Minister and his efforts to deliver a comprehensive, substantial and operationally binding agreement in Copenhagen leading towards a full legally binding outcome no later than 2010. In Copenhagen we commit to focus our efforts on achieving the strongest possible outcome.

Therefore, despite this clear support from CHOGM leaders for action to address climate change in that declaration, “to focus our efforts”, the conference in Copenhagen came and went with very little impact. We must question that if such an agreement of 50 leaders at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting was worth so little when it comes to negotiating in the real world, what is the point?

What is the focus of CHOGM Perth? I am concerned that it will end up being not much more than a talkfest and a nice holiday for world leaders. The Perth CHOGM provides an opportunity to do better than the meeting in Trinidad, but I wonder what additional factors have to be in play so that the leaders can create better outcomes. Therefore, it must be asked what CHOGM is for, why we spend so much money on it and how much the meeting will cost. An article in *The West Australian* on 18 May, entitled “Bill for leader’s luxury hits \$5million”, provided details about the cost of the leaders’ accommodation during CHOGM as well as for the public servants who commute between Canberra and Perth to plan the forum. The article states —

Taxpayers have forked out almost \$5million on luxury Perth accommodation for the army of world leaders, advisers and bureaucrats at the October Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, Federal Government documents show.

There is no mention of the cost to WA taxpayers in that article, but from a press release by federal Minister for Tourism Martin Ferguson on 13 May 2010 we understand that the provisions made available for CHOGM by the commonwealth add up to at least \$58.7 million over three years.

I thank the minister and the officers for providing the opportunity to be briefed on this bill and the considerable time that has been put into that process. We appreciate that additional information. We understand from the police department that it was indicated that WA will not be out of pocket for the cost of running CHOGM, but more questions need to be asked about the details of the costs. The money is all ultimately coming from taxpayers, whether through the Western Australian budget or the federal budget. I am somewhat reassured by the government’s announcement that the whole city of Perth will not be shut down for the event. Considerable attention has been paid to the fact that people’s lives should not be disrupted, as was the case at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation meeting in Sydney in 2007, which severely disrupted people’s activities.

The bill will allow certain areas to be declared special security areas and restricted areas. The exact locations of restricted areas, apparently, are not known yet but are likely to include the convention centre, Fraser’s Restaurant, and Government House, with Fraser’s likely to be completely closed to the public. The business forum will be held at the Burswood hotel, but the required level of security at this and other events such as the sport events has not yet been determined and will depend on whether leaders will actually attend those events. That is my understanding from the briefing. These events are to be defined as CHOGM events. I note that the government is moving amendments to allow for security orders to be made for these events. The amendments, which we will examine in the committee stage, have come to this place but were not considered in the other place.

I again thank the police for providing two lengthy briefing sessions. I welcome the public information sessions, which have already commenced, to inform Perth residents where and when road closures are occurring and to prepare for alternative arrangements to be made ahead of time, especially for transport and city parking. I understand that a dedicated police officer has been appointed to deal with community concerns and to liaise with organisations such as the CHOGM Action Network, which is planning to organise certain events around CHOGM.

According to the briefing, at this stage there are no plans for substantial barricades. The briefing officers also assured us that the restricted areas will be clearly marked. Most of these will be gazetted under clause 13(2) so members of the public will know when they are entering the security area. I will talk about that a little more later. Notifications, for example, are very different for a person who is carrying a prohibited item. If a person is trying to enter a security area when carrying a prohibited item, the person has the choice of turning around with that item and leaving the area or handing the item over and entering. Once a person is found within a security area with a prohibited item, this becomes an offence. This is the critical point about clearly delineating where a security area actually begins. Although this offence does not carry an imprisonment sentence, it is subject to a significant fine of \$6 000. A failure to provide personal details within the security area is also an offence and subject to imprisonment for up to 12 months. It is really important that people do not wander into these areas inadvertently. Entry into security areas will be limited. Pedestrians can enter only after being screened or frisk searched. Vehicle traffic will not be allowed into security areas, and residential vehicles may be exempt but are likely to be subject to an escort.

I want to ensure that the actual location of the security areas is delineated physically and visibly for the public. I would also like to ensure that the public is made aware via the media—radio and newspaper—of the special rules that apply in security areas and that the ramifications for inadvertently crossing into one are publicly advertised. Although the bill identifies both rules and ramifications, this is presented in a format that is difficult to read for most people. We anticipate that the additional rules will be made by regulation or by order, which require the public to be informed, because it is not in the *Government Gazette*. I have some amendments on the notice paper that deal with these matters. I will deal with them when we get to the committee stage, but I argue that they are not at odds with the intent of the bill; they just provide some surety that those areas will actually be physically clearly delineated and that people will know ahead of time what the consequences are if they happen

to go into those areas. Could the parliamentary secretary inform the house how restrictions in security areas and the ramifications of breaches will be made public? I understand that at the moment it can be advertised, but it is not required to be. We will get to that perhaps in the committee stage.

In terms of the right to peaceful protest, I am concerned about the impact of CHOGM on people's civil rights. On the one hand I am keen to ensure that police are able to pre-empt and stop any violence towards CHOGM participants, and clearly nobody wants violence. But at the same time we need to ensure that any such powers do not prevent the legitimate exercise of our civil rights and do not prevent the right to peaceful protest.

Extraordinary police powers and exclusion of appeals and legal challenges of any order are of concern. It is unclear what impact these powers will have on peaceful protest. The right to a peaceful protest is enshrined in international law, such as in article 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states —

The right of peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions may be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order ... the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Any restrictions on these rights should be considered with caution and only agreed to if they are found to be justifiable in the interests of national security or public safety.

In my view the minister has not made the case for additional police powers. I argue that current police powers are adequate to deal with events such as this, and that if necessary and applicable, existing powers could be augmented with powers under the terrorism legislation to address any potential terrorist threats.

The Criminal Investigation Act 2006 already allows for a setting up of security areas; that is, for the prescribing of security areas, for the exclusion of people and for searches of people who wish to enter such areas. I have some concerns that the government is trying to use this bill and the CHOGM event in general as an opportunity to soften up the public to the application of stop-and-search powers. As we know, the stop-and-search powers legislation ground to a halt in this Parliament after a very comprehensive parliamentary inquiry and a large degree of community opposition. Every time these exceptional powers are created and used, even if it is just for a specific event within a specific time frame, it allows the community to become familiarised and, as I say, softened up to these incursions on their rights to freedom of movement and political expression.

The case has not been made that special police powers are actually required to secure the safety of the CHOGM event. We understand from an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 28 April 2011 that the state government plans to set up a speakers' corner in Northbridge. The article states—

People wishing to rail against the Queen or attack nations on human rights issues at a designated speakers corner during CHOGM won't be censored, the West Australian Premier says.

In his typical patronising fashion. It continues—

With exactly six months to go before the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in Perth, WA Premier Colin Barnett gave his assurances that residents and visitors could say whatever they wish.

The speaker's corner will be established in the inner-city cultural precinct of Northbridge where people can hold forth on politics, the environment, human rights and other issues during the three-day event.

The article also says—

Although people will be able to say whatever they want at the speakers corner, protesters will not be allowed anywhere near the formal events of CHOGM or able to interrupt proceedings.

The CHOGM Action Group has informed me that it has been told there are no suitable public places left in the city of Perth where protesters can hold lawful protests because it has been told that all the public space in the city of Perth has been booked by the CHOGM organisers to ensure that no lawful protests can take place adjacent to the actual CHOGM security area.

I would be interested in whether the parliamentary secretary has any information as to whether that is true and whether CHOGM organisers have booked up public space in the City of Perth to ensure that protesters are not able to get local government permits. I am just repeating what I have been told. If the minister can rectify that, that would be most useful.

Hon Donna Faragher: I will double-check what activist groups say as being correct.

Hon GIZ WATSON: If the parliamentary secretary can provide information on that, that would be very useful. Obviously if the information is correct, it flies in the face of our assurances that a legitimate process is going to be able to occur during CHOGM.

At the police briefing we were advised that security areas around, for example, the convention centre would be kept to an absolute minimum due to the high cost of surveillance and enforcement of a larger area. Could the parliamentary secretary identify the exact location where people who wish to protest are being encouraged to do so, other than the speakers' corner, which is well removed from the venue?

I refer to the time limitation for police powers. From the briefing, I understand that the operation of these extraordinary powers will be restricted to the lead-up to CHOGM, during the CHOGM period and the parallel events, and for a few days thereafter while security arrangements are wound down and physical barriers removed. I am concerned about this claim as the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill 2011 does not refer to time restrictions on powers, and, also, the final period is to be set by regulation and not within the bill itself. This is a "trust us" approach by the government. It is also important to note that the bill goes further than the powers given to the police for the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation meeting in that it allows for the assistance of the Corruption and Crime Commission and its special powers to be called in. Again, I ask the parliamentary secretary: what is the problem with managing these events under the current Criminal Investigation Act, and why are the additional powers needed, particularly the coercive powers of the CCC?

I refer to the impact on juveniles. Suffice it to say, this bill affects juveniles and adults alike and that juveniles over the age of 16 years will potentially be subject to CCC powers and that having these powers—although they are not available for civil offences—applied equally against adults and juveniles is apparently justified with a concern that some of the groups are likely to recruit juveniles and indoctrinate them to be part of activist groups. I do not know if there is any evidence for that, and I would like the parliamentary secretary to assure us that powers are not inappropriately used against juveniles and that we recognise their particular status with special protection under the Young Offenders Act. We know that cautioning is more effective with juvenile offenders. I quote from research conducted by the Criminology Research Council, which reads —

With respect to police cautioning, the study finds that the majority of young people who receive a caution never commit another recorded offence, while of those who do reoffend, cautioned children commit fewer subsequent offences and their offences are associated with less serious court outcomes than children who had their first offence finalised in court.

The basic principle is that it is much more appropriate to deal with juveniles by way of cautioning than to hit them with the full force of the law.

The next issue I want to deal with is the publication of the excluded persons list. Under clause 39, the commissioner may, but is not obliged to, publish a list of excluded persons by such means as he thinks appropriate, including in the *Government Gazette*, in a newspaper or on a website. Failure to notify the public of the content of the list does not affect the validity of the list or limit any powers in relation to the persons named in that list. The prospect of an excluded persons list, especially its potential publication, has raised concerns about public naming and shaming. The named person may have no knowledge that they are on a list and may not have been given the opportunity to challenge the listing or know what information has been used to put them on the list. Publishing a person's name upon hearsay and naming them as dangerous and not wanted has a significant impact on a person and their reputation. Any public blacklisting could also have a potential serious impact on the person's family, their workplace and their public standing. Although the advisory officers at the briefing told me that it is intended that people on the list will each be contacted and informed about their inclusion on the list, the bill neither gives the person the right to be heard nor allows for a review or appeal of the decision to include a particular person in the list of names. Of course, the police may not be able to contact a person. I thank the police for providing me with the copy of the APEC review arising from the 2007 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit in New South Wales, which contained a review of the security arrangements at that particular event. That review also dealt with an excluded persons list, as the same provision was made for the APEC meeting. Although the review found the excluded persons list useful for ensuring known troublemakers are not present at the event, it made some relevant comments, and I quote from page 16 of that review —

However in the future any list should continue to be ... clearly restricted to those persons on which there is significant intelligence of threat or fact of violence. Clear and accurate identification of the parameters of declared areas and when an excluded person is and is not in a declared area is vital.

I made the point earlier that it is important to know the limits of declared areas. I understand that police will attempt to contact a person and alert them that they are to be placed on the excluded persons list, and that those people who have been contacted will not normally be included in the list of names to be publicised; however, the statutory provision does not make such differentiation. Hence, the amendment I have placed on the notice paper reflects what I believe to be the intent; that is, that the list to be published will be limited to those people who have not been able to be contacted. I see some relevance in that, but I see no relevance in publicising the full list of people who have been contacted. Basically, if they have been put on a list, they know they are on a list and they do not have the right of appeal, I do not see why, on top of that, they need to have their names published. If

the police want a list of people they are not going to let in, they can have that and use that, but it does not need to be published in *The West Australian*.

I would like to comment on two recent events that I find relevant to CHOGM preparations in relation to the involvement of the Corruption and Crime Commission. At the APEC 2007 meeting the police powers were based on the New South Wales APEC Meeting (Police Powers) Act 2007, which, as I said, was reviewed after the event. We understand that only 13 people were arrested at the APEC meeting and 11 of those were connected to *The Chaser's* organised prank at that event. Police expect a similar number here in Perth, although the area in Sydney was highly barricaded and protected, which made it clear to anybody that the security area was out of bounds. At the briefing we were informed that the review and the experiences at APEC 2007 were taken into consideration in drafting this bill. Upon closer consideration of the review, I found that the powers of the police were considered to be sufficient in reacting to the issues that arose at APEC. I quote from page 3 of the review, which reads —

In general the powers provided for by the Act are appropriate for any future similar sized events or events of appropriate importance; however the criticisms regarding the application of the Act should be taken into consideration.

It could be said that the APEC meeting, which only 21 world leaders attended, was not as important as CHOGM, when more than 50 heads of government will be in Perth, but obviously numbers alone are not the only factor when considering public reaction to the event. It seems likely that the decision to provide for the involvement of the CCC on request is more likely for operational reasons, and this provision allows the police to gather evidence that later cannot be used in criminal proceedings, which, no doubt, the police hope will lead to the provision of greater security and to the gathering of other evidence that can be used to charge an alleged offender. Although I recognise the high bar to CCC involvement, which is for an offence carrying a penalty of at least three years' imprisonment, when the CCC is involved, a person does not have the right to remain silent when being questioned, and the lack of this protection is a breach of human rights in our view. A person has a right to remain silent and not to incriminate themselves. At the briefing, the police elaborated on the requirement for these powers, but I am not convinced, so I would like some more information about who requested the inclusion of the CCC powers; the function the police cannot perform during the event that will require the assistance of the CCC; and what the CCC involvement is modelled on.

The next question relates to the fact that there are no legal avenues or review. Clause 15 of the bill prevents legal challenges to orders during the CHOGM period. Again, this is a breach of procedural fairness and the rule of law. I understand why the police would not want to waste resources in the court before and during the event, and they might have to act quickly. But this should not preclude testing an order post the event. Clause 15(2) prevents any investigation into police conduct under the act other than investigations by the CCC. Police officers and other officials should remain accountable at all times, and the CHOGM event should be no different. Recent experiences in Toronto, when protests were met with even more violent police action, demonstrate that accountability has to be impeccable.

If the parliamentary secretary is having trouble keeping up with all these questions, I can ask them again during the committee stage. Could the parliamentary secretary confirm whether the expiry clause 93 terminates any limitations on legal challenges?

My next point relates to the use of force. I understand that in WA the use of force is regulated by policies published in the police gazette. As a result of recent inquiries, I discovered that that gazette is not a public document. In answering a question in this place about the use of Tasers, I received the following response from the Minister for Police —

The Western Australia Police Commissioner's Police Manual policies and procedures, in respect to Use of Force, were revised in the Police Gazette No 49, published on 9 December 2010.

These policies are the current policies, not an 'interim' measure in the normal context. The reference to these changes being interim may have been in the context that they are under constant review and change, as required, and the outcome of the changes will be monitored for impact.

The revision to policies, published in the above mentioned Gazette, affected all 'Force Option' policies relating to Use of Force, Firearms, Batons, Oleoresin Capsicum Spray, Taser and Handcuffs.

My point is that the exceptional powers that this bill will give include the use of force. The use of force is not defined in any way that is available to the public. Again, I ask the parliamentary secretary to table the relevant rules from the police gazette relating to the use of force; and, if she will not, why not?

In its submission on the bill dated 14 April 2011, the Aboriginal Legal Service also referred to the increased discretionary powers of police to use force and referred to clauses 16, 72 and 74, expressing its concerns about additional impact on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are often the people occupying public space. Will there be any additional policies on the use of force during CHOGM?

In terms of compensation for damage, I understand that the government has undertaken to keep disruption to what is absolutely necessary. It is good that that assurance has been given. Although we believe disruption to business and the community will be kept to a minimum, there will be major disruptions, especially when ferrying dignitaries from their accommodation to the airport et cetera. Will there be any compensation for any property owner who claims their property has been damaged or for business earnings lost due to road closures, because the bill does not provide for this? I raised with the advisers the question of whether there will be compensation—particularly if vehicles have to be moved and are damaged—for any damage caused to vehicles through direct or indirect action to secure special areas. Clause 36 excludes such compensation, even in cases in which someone acts negligently. However, with the expiry of most clauses of the bill on 5 November, any limitation for compensation would expire as well and would limit the number of claims that could be made. We also understand that the police commissioner has ordered to make good any damage the police cause as of policy but not as of right. I assume that is what is being relied upon. We would argue that that should be in the bill as a matter of right.

I am about to run out of time so I will leave some of this to the committee stage. I will move to the use of subcontractors for law enforcement. Clause 53 will give the commissioner the right to appoint any person as an authorised officer. From the briefing we understand that the government does not intend to use subcontractors for law enforcement. Given the sensitivity of the public regarding the outsourcing of government services and the recent track record of the government in subcontracting out important government services such as prisoner transport, we would like to know exactly what this outsourcing is likely to be. I will talk about this in more detail when we get to clause 53. The way I am reading it, it gives very broad discretion as to the appointment of authorised persons and very broad discretion with no recourse to Parliament as to what these authorised persons can do.

I have come to the end of my specific comments until we get to the detail in the committee stage. I wanted to reiterate that we do not believe that the additional powers that this bill seeks to provide are needed. The police could rely perfectly adequately on the provisions they have. Therefore, we will not support the bill.

HON MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM (Agricultural) [3.25 pm]: I welcome the opportunity to speak on the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill 2011. I would like to acknowledge the hard work and effort that Hon Kate Doust put into her speech and point to the fact that, like Hon Kate Doust, I have a few issues with the Corruption and Crime Commission content of this bill. Broadly, I support the intent of this piece of legislation. It warrants noting that, from my vague recollection as a real youngster, perhaps since 1962, the Empire Games, as it was called in those days, was something that Western Australia really showcased to the world. The same sort of thing will happen with CHOGM. The presence of Queen Elizabeth II at this CHOGM will warrant significant attention. The enormity of the event and the apparent need to resort to special powers, as experienced in other states in relatively recent times, would seem to indicate that there is perhaps a need to go beyond what one would normally expect.

The basic thrust of my words today will focus on a few observations. More importantly, the main aspect of my speech will be the need to pose some questions to the parliamentary secretary that relate to people who live in rural, regional and even remote parts of the state. One of the comments that Hon Kate Doust made is one that I raised with her last night; that is, come the end of October we will see many students, not necessarily from the metropolitan area, although they will be involved as well, travelling to and from Perth as the annual tertiary entrance examination is held. Some of those students will be attending study courses in Perth. The basic question I have of the parliamentary secretary is: how will students, parents, families and travellers be informed of the issues relating to travelling through the city to wherever they need to go, such as the University of Western Australia? I am talking about issues such as access and the like.

CHOGM is certainly a great event for Australia, particularly for Western Australia, with the cultural and economic advantages being self-evident. We will witness people coming together from as many as 50 different countries and discussing world and worldly sorts of issues. Many of those issues are relevant to Western Australia, such as biosecurity—I know that the issue of immigration is in the newspapers every day—aid, tourism and economic growth and development. Issues that are very important to some of our smaller northern neighbours who may be attending this conference are sustainable communities, education and even the Colombo Plan, which I think still exists in some shape or form. I do not think it is anything like what it was 40 or 50 years ago but it still exists. Climate change is another issue that is very important to a lot of Pacific island nations. CHOGM will afford us an opportunity to talk about that. I believe that the royal family is particularly concerned about those issues.

Finally, I turn to the issue of democratic freedoms. I want to make some observations on this point that are pertinent to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill 2011. It is all about special powers and how ordinary, everyday Western Australians will be impacted on by the passing of this legislation. The obvious question is: how will our personal freedoms be affected? Obviously there are very significant issues associated with stop-and-search laws; Hon Kate Doust has already made mention of the views of Mr Hylton

Quail of the Law Society of Western Australia. There are important implications for families, sporting teams, employees, business people, retirees and students throughout the state, particularly in the agricultural regions—implications for their freedom and accessibility of services, geographical location, commercial undertakings and so on.

I pose the question: have the police given any particular thought as to where protests might occur? Hon Giz Watson made mention of that point, as did Hon Kate Doust. What planning is in place? Are there designated security areas? When will regulations identify such areas? Are there implications for the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation? Might there be a role for the Corruption and Crime Commission? The member for Cannington asked in the other place a very pertinent and thought-provoking question about personal liberty and the impact of CHOGM on 16-year-olds: why do we want legislation that will allow 16-year-olds to be taken into custody for the CCC to interview without the checks and balances that freedom and liberty demand in our society? For members who have not scrutinised the bill in any detail, these details are contained within parts 7, 8 and 9 of the bill, but I say to the parliamentary secretary that some explanation is required in respect of this matter. Perhaps she can comment on that later.

Our responsibilities in relation to this legislation are clear: it is fairly obvious that we need to protect commonwealth leaders and their entourages, but we also have great responsibilities and obligations in relation to the maintenance of our personal freedoms. People should be allowed, for instance, to protest. On behalf of residents and constituents, we also need to ask the question: what steps does the government plan to take to inform ordinary, everyday Western Australians living in rural, regional and remote parts of the state about the restrictions they need to know about, and what will be required to access services, particularly in the CBD? There are many what-ifs and the like, but I trust that the parliamentary secretary will speak broadly and expansively on this matter. Specifically, how will people be informed? Nobody will disagree with the need to control access and movements in certain parts of the CBD and perhaps elsewhere, but I ask again: how will it be done, and how will the message be conveyed, particularly to the regions? Will it be via newspapers, television and radio? I am sure that the government has something in mind, but we need to have this particular information put on the public record.

It sounds like a massive undertaking, but on this side of the house we acknowledge that it has to be done. I also note that some \$12.2 million has already been allocated to WA Police. How much more money will be required? Will the parliamentary secretary explain to the house what processes will be in place to facilitate the orderly protests that I mentioned before? Given the nature of some of the 50-odd countries that will be present at this event, such protests will inevitably happen. People in our system have rights that people in some other countries perhaps do not. I trust that the expectation in Australia that we have the capacity to voice our concerns will be upheld.

When will we see the plans for the areas that will be declared and restricted? What will happen to the Perth bus station, the railway station and other transport hubs, given the point that I made about students accessing the CBD? Will they be closed? What alternative arrangements will be put in place, if the government is contemplating such arrangements; and, if it is, how and when will the people of Western Australia be informed of them?

There are costings issues; I have mentioned the \$12.2 million, but that is just part of the Western Australian police budget; we cannot give police officers and other authorised officers the powers needed to promote the safety and security of people attending the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and associated events and functions without incurring significant costs. Those costs also need to be spelt out to the Western Australian people.

In conclusion, my reason for speaking was to pose these particular questions. I will not necessarily discourage my constituents from coming to Perth for that event; it is a great opportunity for them to be part of the events. I am sure that the parliamentary secretary will be able to address the concerns I have mentioned to make things easier for the range of people who may want to visit our state capital. As we all know, Western Australia is a unique place, and this is a great opportunity to showcase our state and capital city, our built, cultural and natural environments, our relaxed lifestyle and our progressive outlook. Our progressive outlook, in particular, is something that law and order and special powers issues may impact upon. People need to understand that we have a particular lifestyle and sense of liberty that perhaps does not exist in a number of other places. These are all things that we treasure in this wonderful place.

CHOGM 2011 promises much, and I can only hope and pray that Western Australia can deliver for all who come to participate later this year, be they dignitaries, constituents, children or families. Again, I ask: how and when will the regions be informed? The minister, through the parliamentary secretary, needs to understand that many people, for myriad reasons, will travel to Perth in late October. Students will be preparing for their TEE; buses and trains will be in demand; business people will have appointments and sporting events will attract people of all ages, no matter what other events are occurring. With that information and those questions, I will conclude my remarks.

HON DONNA FARAGHER (East Metropolitan — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.38 pm] — in reply: I thank members for their contributions to the second reading debate, and the opposition for its support of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill 2011. With no disrespect to members, probably quite a few of the questions asked fall somewhat outside the scope of this bill. Having said that, I will try to answer as many questions as I can. I think it is important to reflect for a brief moment on the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting itself, particularly given, one might say, the slightly negative attitude taken by Hon Giz Watson.

Hon Giz Watson: More than slightly.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Okay, the negative attitude; it is a Thursday afternoon, I was being nice!

Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm said he would like to think he was not discouraging his constituents from coming to Perth during CHOGM. I say to Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm that I certainly do not want him to discourage his constituents from coming along. In fact, the government is very keen for as many people as possible to come into Perth during CHOGM to see what is going on; to come and see the Queen. I will be there. I am excited.

[Quorum formed.]

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I am excited about CHOGM, and I think everyone should be excited. This is a historic event for Perth. It will be the largest event of its kind ever held in this city. I think we should see it as a very positive event for not only what the delegates will find when they come to Perth and see what a fantastic city and state we have, but also for the general community. I will say a couple of things in relation to specific events that will enable the involvement of the entire Western Australian community. As has been said, around 28 to 30 October and a bit before, about 4 000 people will descend on Perth—around 3 000 delegates, officials and the like and around 1 000 media representing some 53 countries of the commonwealth. As has been said, Her Majesty the Queen will also be in attendance as head of the commonwealth. I think it will be an absolutely fantastic opportunity for residents of Western Australia, young and old alike, to have a chance to see the Queen.

Hon Giz Watson interjected.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Hon Giz Watson might joke about that and have a different view—I do not intend to speak at length about that—but the Queen is held very dearly by many people and I think this is a wonderful opportunity for the people of Western Australia to see her. That should be respected by all members of this house.

Hon Giz Watson interjected.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: It should be respected.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Jon Ford): Order, members!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Thank you, Mr Deputy President.

As has been mentioned by a couple of the other speakers, outside the meeting of CHOGM itself, three parallel events will be held: The youth forum, the business forum and the people's forum; the latter of which Hon Kate Doust spent a bit of time on. They will fall within the definition of CHOGM Perth, which I allude to in the context of amendments I have placed on the supplementary notice paper. Whilst perhaps slightly outside the gamut of this bill, Hon Kate Doust did ask some questions with respect to the forum. In the context that it is part of CHOGM Perth, I can confirm that Lotterywest funding was announced yesterday of around \$490 000. That is on top of funding from the state government of around \$150 000, which was provided to the Western Australian Council of Social Service, the local partner to the Commonwealth Foundation, which is running the forum, to help engage with the non-government sector and others in the development of the program.

Hon Kate Doust: There was no mention of that.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: It should be remembered that the three forums I mentioned are not run by the state government—they are not state government forums; they are part of CHOGM. However, we are committed to supporting those forums when it is possible. That is an example in which direct state government involvement has been provided in both WACOSS's involvement and the funding to enable it to engage with the wider community, and the Lotterywest funding that was announced yesterday. It should be remembered that these three forums are part of CHOGM; they are not forums that have been organised by the state government or, indeed, the commonwealth government.

Outside of that though—this has been mentioned—there will be a number of other community-related events, if I can put it that way, that have been jointly funded by both the state and commonwealth governments. They are there for the entire community to enjoy, whether it is in the arts and cultural festivals that will occur in the lead-up and during CHOGM; the sporting events, netball as well as hockey; as well as a range of other activities. The people's space and the like have been mentioned, and I understand that will be held over four days.

I think it also needs to be remembered—Hon Kate Doust mentioned this during her contribution to the debate—that it is true that, as a general rule, CHOGMs are viewed in a positive light. Perhaps that is because we do not see the scenes that we have seen at G20 summits and the like. Having said that, we cannot be complacent. We need to make sure that we have appropriate legislation in place to ensure that we hold a safe and secure event for the dignitaries and delegates who attend CHOGM Perth and for the Western Australian community. This legislation seeks to do that.

As has also been mentioned—it was alluded to in my second reading speech—this is not new legislation as such when we look at it in the context of Australian events. The 2006 Olympic Games, the 2002 Queensland CHOGM, the Australian formula 1 grand prix and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation are all examples of where special powers legislation has been enacted.

Much has been said about the need to clarify the events and activities associated with CHOGM. Members will be aware that during debate in the other place—I will not reflect on that debate; but it is important in the context of what we are discussing now—the Minister for Police indicated that consideration would be given to reducing what has been put by some as uncertainty surrounding which events or what types of events will be covered under this bill. I do not take that as Hon Kate Doust has; that is, it is a flawed piece of legislation. I reject that notion. The government has looked at this and WA Police have looked at it. Yes; I have placed a number of amendments on the supplementary notice paper, which I will move during the committee stage.

Hon Kate Doust: Isn't it strange that they reflect the matters canvassed in the other house? Isn't it a good coincidence?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: We will have plenty of time to go through them in the committee stage, Hon Kate Doust.

In saying that, the government and WA Police still take the view that the bill needs to be flexible inasmuch as slightly less than six months out it is difficult to know all the events because a number of them are still being finalised. Indeed, the reality of CHOGM is that there are a number of, one might say, formal and informal activities. As the lead-up to CHOGM gets closer, some of those events may change. The legislation needs some flexibility to deal with those issues. Having said that, the government is very keen to make sure that the community is aware of issues such as the location of roadblocks and those sorts of things. It is not in the interest of the government or the WA Police to have a situation in which people do not know about those sorts of things, because that would cause more disruption. The WA government, along with the Australian government, has said that there will be some disruption. The state government is very conscious of the disruption that will be caused, and we are trying to keep it to a minimum. I think I made this point via an interjection, but I will reiterate. To provide information to the public we have already held two public forums at the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre; one was held in the morning and the other in the evening. More public forums will be planned as we get closer to the event. In addition, there will be letter drops, advertising in the press and personal visits to parts of the CBD that are likely to be significantly impacted upon.

I turn to the issue of identifying the CHOGM security areas. As I said, some of the CHOGM events and activities have not been finalised and, therefore, I cannot give the house an exact location of all the security areas. I hope that the house appreciates that. As the venues are finalised by the Australian government, site security assessments will be made and form the basis for determining the security areas. Some of the site assessments have been conducted and others will obviously happen as specific sites and activities and events are finalised.

General queries were raised at the public forums covering a range of issues, from roadblocks, volunteers and how to get involved, to whether the train station will still be operating. Those public forums were conducted by the Australian government but included representatives from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, WA Police and the City of Perth. It should be remembered that although CHOGM is being held here in Perth, the Australian government is responsible for CHOGM. For that reason, the CHOGM task force is headed by the Australian government.

Since the bill was first debated in the other place, a great deal of comment has been made about homeless people who may be impacted upon, which now comes to the issue of what is meant by "restricted area" as opposed to the CHOGM security area. There will be the designated core security areas and within that will be restricted areas. Restricted areas will essentially be limited to those places where the CHOGM meetings will occur. At this stage—these things can change—those places are expected to be, for example, the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre and Fraser's Restaurant, where the state reception centre will be. People will not be able to enter those restricted areas unless they have the appropriate accreditation and are a delegate or the like. The public can be in the designated, larger security areas. There has been a suggestion that the whole of the CBD will go into lockdown and homeless people who are sleeping will be moved on. It is incorrect to say that. That circumstance would arise only if a homeless person was found to be in the restricted area; people cannot be in a

restricted area unless they are accredited or authorised to be there. Having said that, in case a circumstance arises in which a person who is homeless is found to be in a restricted area, the Western Australia Police is working with the Department for Child Protection to make sure that alternative accommodation arrangements are put in place. The Department for Child Protection is working in partnership with eight service providers under the Street to Home program to ensure that any homeless person who may be affected by CHOGM restricted areas is provided with an alternative safe and supportive environment; that would be done with dignity and respect. Those arrangements are now being worked on.

Hon Kate Doust then branched into perhaps a more general discussion on the issue of homelessness. Obviously, that issue does not fall within the gamut of the bill per se and those questions are more appropriately addressed to the Minister for Child Protection. Having said that, the Department for Child Protection provides funding of \$3.1 million per annum for accommodation and support services for people experiencing homelessness in the inner city. In addition, \$135 million of government money is in place to combat homelessness. Earlier today when we heard the magnificent budget speech read out by Hon Simon O'Brien, we learned that additional funds have been put in place for the construction of another facility. I am happy to take further questions on the homelessness issue during the committee stage, but I hope that I have clarified what is meant by "restricted areas" as opposed to the security area.

Obviously traffic is an issue that comes very much within the issues surrounding public notification and the like. Traffic measures will be in place along Adelaide Terrace and St Georges Terrace from Friday, 28 October to Sunday, 30 October. Traffic measures will also be in place on Fraser Avenue at Kings Park on those same dates. Those traffic measures have already been announced at the public forums and will be reiterated to the public through the mechanisms I referred to earlier.

Hon Kate Doust raised issues about dignitaries coming from the airport. The advice that I have at this stage is that there is no intention to institute roadblocks from the airport to dignitaries' accommodations. Other traffic measures might be undertaken—I understand that I can say these sorts of things—such as giving dignitaries a green light through, which now happens when visiting dignitaries come to Western Australia. These sorts of mechanisms will be utilised rather than roadblock–lockdown measures. Perhaps that answers some of the questions from Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm and Hon Giz Watson about people having difficulty getting in and out of the city. It must be borne in mind that we have been pre-emptive in trying to minimise disruption so much so that we have declared Friday, 28 October a public holiday. There will not be the usual work traffic in the CBD that there would be otherwise if that were not so.

On the question of consultation with the traffic industry, I can confirm that a traffic and transport committee is chaired by Reece Waldock, Director General of the Department of Transport. The committee includes representatives from the taxi industry, buses and trains as well as police and others. The committee is overseeing the development of plans and the impact management requirements as a result of CHOGM, as well as the communication plan. As I said, we are trying to minimise disruption as much as possible. We want to keep security to a minimum with a limited use of barriers and with the public holiday that I mentioned. It is not a lockdown such as occurred at the Asia–Pacific Economic Cooperation meeting in Sydney in 2007. We want people to come into the city.

At this stage there are no plans to close the Esplanade train station or any other train station. Again, these plans will continue to be reiterated through public transport communications and the like. I can also say that Wellington Street bus station will remain open. The bus station adjacent to Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre will be closed between 28 and 30 October and buses will be re-routed to Wellington Street station. Again, that is part of the work being done by the committee headed by Reece Waldock.

Airspace restrictions are dealt with by the commonwealth government. The offence in the bill relating to airspace is to support the commonwealth powers.

Hon Kate Doust: We did raise the issue about how that would be managed and you say that the commonwealth handles that. It would be useful to be able to provide that information to people, and I would like to know. Are you able to extract that information from the commonwealth in some way?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Not right now.

Hon Kate Doust: No, not right now; I appreciate that.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I will see what other information we can provide, but I understand that the federal Office of Transport Security is responsible for airspace restrictions. I will see what other information there is.

Hon Kate Doust: I think we will probably still be going on this bill after today.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: On the issues surrounding police resources, I say at the outset that no police station will be closed. Also the Commissioner of Police is working to minimise the impact on regional and rural stations. There are plans currently to deploy around 300 police only from regional WA. I can confirm that there

have been a number of high-level meetings between senior police in other jurisdictions generally on the progress on numbers, and there is a further meeting next week to refine the support that may be required. I therefore do not have further details on that, except to say that WA police are confident that appropriate support will be provided. On the question of training and accreditation of police from recognised law enforcement organisations in other jurisdictions, there is already considerable commonality in training police across the country. I do not think members would disagree with that. That training is supplemented through joint training and common procedures. More specialised information will be provided prior to CHOGM. Obviously, these officers are accredited through their appointment to their home agency as provided for in clause 47(1) of the bill. There were some queries surrounding authorised persons. We are looking in that context to potentially utilise local government rangers, contracted traffic controllers and the like. I understand that all bookings have been made and confirmed for appropriate accommodation for officers; so, that is all in hand.

There were some specific queries from Hon Giz Watson about subcontracted authorised officers with special powers. The advice I have is that authorised persons will not be used for law enforcement purposes. Authorised persons could well be used for traffic measures, traffic control and those more general tasks. An appointment as authorised officer can be made only if they have the necessary expertise and experience.

I will make some brief comments on the Corruption and Crime Commission and the need for compulsive hearing powers. As I have a pretty strong feeling that this matter will be discussed at length during the committee stage, I will make only a couple of general comments. The compulsive hearing powers imposed through this bill are an investigative tool. Under Western Australian law, the Corruption and Crime Commission has powers to conduct coercive examinations in relation to organised crime. WA Police does not have those powers. The threshold for the use of those existing powers is extremely restrictive. The CHOGM coercive hearing powers are aimed at expeditiously investigating any of the many serious offences that are outside the scope of the existing coercive hearing powers for terrorism and organised crime. For example, a person who had a personal vendetta against someone or was planning to injure a particular delegate for no reason other than revenge would not fall within the scope of those coercive hearing powers.

There was a query about subjecting juveniles to compulsive examination. I appreciate this may be a point of disagreement, as the opposition believes it is unlikely that juveniles would be used by groups wanting to do harm. I do not think we should take that risk. We want to make sure that juveniles are not used for a purpose that could cause a serious security risk not only to delegates and those attending CHOGM in Perth, but also to the Perth community at large. There are safeguards in the CHOGM bill and in the relevant sections of the Corruption and Crime Commission Act. Juveniles and anyone else questioned are protected by anonymity. They can have legal representation, they can be accompanied by another person and, importantly, evidence given cannot be used in civil or criminal proceedings against them. There are therefore safeguards. I would like to think—likewise I am sure does every member of this place—that no group would want to do harm to people attending CHOGM or to the Western Australian community. Equally, we want to make sure that they are not utilising juveniles in any potentially negative cause. But if they are, or if they think they will, we would not like a loophole in the legislation that they could use for their own ends.

Hon Kate Doust asked what types of items would be prohibited. The items are listed under the definition in clause 3 of the bill. There will also be items that can be prescribed in regulation. Currently, particular weapons, for example, would be prescribed in the regulations.

Does a person who has had their car confiscated under the bill have to pay to get their car back? No.

A number of members raised the issue of the publication of the excluded persons list. I can confirm that it is currently not the intention of WA Police to publish the list, however, there has to be a capacity for the list to be published should a threat warrant it. As I understand, 61 people in New South Wales were placed on that state's excluded persons list for the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit. The authorities were able to contact all but eight people; the remaining eight could not be located. As I have said, the police do not intend to publish the list; however, there may be cases in which publication of the list is required. It may enable the public to assist in reporting any breaches of the law or it may assist to prevent violent activities undertaken by those excluded persons. The Commissioner of Police must be satisfied that the person poses a serious threat to the safety of persons or property. This is a higher threshold than the balance of probabilities. In addition, persons on the list have the opportunity for judicial review if they object to the commissioner's decision. I will not go into the proposed amendments tabled by Hon Giz Watson, except to say that if they were accepted they could cause a significant delay between the receipt of intelligence about a particular person and the placing of that person on the excluded persons list. We would not want a situation in which there was a delay, particularly if there was serious threat to delegates, dignitaries or anyone else participating in CHOGM.

Finally, I can say that, again, protests will not be able to occur in restricted areas, but they will not be stopped from occurring in designated CHOGM areas.

Hon Giz Watson: When you say “designated”, do you count security areas?

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Yes, there are the designated CHOGM security areas and the restricted areas are inside those—the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre is an example at this stage. A protest could not occur in the convention centre, because in any event protesters, along with people like me and others, will not be accredited and will not be allowed to be there. But there is no prohibition of protest in the larger security area that will be designated. WA Police are in fact already liaising with the action group that the member referred to, because the police want to work cooperatively with these groups. If there are protests, cooperation is the key and WA Police are very happy that if people protest, the protest is planned and that we know where it will occur. The protests will not be stopped provided that they do not interfere with roadblocks and those sorts of things. Significant work is being done by WA Police and the action group to which the member referred, and I presume any others that might be planning a protest. I know that I have not answered all questions, but I have tried to answer as many as possible. I presume I will be asked all those questions again during the committee stage. With that in mind, CHOGM will be wonderful for Western Australia and should be seen in a very positive light. I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 4.15 to 4.30 pm

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

DISABILITY SERVICES — SUPPORT WORKERS

357. Hon SUE ELLERY to the Minister for Disability Services:

Does the minister share the views in the budget speech today that those disability workers in the not-for-profit sector “do it better than employees of a large bureaucracy will likely ever do”; and, what message does that comment send to the 1 200 disability support workers employed by the Disability Services Commission who every day provide personal care and support to people with disabilities?

Hon HELEN MORTON replied:

I thank the honourable member for the question. I just want to say that this is the most fantastic budget that we have ever had—\$1 billion in social services packages —

Hon Sue Ellery interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This the first question and the minister has just got to her feet. The minister should be given a chance to respond to the question. Whether members like it or not, they have to hear it.

Hon HELEN MORTON: I am just going to say that this is an amazing budget—a \$1 billion social services package, which raises the social agenda to the same importance as the economic agenda in Western Australia. What an amazing feat it is to be doing this as well as achieving a \$442 million surplus and the biggest ever infrastructure spend and despite a substantial downward revision in revenue from property transfers and the GST share. This is the most amazing outcome that anybody in the community services sector could have ever hoped for. I am incredibly proud to be part of a government that has delivered this budget.

Having said that, I think the member would acknowledge, along with us, that the people who work in the community services sector have for a long time experienced a lesser level of pay. The equity pay issue has been a considerable problem for a long time. The people who rely on those people in the community sector—the mums and dads who look after kids with a disability or the people with mental illness—are absolutely dependent on that community sector for their day in, day out survival. The Leader of the Opposition knows that as well as I do.

Hon Sue Ellery: As are the families of the people whose family members are cared for by Disability Service Commission employees. They have all got the same skills and the same level of dedication and they should be acknowledged for that.

Hon HELEN MORTON: And the Disability Services Commission employees do a great job. The work that is being undertaken by disability services, both in the community sector and in the government sector, is greatly valued by this government. The work that they do helps mums and dads and people with a disability and the people with an illness live their days, day in, day out. Amazing, demanding challenges take place, and they are all greatly valued.

REDRESS WA — PAYMENTS

358. Hon SUE ELLERY to the Minister for Community Services:

Noting that the response of the minister to question without notice 233 on 6 April 2011 when asked to confirm that all payments to Redress WA applicants would be completed by 30 June 2011, was “No”, and that media reports of late April referred to the minister’s office saying that all payments would be completed by 30 June 2011, I ask the minister to clarify when all payments will be completed.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY replied:

I thank the member for the question. It has always been the intention that the assessments would be completed by 30 June 2011, and the majority of payments will be made by 30 June 2011.

Hon Sue Ellery: That was not what you were saying in August last year.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: I heard Hon Sue Ellery on radio say that I use weasel words. I do not use weasel words.

Hon Sue Ellery: I read it from your press release. If they are weasel words, they are yours!

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: I never put weasel words in my press releases or say weasel words. I am very open and very accountable.

Redress is dependent on applicants returning their fully completed acceptance documentation and providing correct bank account details. With some applicants, this can take several months from the date of the offer. It is therefore not possible to estimate when all Redress payments will be finished.

MID WEST ENERGY PROJECT

359. Hon KATE DOUST to the Minister for Energy:

- (1) Why has the completion of the southern section of the Mid West energy project been deferred until 2014–15?
- (2) When will construction actually start?
- (3) Is the government committed to the critical northern phase of the project; and, if yes, why does it not appear in the forward estimates?
- (4) Has the government reviewed the business case; and, if not, why not?

Hon PETER COLLIER replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1)–(4) Yes, the government is committed to the process; and certainly the first half at this stage, and we will watch the load increases in the years ahead. I am sure that Hon Kate Doust is aware that we have a number of processes to go through with approvals —

Hon Kate Doust: You have been going through them for three years now! You keep deferring it.

Hon PETER COLLIER: We are not deferring it at all. We have still got to complete the new facilities investment test, which is being completed as we speak.

Hon Kate Doust interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let us not have a two-person debate. This is the question and answer session.

Hon PETER COLLIER: As I said at the outset, the government has made a commitment to the first section of the line. We will follow the growth patterns in the Mid West in the years ahead to determine the demand levels beyond that. We will then make a determination on when that second tranche of the line will be completed. Yes, we have made a commitment and there is money in the budget for that first tranche, and we will monitor load growth in the years ahead to determine when the second tranche is needed.

STOLEN WAGES — REPAYMENT

360. Hon SALLY TALBOT to the Minister for Indigenous Affairs:

There appears to be an omission in the budget papers in that there is no mention of any funding allocated to the repayment of stolen wages. Given that the government has been sitting on the report and recommendations for nearly three years, how can the minister account for this omission?

Hon PETER COLLIER replied:

There has not been an omission; it has not gone to cabinet yet. We are still considering the stolen wages issue.

Hon Sally Talbot: This was your big chance. You missed it. You have blown it.

Hon PETER COLLIER: In this budget we have committed \$167 million —

Hon Sally Talbot interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The first four questions of today have been followed by a consistent series of interjections by the people who have asked the questions. Ask your question and then wait for the minister. Give the minister an opportunity to provide the answer.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The legitimacy of this government in terms of Indigenous affairs does not rest on the stolen wages issue. It is a significant issue for a number of people, which I acknowledge.

Hon Sally Talbot interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Can you just listen! You are getting as bad as Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich. I will start calling you Ljil!

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Where is Hon Ed Dermer?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Yesterday I had to invite a member to look at standing order 116. Perhaps a few other members should have a look at that.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I really want to answer this question. I am very conscious of the stolen wages issue. The stolen wages issue is a very vexed issue. Firstly, the time frames that we are talking about are in the significant past. Trying to ascertain exactly who is eligible for the stolen wages —

Hon Sally Talbot: Have you read the report?

Hon PETER COLLIER: Will you be quiet, woman!

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is a classic example of an unruly and unparliamentary interjection prompting a response that is equally unruly and unparliamentary. If the minister directs his answer through the Chair, he will not have to look at any other member when he provides his answer, which will be recorded very studiously by Hansard.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I apologise to Hon Sally Talbot. It was unruly and I apologise. But it was a little frustrating because I was getting constant interjections. I need Hon Sally Talbot to understand that I am very conscious of the stolen wages issue, but I can assure her that my “big chance” does not emanate from the fact that there was no funding for the stolen wages in this budget.

I will go through a few things. At this stage, we have allocated \$167 million over the forward estimates for Aboriginal incentives and programs, more than \$62.5 million of which will be allocated in 2011–12. I will go through a few things that we have allocated for Aboriginal people in this budget. They include \$13.1 million for the expansion of the regional justice strategy in the Kimberley and the Pilbara, \$1.7 million in support for the Clontarf colleges, \$300 000 in support for the transition of the Western Australian Indigenous Tourism Operators Committee to a new self-sustaining model, and it goes on and on. We have funded more than a dozen programs. What I will say to Hon Sally Talbot is that we will consider it. As I am sure she understands, it is a very, very difficult issue. It is very difficult trying to ascertain, firstly, who is eligible and, secondly, how much they are eligible for. The suggestion that we are ignoring this issue is unfounded.

Hon Sally Talbot: You’re going to have to fight to get it on the cabinet agenda, though, and that’s not what you’re doing.

Hon PETER COLLIER: How does the member know whether I am fighting for it?

Hon Sally Talbot: I can read between your lines.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Absolutely not. I am sorry; Hon Sally Talbot is way off target on that issue.

I will conclude. The reason it is not in the budget is that it has not been considered. I had a discussion with Hon Kim Hames about this very issue today and will continue to have discussions. I will meet with someone from the Aboriginal community tomorrow to discuss this issue.

GUNNS LTD — ASSIGNMENT OF TIMBER ALLOCATION

361. **Hon GIZ WATSON to the minister representing the Minister for Forestry:**

- (1) Is the minister or the Forest Products Commission considering, or has the minister or the FPC agreed to, the assignment of Gunns Ltd’s timber allocation, or any part thereof, under its contracts with the FPC?
- (2) If yes to (1), will the minister please provide full details, including —
 - (a) what timber allocation has been assigned;
 - (b) on what date;
 - (c) for what period; and
 - (d) to which buyer?
- (3) Will the minister please table any document or documents that have been signed in relation to part (2)?
- (4) If no to (3), why not?

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1) No proposals are being considered at this time.
- (2)–(4) Not applicable.

DR DEVINDER GREWAL — EMPLOYMENT WITH ESPERANCE PORTS SEA AND LAND

362. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has Dr Devinder Grewal ever been employed by Esperance Ports Sea and Land?
- (2) If yes, on what date did his employment commence and on what date did his employment cease?
- (3) Has Dr Grewal ever provided any services as a contractor or consultant to EPSL; and, if yes, what was the nature of the services provided and on what date did they commence and finish?
- (4) Has Dr Grewal ever declared a conflict of interest regarding any work he has done for EPSL; and, if yes, what was the nature of the conflict?
- (5) Has Dr Grewal ever been involved in any discussions with mining or exploration companies regarding allocation of space at EPSL?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question. The Minister for Transport has provided the following information.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Dr Devinder Grewal commenced employment at Esperance Ports Sea and Land on 5 January 2009. He ceased employment on 14 April 2011.
- (3) No.
- (4) No.
- (5) Yes, as part of his employment as general manager, commercial/commercial manager at Esperance Ports Sea and Land.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE — KIMBERLEY DISTRICTS

363. Hon JON FORD to the Minister for Child Protection:

I refer the minister to question without notice 345 that I asked yesterday.

- (1) How many service delivery full-time equivalents for the Department for Child Protection are located in Kununurra, Halls Creek, Fitzroy Crossing, Derby and Broome?
- (2) For each of the areas in (1), how many vacancies exist, for how long have they been vacant and where are they located?
- (3) What is the number of monitored cases—that is, cases that are not assigned to a caseworker as part of their caseload—in each of the areas in (1)?

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question.

- (1) There are 30.4 FTEs in Kununurra; nine in Halls Creek; eight in Fitzroy Crossing; eight in Derby; and 32 in Broome.
- (2) There is one vacancy for one month in Kununurra; zero in Halls Creek; zero in Fitzroy Crossing; one vacancy for one month in Looma; and one vacancy for three months in Broome.
- (3) It is noted that substantial natural disaster emergency responses, including the evacuation of Warmun by the Kununurra office and assistance to the Ngallagunda community by the Broome and Derby offices, have impacted on staff workloads. There are 37 monitored cases in Kununurra; four in Halls Creek; eight in Fitzroy Crossing; 18 in Derby; and 20 in Broome.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS — SENSITIVE SITES

364. Hon LYNN MacLAREN to the minister representing the Minister for Agriculture and Food:

I refer to the WA Department of Agriculture and Food's sensitive sites register.

- (1) Why were some organic growers given only three days to register their properties as sensitive sites?

- (2) Given that all non-GM farmers, not just organic ones, potentially stand to lose premiums and market access due to GM contamination, will these farmers also be given the opportunity to register their farms as sensitive sites?
- (3) At a recent forum in Manjimup, DAFWA's executive director, David Bowran, suggested that GM farmers could sue organic farmers for lost income for having to put in place buffer zones. Is the intent of the sensitive sites register to facilitate such legal action?

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1) Three days is not correct. Between 30 March 2011 and 1 April 2011 the Department of Agriculture and Food sent 1 378 letters to growers asking them to verify their property details and register their property. DAFWA accepted registrations until 3 May 2011.
- (2) There is no known evidence of premiums being lost in Western Australia where the adventitious presence of GM is less than 0.9 per cent in non-GM crops but, rather, it is enhanced as a result of GM canola being introduced. As defined on the Sensitive Sites WA webpage, any grower with a property that its owner and DAFWA consider to have a legitimate need for registration as a sensitive site may register their property.
- (3) The Sensitive Sites WA service aims to assist growers to prepare risk assessment and risk mitigation plans in consultation with neighbours so as to protect legitimate sensitive agricultural production systems.

WHEATBELT LAND USE PLANNING STRATEGY — ACCESS

365. Hon MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM to the minister representing the Minister for Planning:

I refer to question without notice 306 regarding the Wheatbelt land use planning strategy.

- (1) Have any new efforts been made by the Department of Planning to provide hard copies of the strategy to stakeholders and the general public; and, if yes, what materials have been provided and to whom?
- (2) What public advertising has taken place regarding the existence of the strategy and the opportunity that the public has to provide input to its final form?
- (3) Can the minister confirm that the public submissions period for this important document have been extended; and, if so, what is the last date on which submissions or comments can be made?
- (4) Were cheaper options or versions of the strategy considered given the estimated price per unit of \$270; and, if not, why not?
- (5) How many hard copies of the Pilbara planning and infrastructure framework were printed, which stakeholders were these distributed to and what is the unit cost of each of these documents?

Hon HELEN MORTON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question. The following information has been provided by the Minister for Planning.

- (1) A copy of the strategy and two strategy maps along with a compact disc containing all documents have been sent to all local governments and other stakeholders, including all agencies and people who made a submission on the Wheatbelt land use planning strategy document and members of the public who have contacted the project officer directly. The package has been sent to more than 150 stakeholders in total. People are able to contact the project officer if they would like to receive the CD and a printed copy of the strategy.
- (2) The existence of the strategy has been widely publicised. As a precursor to the preparation of the strategy, the Western Australian Planning Commission released the "Towards a Wheatbelt Regional Strategy" directions paper in September 2009. During the directions paper consultation period, staff held forums in Perth and Northam and invited planning consultants in the Wheatbelt to meet individually with Department of Planning officers. During the preparation of the final strategy, Department of Planning staff also attended the Western Australian Local Government Association's own meetings to advise on the progress of the project. In regards to the final draft strategy, email notification has been sent to each local government and other stakeholders, together with the mail-out of the hard copy and CD. Advertisements will shortly be appearing in local newspapers.
- (3) Yes, the public submissions period has been extended to Friday, 19 August 2011. It was originally 2 July. The project team is amenable to receiving submissions after this date if people are unable to provide a submission in time.

- (4) Several quotes were investigated. No quote was considered a reasonable expense for a draft document that could be subject to extensive modification in a short period. Printing of the final document has been budgeted for later this calendar year.
- (5) Five hundred copies of the Pilbara planning and infrastructure framework were printed at a cost of approximately \$21 each, totalling \$10 500. It was distributed to recipients on the Western Australian Planning Commission's standard distribution list, local members, key organisations and local governments in the Pilbara, local media, mining companies and members of the public who requested a copy.

RESIDENTIAL LOTS — APPROVAL

366. Hon ED DERMER to the minister representing the Minister for Planning:

For the 2010 calendar year —

- (1) How many residential lots received conditional approval?
- (2) How many residential lots received final approval?

Hon HELEN MORTON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question. The following information has been provided by the Minister for Planning.

- (1) In the 2010 calendar year, 26 881 residential lots received conditional approval in Western Australia.
- (2) In the 2010 calendar year, 11 504 residential lots received final approval in Western Australia.

DEPARTMENT FOR CHILD PROTECTION — FORCED ADOPTION PRACTICES

367. Hon ALISON XAMON to the Minister for Child Protection:

I refer to forced adoption practices and the ongoing trauma experienced by many people affected by these practices.

- (1) How long does it currently take for an applicant to receive a copy of their personal file from the Department for Child Protection?
- (2) Will the minister consider allocating more resources to the department to enable more timely processing of these requests?

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1) Most applications generally take up to six months to process. However, in exceptional circumstances in which specific criteria are met and the information is readily available, an applicant could receive information in about a week.
- (2) No, not at this stage.

EARLY YEARS COLLABORATIVE PROJECT TEAM

368. Hon LINDA SAVAGE to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

I refer to the early years collaborative project team.

- (1) Which public sector agencies are represented on the EYCPT and how were they selected?
- (2) Which community sector organisations are represented on the EYCPT?
- (3) When will the final report of the EYCPT be available to the Parliament?

Hon NORMAN MOORE replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question.

- (1) The Department of the Premier and Cabinet; the Department of Education; the Department for Communities; the Department of Health; the Department for Child Protection; and the Department of Treasury and Finance. The public sector agencies represented on the project team were selected based on their current functions relating to the policy, planning, resourcing and/or service delivery for early years in Western Australia.
- (2) The Western Australian Council of Social Service; Child Australia; Playgroup WA; the Telethon Institute for Child Health Research; CLAN WA; the Smith Family; the YMCA; Ngala; the Chamber of

Commerce and Industry of Western Australia; Kwinana Family Day Care; and the Western Australian Local Government Association.

- (3) The final report of the project team is scheduled to be finalised by early August 2011 for submission to the directors general of the Department of Health, the Department of Education and the Department for Communities.

NGARLUMA SUSTAINABLE HOUSING PROJECT

369. Hon HELEN BULLOCK to the minister representing the Minister for Housing:

I refer to the government's agreement with the Ngarluma Aboriginal community in Roebourne to acquire 50 lots in the Ngarluma sustainable housing project to build 32 social housing houses and 18 government employee houses.

- (1) How many of each type of house will be built or commenced in —
 (a) this calendar year; and
 (b) the 2011–12 financial year?
- (2) When does the government propose to complete its obligations to the Ngarluma community?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1) (a) Social, non-government organisation and affordable housing—26, and government regional officers' housing—10; and
 (b) social housing—six, and GROH—eight.
- (2) As outlined in (1).

YUONO DOWNS PASTORAL LEASE — CONTAMINATED SITES MEMORIALS

370. Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum:

I refer to the placement of memorials by the Department of Environment and Conservation on the Youno Downs pastoral lease due to a large number of pits being defined as contaminated or sites suspected of contamination.

- (1) What action needs to be undertaken to enable the station owners to remove the known or suspected contaminated sites classification caused by mining operations on Youno Downs station?
- (2) Does the minister understand the financial implications for the lessees of the placing of contaminated sites memorials on the Youno Downs pastoral lease?
- (3) What action will the minister take to ensure that the mining companies that caused Youno Downs to be identified as contaminated, or a site suspected of being contaminated, remove the contamination or demonstrate that the site is no longer contaminated?

Hon NORMAN MOORE replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question.

- (1)–(3) It is unclear which mine pits the member is referring to. However, the Department of Mines and Petroleum is aware that there are mining operations currently under care and maintenance on Youno Downs station. The placement of memorials relating to site contamination is done under the provisions of the Contaminated Sites Act 2003 and, as such, the member may wish to seek a response from the Minister for Environment.

GOVERNMENT TRADING ENTERPRISES — CAPITAL EXPENDITURE NEEDS

371. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Finance:

I refer to the critical role the minister plays in analysing the performance and capital expenditure budgets of government trading enterprises and the revelation in today's budget that the state net debt for the non-financial public sector will be around \$24 billion by 2014–15.

- (1) Is the minister aware of the growing backlog of essential capital works for government trading enterprises responsible for power, water and ports?
- (2) How does the Barnett government expect to meet the capital expenditure needs of these GTEs over the next four years, in light of this extraordinary level of state debt?

- (3) What action will the minister take to ensure our power, water and port GTEs are able to meet the growing demand for their services?

The PRESIDENT: There are elements of that question that are specific to other specific portfolios. The Minister for Finance will be required to answer whatever parts of the question encompass his portfolio.

Point of Order

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Mr President, when the portfolio of finance was created, the Premier indicated that the Minister for Finance would play a critical role in analysing the performance and capital expenditure budgets of government trading enterprises. That is what I have asked about today.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is the part of the question that is relevant to the minister's portfolio.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

(1)–(3) I thank the member for attempting to ask me a question. The fact is it is not relevant to my portfolio.

Hon Ken Travers: So the Premier was lying in his release, then?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: If the member wants to have an answer—in fact, I am going to persist with an answer, because he is misrepresenting the facts. Firstly, as the President has correctly pointed out, each of the government trading enterprises that the member has mentioned comes within the responsibility of ministers other than me. The member ought to know that, because he thinks he knows everything. So that question cannot be addressed to me. If the member wants to address a question to me in my capacity as being involved in budget preparation, my only capacity there is as a member of the Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee, which is a subcommittee of cabinet. As the member would also be aware, I do not answer questions about what happens at cabinet; I am not allowed to. In any case, it is not my portfolio responsibility to respond to those questions that the member has raised.

If the member insists on saying that there is a role to be played by the Department of Finance in examining the performance of GTEs —

Hon Ken Travers: And the capital expenditure.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: — and the capital expenditure of GTEs, then that is a matter that we can canvass on another day.

Hon Ken Travers: The Premier said you were going to do that.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: No, he did not say I was going to do that.

Hon Ken Travers: He did! He said you would play a critical role in it!

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Mr President, the honourable member might like to hold his horses, because the fact of the matter is that the Department of Finance will not be created until 1 July 2011, at which time the new director general of the Department of Finance will commence in that newly created role, and at which time the process that the Premier was alluding to will commence; but it has not yet.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION — 2009–10 YEARBOOK

372. Hon SALLY TALBOT to the minister representing the Minister for Environment:

I refer the minister to page 3 of the Department of Environment and Conservation 2009–10 annual report, and more specifically the statement —

A full account of DEC's considerable sweep of activity across Western Australia is being documented instead in the inaugural *DEC Yearbook 2009–10*, to be published later in 2010.

- (1) Has the yearbook for 2009–10 been released?
- (2) If yes to (1), when, and will the minister table a copy?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?

Hon HELEN MORTON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question. This information has been advised to me by the Minister for Environment.

(1)–(3) The 2009–10 annual report of the Department of Environment and Conservation was tabled in Parliament on 22 September 2010. As a new initiative, the department also decided to prepare a 2009–10 yearbook containing greater detail about its activities. The yearbook is in an advanced stage of preparation within the department and it is expected that it will be released before 30 June 2011.

DISABILITY SERVICE COMMISSION — PROVIDER CONTRACTS*Question on Notice 3755 — Answer Advice*

HON HELEN MORTON (East Metropolitan — Minister for Disability Services) [5.04 pm]: Pursuant to standing order 138(d), I wish to inform the house that the answer to question on notice 3755 asked by Hon Sue Ellery on 23 March 2011 to me as the Minister for Disability Services will be provided on Tuesday, 24 May 2011.

COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING (SPECIAL POWERS) BILL 2011*Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm) in the chair; Hon Donna Faragher (Parliamentary Secretary), in charge of the bill.

Clause 1: Short title —

Hon KATE DOUST: Because we do not have a lot of time this afternoon I might save the big questions for when we resume. Given the budget has just been handed down this afternoon and having had a very cursory look through the budget papers to see what other moneys have been allocated to CHOGM, because we canvassed that during the second reading debate, I do not know whether the minister dealt with some of those monetary matters.

Hon Donna Faragher: I didn't actually.

Hon KATE DOUST: We might talk about some of them now. I note in budget paper No 3 that a number of allocations relate to CHOGM. On page 113, under "Deputy Premier; Minister for Health; Tourism" there is an allocation listed "CHOGM — Provision of Health Services". I note in the 2010–11 period \$21 000 has been allocated. In 2011–12, \$1.2 million has been allocated. I wonder why that money was going to be allocated and spent in the area of health specifically for those four days. I thought the minister might provide us with the detail of what that is all about.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: As much as I would like to go through budget line items for other portfolios, I —

Hon Alison Xamon interjected.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: It is a touch early.

I seek your advice, Mr Chairman. I think the question asked by Hon Kate Doust does not fall within the ambit of this bill insomuch as questions have been asked about health and a budget line item. This bill relates to special powers during CHOGM.

Hon KATE DOUST: While you think about that, Mr Chairman, the detail of why that allocation has been made is on page 115. It refers to "the provision of ambulance services, doctors and nurses for all meetings, dinners and functions attended by Foreign Ministers and Leaders." I think that is an excessive amount of money to be allocated during that period when people are lining up at hospitals trying to get doctors, ambulances and services.

Hon Donna Faragher: Good try, but it doesn't relate to the bill. Look what the bill is for.

Hon KATE DOUST: It might be a good try, but it is relevant and I am wondering whether this is part of a total package of dollars allocated by the state government towards CHOGM.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be fair to say that once this bill has been passed, it will be fair and reasonable to ask for a sum total of the cost of carrying out this Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. However, that appears to be as far as where it is reasonable to expect an answer to go.

Hon KATE DOUST: We did actually talk about the costs, and I think the parliamentary secretary talked about the \$12.2 million that had been allocated to police, the \$1 million that had been allocated to compensate the Royal Agricultural Society for the potential loss of custom at or visitors to the Perth Royal Show because of the change in the date of the public holiday, and I think there were a couple of other amounts that were touched on. But the budget contains a number of other amounts that are directly related to this event. They are linked to the provision of services for health, tourism, marketing—to make it attractive to the delegates who will be in Perth—and transport, which I thought was relevant, to provide alternative services. The transport part of the budget has an allocation of \$300 000 for CHOGM. I think that might actually have some clear relevance because roads will be shut down—we have talked about access to public transport. It is all part of the whole package. Although the parliamentary secretary has not been able to give us an answer about the other costs that will be incurred by the state government, I hope that, as we make our way through the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (Special Powers) Bill 2011, the parliamentary secretary will be able to cobble together some figures. I think the public would like to know what it will cost them to have CHOGM occur in Western Australia—not the federal component, but how much it will cost the taxpayer to have this event run. I know that the parliamentary secretary

does not have all those details to hand, but I wanted to put on the record some of those areas and those figures I have picked up after a very cursory look through the budget. I will have another look over the weekend and see what else pops up.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Why don't you read the bill while you're at it? Then you might be able to talk about something that's relevant!

Hon KATE DOUST: Why don't you finish eating before you speak? Did your mother never tell you not to talk with your mouth full?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members, it is after 5.10 pm and we are getting towards the end of the day; let us have some decorum, please.

Hon KATE DOUST: You are right, Mr Chairman; the Deputy Leader of the House should not have talked with his mouth full.

If the parliamentary secretary is able to pull a set of figures together with all those costs, I would be interested to see them so that we will know the bill the taxpayer will be footing for the holding of this event in Perth.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I again draw the member's attention to the fact that this bill is quite specific. It is not an appropriation bill; it is a bill that deals with the ability to give police officers and certain other persons special powers with respect to CHOGM 2011. In my view, Mr Chairman—I will stand corrected by you—issues on the funding for all aspects of CHOGM are outside the scope of this bill. Having said that, the Premier has said that, after CHOGM has finished, he will table a full list of all expenditures. As members appreciate, this is an ongoing matter—it is still six months away—and there is obviously funding between the commonwealth and the state and the like. Although I am very happy to answer any questions that Hon Kate Doust puts to me, I think that particular question is outside the scope of the bill.

Hon GIZ WATSON: I just wanted clarification of the Chairman's ruling or comment. Did you say it was within the debate to have an amount for the cost of implementing this bill? Is that what was suggested? That is what I am interested in, and it seems to me that that would fit within the scope of the bill. I recognise it is a difficult task because it seems that it is not all costed yet, and that is perhaps the point that is being made. But it seems to me that if the Parliament is about to pass a bill that incurs a cost, it is not unreasonable to ask what that cost will be. Perhaps that is the point that Hon Kate Doust is seeking to make, and I am just checking whether that is a reasonable question.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon Giz Watson, the answer that I provide supports the suggestion or the idea that there is a setting up cost for the special powers that exist within this particular bill. I am addressing that issue of the particular cost, because there is a certain dollar amount for setting up a structure, I suppose, to deal with the special powers. It is a fairly narrow sort of figure that I am suggesting.

Hon GIZ WATSON: Are we talking about the setup costs and not the costs associated with implementing the special powers contained within this bill? Surely we could estimate the cost of not only setting up the powers, but also implementing the powers and running and policing the event.

The CHAIRMAN: Members, my suggestion is that if there is a cost associated with one of those particular clauses within the bill, it is within the realms of possibility to ask a particular question on that cost. However, members cannot ask what the total cost of CHOGM is, because that goes well beyond the scope of this particular bill.

Hon KATE DOUST: Again I refer to budget paper No 3, which was handed down today. There is a budget allocation for 2011–12 for CHOGM under “Western Australia Police”, so it is specifically about police for CHOGM. It refers to \$20.6 million for “additional resources”. Given that the parliamentary secretary has the appropriate advisers with her and I am sure they are right across what those “additional resources” are that have been budgeted for to deal with this bill, my question is: what are those “additional resources” for which this budget allocation has been made to specifically deal with this bill and CHOGM? If the parliamentary secretary is not able to provide that today, I am happy for her to provide it at a later stage.

The CHAIRMAN: Given that we need to start members' statements at 5.20 pm, I will leave the chair and report progress.

Progress reported and leave granted to sit again, pursuant to temporary orders.

FOODBANK GERALDTON

Statement

HON MATT BENSON-LIDHOLM (Agricultural) [5.20 pm]: It was my pleasure to visit the Foodbank Geraldton again last week and to catch up with the manager, Mrs Pat Hodges, and the many volunteers who tirelessly give their time to ensure that members of the community who are disadvantaged for whatever reason

are supported with an extensive range of food, drinks and personal effects. Many thousands of people in Western Australia are in need of, and rely on, supplementary food from community organisations. Foodbank distributes to more than 600 of these types of organisations. Sadly, over 4 000 people in Western Australia die each year whose deaths are attributed to poor diets, and 10 per cent of Western Australians die up to 20 years earlier than they should. Foodbank is a very important resource for Geraldton and the wider area of the Mid West and Gascoyne regions. Pat Hodges is to be commended for her work at Foodbank. She has served with the organisation for eight years; two as a volunteer and six as the manager. She has put together and manages a big team of volunteers. She manages, trains and supervises people who are serving their community service obligations and have been placed into her care by the Department of Justice, and others who have been placed at Foodbank by Centrelink as part of the work-for-the-dole scheme. Foodbank Geraldton provides food for hostels, agencies, community organisations, families and individuals. It also works closely with local police units to provide community assistance in times of crisis and receives support from many local organisations and businesses, which is appreciated enormously. I also point out that Mr Shane Hill, a former member for Geraldton, is the patron of Foodbank Geraldton and also makes a great contribution.

Foodbank Geraldton distributes more than 30 000 meals a month in the Geraldton, Mid West and Murchison areas, and there is pressure to deliver more. In addition, Foodbank Geraldton runs many community breakfast programs, particularly the phenomenally successful school breakfast program. That program started with just 11 schools in 2001; today the organisation feeds breakfast to 37 000 children in 370 schools each week. The program is supposed to expand when it receives additional funding from other areas of government, especially the Department of Education. Everyone involved hopes that the Minister for Education can deliver \$780 000 in funding. An interesting fact is that Foodbank Geraldton produced 1 000 Christmas hampers last year and was able to fill every hamper for the first time in seven years due to the generosity and support of the Geraldton community. With the help of the Fire and Emergency Services Authority, Foodbank Geraldton also donated much needed food supplies to the flood-affected Pia Wadjari community, which is located 200 kilometres east of Mullewa, after heavy rains caused flooding and cut off access to the town earlier this year. Pat Hodges said that Foodbank had the capability to get supplies to other remote communities that are in crisis.

In conclusion, I congratulate Pat Hodges and all her staff for their outstanding contribution to very many disadvantaged people, schoolchildren and community organisations in the City of Geraldton–Greenough, the Mid West region and beyond. Without Foodbank Geraldton and the many organisations and individuals who support it, it is hard to imagine how many people would indeed survive in that particular part of the world. I take my hat off to all involved in the service and wish the organisation well in its future expansion planning.

INSIDE PARENTS PROGRAM

Statement

HON ALISON XAMON (East Metropolitan) [5.24 pm]: Tonight I thought I would talk about something pertinent to National Families Week. For those members who do not know, this week from 15 to 21 May is National Families Week. Last week I noted that the Minister for Community Services announced that the focus for Western Australia for Families Week this year would be on the positive influence of good fathering and she spoke about the value of the role of the father in a family. Picking up on that theme, I thought I would comment on a program that I believe is particularly good for families. The community is aware of an increasing recognition of the importance of good parenting and of positive family experiences, particularly in the early years of childhood. People are far more aware now of the damage that can be wrought on families, even on very young children, as a result of negative experiences. For many people, if not most, good parenting is not always easy. It is a difficult job although, certainly in my case, incredibly rewarding. It can be a pretty tough job, particularly for people who have never had the opportunity to experience good parenting themselves. It can be especially difficult if they have not been exposed to the good skills necessary to become good parents.

I therefore want to draw members' attention tonight to an impressive program that was developed in WA called Inside Parents. I went to the launch of Inside Parents in 2009. It was a really interesting experience. Inside Parents is a therapeutic parenting program delivered to fathers in Acacia Prison, which is a medium-security prison. The program is run by UnitingCare West. It aims to enhance community safety and reduce crime by reducing recidivism; also, importantly, by breaking the intergenerational transmission of criminal behaviour. The program does this by providing a care model of reintegration support for fathers who are due to leave prison in the near future to help them to successfully reunify with their families, or at least to help fathers maintain connection and contact with their children. The outcomes include increasing the capacity of these fathers to parent appropriately during a difficult period. The program is evidence based and, importantly, was specifically designed to be culturally relevant, with 50 per cent of men participating being Aboriginal and 70 per cent of families receiving support also Aboriginal.

It is a purely voluntary program and has proved to be very popular. When I was at the launch, I spoke to some prisoners who had participated in the program. They said that they had found it to be one of the most important

things that they had ever undertaken. They were learning basic parenting skills that a lot of us take for granted. They learnt how to play with their children. They learnt that it was important to read to their children. They learnt that it was important to spend time with their children. These are things that many of us take for granted and many of us think would be self-evident. But for these men, who had pretty much without exception the saddest stories to tell about their own upbringing, it was actually a revelation to learn about the positive role that they could play with their children.

I also spoke to one gentleman who I did not ask but chose to reveal that he was at the end of a term for having committed a violent assault. He said that prior to entering prison he had been quite a violent man and had problems with alcohol. As a result of the program, he had an opportunity to drastically think about the effect of his behaviour on his own children. He had never made the connection between the way he conducted himself and the effect it had on his children. In particular he was devastated when he realised the possibility that he was creating a cycle of behaviour that meant it was more likely that his own children would end up in prison. He was determined not to go back to prison ever again. He certainly did not want that for his own children.

The program was independently evaluated by Edith Cowan University. The results were based on pre and post-group tests and participant focus groups. The results demonstrated significant improvements in factors that we know reduce recidivism, such as antisocial attitudes and beliefs, impulse control and attribution of hostility. There were significant improvements in parenting competency and satisfaction, significant improvements in reducing potential child abuse, significant improvements in emotional regulation and awareness—that is, anger management—and the program was consistently rated by the few prisoners who managed to undertake it as the best program they had ever done.

Inside Parents is recognised as an innovative, cutting-edge program that makes a real difference. It has received awards to reflect this. Amongst other awards, the program won an Australian Crime and Violence Prevention Award in 2010. We should be really proud of this WA-created and internationally noteworthy program. The program was originally run with \$550 000 funding over two years under the national community crime prevention program through the federal Attorney-General's Department, but this funding stream no longer exists. The program has now ceased operating because it has not secured additional funding.

We talk a lot in this place about the need to be tough on crime but here we have a demonstrated program that has the potential to have a real impact on reducing crime, both by existing prisoners and generations of children, yet it has virtually been abandoned by government. I understand that the Attorney General and the police minister are very supportive of the program. It has obviously been welcomed within the Department of Corrective Services. Given the focus on the importance of positive fathering, as recognised by the Minister for Community Services, at least three state government ministers would arguably support the intent of this program. They also claim a desire to reduce crime and improve parenting. Surely there must be a way to secure enough funding to continue the program.

I have had a quick look through the budget that I received a couple of hours ago. I cannot see that that level of detail is in there. I will certainly ask questions about that. I do not think the federal government should be left off the hook on this one either. It is really important that programs such as this continue to receive funding.

In conclusion, I note that it is National Families Week. As such, it is really important that we talk about supporting at-risk families of all types. The reason this program has been so successful is that it has targeted prisoners' strong attachments to their children. They love their children every bit as much as I love mine. Inside Parents has demonstrated it can improve outcomes for children as well as families, as well as reducing the likelihood of these children ever entering the criminal justice system. It also reduces the likelihood of male offenders committing further offences. I congratulate UnitingCare West for its work in developing and piloting the program. It was really innovative and it was really important. I urge the state government—because that is where I am—to provide ongoing support and ensure there is some way that the program can continue. Thank you.

House adjourned at 5.34 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

BUNBURY AND BUSSELTON — RENTAL HOUSING SHORTAGE

3698. Hon Adele Farina to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Housing

I refer to the chronic shortage of affordable rental housing in the Greater Bunbury area and Busselton, and ask —

- (1) What is the Minister doing to address this issue?
- (2) When will additional and affordable rental housing become available in the Greater Bunbury area and Busselton?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

The Department of Housing advises:

- (1)-(2) Please refer to Legislative Council Question on Notice 3700.

SOUTH WEST REGION — AFFORDABLE HOUSING

3700. Hon Adele Farina to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Housing

I refer to the Minister's announcement, made on 5 February 2010, of Federal Government funding to build 285 new affordable dwellings for the South West by early January 2011, and ask —

- (1) Were the 285 new affordable dwellings completed by early January 2011?
- (2) If no to (1), why not?
- (3) How many have been completed to date?
- (4) When will the balance be completed?
- (5) Will all of the 285 new affordable dwellings be Homewest housing?
- (6) If no to (5) —
 - (a) how many will be Homewest housing; and
 - (b) what is proposed for the balance?
- (7) What sort of housing has been built (unit, house, number of bedrooms, number of bathrooms) and how many of each?
- (8) What additional funding has the State Government committed to build additional new affordable dwellings in —
 - (a) the Greater Bunbury area; and
 - (b) Busselton —

in view of the continuing chronic shortage of affordable housing in these areas?
- (9) In relation to (8) —
 - (a) what is the construction timeframe; and
 - (b) how many new dwellings will be built?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

The Department of Housing advises as at 15 March 2011:

- (1) No
- (2) The number of dwellings planned was reduced to 274 units, due to changes in the program and a reallocation of priorities since the original announcement was made. There was a general shortage of trades and some materials due to the amount of work in progress in the Southwest, including the Commonwealth Stimulus Schools projects, which led to delays in completing some of the projects.
- (3) 186 dwellings. In addition, through the utilisation of funding sources other than the State and Commonwealth Stimulus Packages, a further 64 units have been completed for Social Housing since 2008–2009.
- (4) 16 dwellings in April 2011, 62 dwellings in May 2011, 10 dwellings in July 2011. In addition, through the utilisation of funding sources other than the State and Commonwealth Stimulus Packages, a further 51 units are currently under construction for Social Housing.

- (5) No
- (6) (a) 124
- (b) The remaining 150 dwellings will be managed by Community Housing Organisations to provide Social Housing. Of these, 142 dwellings will be transferred to these Community Housing Organisations to own as part of the Department's Asset Transfer commitments.
- (7) Aged Persons
- 3x Single Bedroom Town House
37x Two Bedroom Town House
80x Single Bedroom Apartment
24x Two Bedroom Apartment
- Family
- 11x Three Bedroom Single Detached House
8x Four Bedroom Single Detached House
2x Five Bedroom Single Detached House
1x Six Bedroom Single Detached House
4x Two Bedroom Duplex
7x Three Bedroom Duplex
1x Five Bedroom Duplex
36x Two Bedroom Town House
9x Three Bedroom Town House
1x Five Bedroom Town House
- Singles
- 50x Single Bedroom Town House
- (8) (a) Since 2008-2009 — \$16.5 million (plus \$5.4 million through the State Stimulus package).
- (b) Since 2008-2009 — \$3.7 million (plus \$5 million through the State Stimulus package).
- (9) (a) Since 2008-2009, utilising additional funding sources other than the State and Commonwealth Stimulus Packages, 61 dwellings have been completed. Another 28 are under construction (9 dwellings due for completion in April 2011, 3 dwellings in June 2011, 9 dwellings in August 2011 and 7 dwellings in December 2011).
- (b) Since 2008-2009, utilising additional funding sources other than the State and Commonwealth Stimulus Packages, 74 dwellings have been commenced in the Greater Bunbury area, of which 55 are complete, and 15 dwellings have been commenced in Busselton, of which 6 are complete.

MR NEIL WINZER — PUBLIC INTEREST CLAIM

3772. Hon Giz Watson to the Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Transport

Referring to the public interest claim initiated by Mr Neil Winzer, who was recently transferred from the Department of Planning to the Department of Transport, my Question No. 2653 of 29 November 2005, the Hon Norman Moore's Question No. 2061 of 25 August 2005, and the Hon Paul Omodei's Questions No. 2926 and 2946 of 26 February 2007, and I ask —

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Mr Winzer believes that some answers provided to these questions are incorrect?
- (2) Did the Minister receive correspondence from Mr Winzer of 7 January 2011 requesting that corrections to the parliamentary records be made?
- (3) Why did the Minister in his response of 15 March 2011 just note Mr Winzer's correspondence but not provide any answers to the questions raised and clarifications requested by Mr Winzer?
- (4) Will the Minister confirm that Mr Winzer cited in his correspondence to the Minister for Planning and the Minister what he believes are gross inconsistencies between records of the Legislative Council, the Corruption and Crime Commission report of 14 August 2008 and WorkCover transcript in relation to critical aspects of his public interest claim?
- (5) According to statute and procedure, could a public interest claim in 1999 be addressed in any way other than in writing?
- (6) Would a similar public interest claim when made under the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2003* be likely to have a similar outcome?

- (7) Is the Minister aware that the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs was for 'immediate steps to resolve the issue of Mr Winzer's employment', and yet it remains the case that Mr Winzer, although a public servant, has not worked or been paid since 1999?
- (8) Will the Minister acknowledge that Mr Winzer's public interest claim and Mr Winzer's employment are inextricably linked and therefore the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs (2007, Tenth Report, Petition No.18 – Neil Winzer Prayer for Relief), was for a resolution to the public interest claim, particularly in light of Committee's view at that time that 'the Committee believes that the 'public interest claim' will be adequately addressed by the Corruption and Crime Commission, if that agency receives Mr Winzer's full co-operation with its investigation' (paragraph 5.181) '?
- (9) Will the Minister acknowledge that, if there had been a thorough and objective investigation of Mr Winzer's public interest claim, grounds may have been established for his return to work and/or a re-start of his pay?
- (10) If yes to (9), is the Minister prepared, in accordance with the 2007 recommendation of the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, to take steps toward to a resolution of 'the issue of Mr Winzer's employment'?
- (11) If no to (10), why not?
- (12) If yes to (10), when?
- (13) What does the Minister intend to do to resolve Mr Winzer's ongoing grievance?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

The Department of Transport advises:

- (1) Numerous questions have been asked by honourable members over the years regarding Mr Winzer's public interest claim. Detailed answers have been provided to those questions and Mr Winzer is entitled to form his own opinions about the answers provided.
- (2) Yes
- (3) Mr Winzer's letter of 7 March 2011 was the latest of many letters he has addressed to Government Ministers. Additionally Mr Winzer has taken the opportunity of referring his concerns to the —
Office of Public Sector Standards Commissioner
Equal Opportunity Commission
Corruption and Crime Commission
Legislative Council Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations
Office of the Auditor General
Members of Parliament
Western Australia Police
Over the years numerous responses have been provided to Mr Winzer and it was believed that no new information could be provided at this stage.
- (4) It is not appropriate to comment on how Mr Winzer interprets information provided by agencies that are not under my control.
- (5)-(6) This is a legal matter for which Mr Winzer will need to seek independent legal advice.
- (7)-(13) Since approximately 1999 Mr Neil Winzer has been on leave without pay. As a result of the split of the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, Mr Winzer became an employee of the Department of Transport (DoT) on 1 July 2009. DoT has been engaged in discussions with Mr Winzer relating to his employment in the department. Various offers have been made to him which he has either not responded to or rejected. The department is continuing to engage with Mr Winzer.

RENEWABLE ENERGY BUYBACK SCHEME

3775. Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm to the Minister for Energy

I refer to the Renewable Energy Buyback Scheme, and I ask —

- (1) How many non-commercial alternative energy generating systems, with a capacity greater than 5 kW, are currently connected to the electricity grid?
- (2) Of the systems listed in (1),

- (a) do they currently receive any payment or any form of power consumption offsetting allowance for the energy that is supplied in excess of domestic requirements that is fed back into the electricity grid;
 - (b) what is the combined potential capacity provided to the grid, and what was the amount of power generated and supplied into the electricity grid in the last 12 months and how is it measured;
 - (c) what was the domestic market value of the power generated in the last 12 months, and to which agency does this benefit accrue; and
 - (d) has there been any estimation of the overall supply or capital costs that have been incurred or avoided due to the contribution of these systems and if so, what are they?
- (3) Can you confirm that in order to have a non-commercial alternative energy generating system larger than 5 kW system connected to the electricity grid, both the control equipment and installation must be accredited and approved by Western Power and Synergy as meeting their required standards?
- (4) Have there been any instances where problems with system instability can be attributed to the operation of such systems and if so, how many?
- (5) What is the evidence that they are the cause of the problem?
- (6) What are the direct costs involved to affected utilities from systems instability having been positively identified as caused by alternative energy generating systems?

Hon PETER COLLIER replied:

- (1) Within the South West Interconnected System (SWIS), Western Power has approved 487 non commercial systems with a capacity between 5kW and 30kW.
- (2) (a) Synergy does not offer access to the Renewable Energy Buyback Scheme (REBS) and Feed in Tariff to customers with systems larger than 5kW in capacity.
- (b) 3743kW based on the combined capacity of inverter sizes that have been approved for installation. However, some installations may not have proceeded, and some may have an inverter with greater capacity than is required for the capacity of the solar panels installed.
- (c) Synergy does not receive export data for customers who are ineligible for the REBS or Feed in Tariff and is therefore unable to determine the value of energy exported from those installations. Any generation that is not purchased under contract or sold to Synergy through a REBS contract would be to Synergy's benefit under the Notional Wholesale Meter arrangements of the Wholesale Electricity Market.
- (d) Perth Solar City is undertaking studies on the impacts and benefits of solar photovoltaic systems on the network. As the studies have only recently commenced, results or findings are not yet available.
- (3) Western Power is required to assess all applications to connect systems in accordance with technical rules as administered by the ERA. If all requirements are met the system is approved.
- (4) There is no direct evidence at this time.
- (5)-(6) Not applicable.

BKM 102 BEACHING, BARROW ISLAND — ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE

3787. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Transport

I refer to the below-waterline damage, beaching on Barrow Island, and subsequent towing to Dampier of the vessel 'BKM 102' operated by Boskalis Ltd, which resulted in the damage and contamination to surrounding waters visible in photographs entitled '2011-01 BK102 Hull Damage.pdf', available at www.robinchapple.com/qdata, and ask —

- (1) Was the BKM 102 assessed as seaworthy prior to being towed to Dampier?
- (2) If no to (1) —
- (a) what was the justification given for towing the vessel to Dampier; and
 - (b) who made the decision to tow the vessel to Dampier?
- (3) If yes to (1), who carried out that assessment?
- (4) Were safety concerns raised by crew members over the decision to tow the vessel to Dampier?
- (5) If yes to (4), were these concerns addressed by the company?

- (6) If no to (5), were all or some of the crew members stood down and replaced?
- (7) If yes to (5), did all of the same crew members operate the BKM 102 during the towing operation?
- (8) If no to (7) —
 - (a) who operated the BKM 102; and
 - (b) how many crew members were on board the vessel during the towing operation?
- (9) Was the Dampier Port Authority notified by the operators of the BKM 102 that a damaged vessel was entering the port prior to the vessel entering port limits?
- (10) If yes to (9), when was this notification received?
- (11) If no to (9), why not?
- (12) Was permission sought or acquired from Department of Transport prior to the movement of the holed BKM 102?
- (13) If no to (12), why not?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

The Department of Transport advises:

- (1) Yes
 - (2) Not applicable
 - (3) Bureau Veritas.
 - (4) None that the Department of Transport is aware of.
 - (5) Not applicable
 - (6) The Department of Transport has no authority to deal with employment issues and has no information on this matter.
 - (7)-(8) Not applicable
 - (9) No
 - (10) Not applicable
 - (11) The Dampier Port Authority is not aware of the reasons behind the decision not to notify the Harbour Master or Chief Executive Officer, as required under the Port Authorities Regulations 2001, Part 2 Division 2 Regulation (9) Subregulation (1)(a). The vessel owner has been reminded of their obligation to comply with this regulation.
 - (12) No
 - (13) There is no requirement to notify the Department of Transport.
-