

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Division 39: Western Australia Police, \$1 225 035 000 —

Mr I.M. Britza, Chairman.

Mrs L.M. Harvey, Minister for Police.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan, Commissioner of Police.

Mr C.J. Dawson, Deputy Commissioner (Operations).

Mr S. Brown, Deputy Commissioner (Specialist Services and Reform).

Mrs M.L. Fyfe, Assistant Commissioner.

Mr A. Kannis, Acting Executive Director.

Mr M. de Mamiel, Director of Finance.

Mr S. Hodges, Director, Strategy and Performance.

Mr G. Lord, Director, Asset Management.

Mr J. Migro, Divisional Detective Superintendent, Licensing Enforcement Division.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIRMAN: The first question goes to the member for Midland.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to the first page of the police division on page 481 and start with “Boost to Police Resources—Additional 550”. Can the minister give a breakdown of the 550 officers and when each of those officers or groups of officers will be engaged? Will any of the 550 new officers be on the beat in 2013–14? When will those officers be operational? Can I also seek an undertaking from the minister that these are over and above current police staffing numbers for police officers, auxiliary officers and other staff?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The 550 additional officers comprise 400 police officers and 150 police auxiliary officers. The 550 police officers will comprise 200 detectives, who will be based at local stations; 150 auxiliary officers; 50 officers, who will go towards a new rapid response unit south of the river; and 150 general-purpose police officers. The funding is \$282 million over four years: \$215 million towards salaries for the new officers; and on page 491, \$67 million towards accommodation and infrastructure costs under the asset investment program. The 200 detectives will assist in targeting high-volume crimes such as burglary. The 150 police auxiliary officers will be used to increase support at metropolitan stations. It is envisaged they will help to reduce the administrative burden on police officers and increase the capacity of our police officers to patrol and respond to calls for assistance from the public.

During 2013–14, the first 50 police officers will be recruited and deployed to the new rapid response unit south of the river, and their deployment is expected during the first half of 2014; and 33 police auxiliary officers will be recruited and deployed to metropolitan stations during 2013–14. This recruitment is in addition to the completion of the additional 350 police-officer program promised as part of the 2008 election commitment —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The Liberal Party actually promised 500 officers as part of its 2008 commitment!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — which is 150 police auxiliary officers and 350 police officers. We have 100 positions left from that program to recruit by the end of 2013–14 and we are on track to do that. We have allocated \$67 million over four years to expand existing facilities for the increased police resources, which includes the new police station at Ballajura, and also the expansion of existing accommodation in the various districts to ensure we have toilets, desks and accommodation for the expanded police force.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Chairman, there are parts of my question that have not been answered yet. Specifically, I would like to know when each of the 550 officers will be engaged. The minister has given figures for 2013–14, but she has not given them for the out years on a year-by-year breakdown. The police have that information and have provided it to the minister, so I ask her to provide it to the chamber.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am pleased to provide it to the chamber. For 2013–14, we will have 50 police officers as part of the new rapid response unit south of the river, and 33 of the 150 police auxiliary officers. For 2014–15, we will have 70 of the 200 detectives, 60 of the general-purpose police officers and 50 additional police auxiliary officers. For 2015–16, we are looking at another 70 detectives, another 50 general-purpose police officers and another 51 police auxiliary officers. For 2016–17, all going well, we will have another 60 detectives, another 40 general-purpose police officers and another 16 police auxiliary officers. That will give us a total of 200 additional detectives, 200 additional police officers and 150 additional police auxiliary officers.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I clarify that 116 of the promised 550 officers will not be delivered until 2016–17 and, potentially, the government could do the same as it did at the last election and engage over 100 of those officers post-March 2017 and not before the next election? If I have added the minister's figures correctly—60 plus 40 plus 16—then 116 officers are listed for recruitment in 2016–17.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member will probably recall that the 2008 election commitment was for an additional 500 police and police auxiliary officers over five years.

[5.10 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It was actually our commitment that the minister matched and she has now redefined it and pushed it out by a year. I am not going to recall what is not there to recall.

The CHAIRMAN: Member! I will accept the follow-on question but I do not want a debate across the chamber.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Thanks, Mr Chairman; quite right.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That was a five-year commitment. The first opportunity that the government had to fund that was in the 2009 budget and we are well on track to deliver that commitment. We have until 2013–14 to deliver the remaining 100 officers as part of that growth program; we remain on track and on target to deliver that and I have no reason at this point in time to suspect that we will not be able to deliver the final tranche of 116 police and police auxiliary officers in 2016–17.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister saying that she will not undertake to deliver them before March 2017?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am saying by 2016–17; we do these things in budget cycles not quarters.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The final part of my question that has not been answered is on the undertaking I sought from the minister that these numbers will be over and above any attrition or loss of any category of staffing. Can the minister assure me of that and indicate the raw numbers of staffing for each of those categories and what they will be by the end of the 2016–17 financial year?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: These numbers of additional police officers are over and above our recruitment for attrition. We have schools going through the academy that specifically recruit to cover attrition; the current rate is about 26 officers per month but I will defer to the commissioner.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have an answer to a question on notice with those exact numbers so I do not need any deferral to the commissioner on that. I am seeking assurance from the minister that these will be over and above—I think the minister has given that. Could she tell me the raw number that she is working off for each of those categories and what it will be after 550 are added?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We will have to take that on notice. I am happy to provide by way of supplementary information the number in sworn strength that can be expected by the 2016–17 financial year as a result of our growth program.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Chairman, can I clarify what I would like by way of supplementary information?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, to make more precise what the member is asking for?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is right. I would like to know the current number of police officers, the current number of auxiliary officers, the current number of all other categories of staff, and then the anticipated number in 2016–17 when 550 are added to that total number.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can provide by way of supplementary information the starting point for the growth program with sworn police officers and auxiliary police officers, and then what that number will be at the end of the growth program with the addition of the 550 as part of the growth program.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister unwilling to provide the current number of unsworn officers—that is, the members of staff who are neither auxiliary officers nor police officers—and what the number will be in 2016–17? Is that what the minister is saying she will not provide?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No; I am saying that the growth program is specific to 550 police and police auxiliary officers. I am happy to provide the starting and finishing points for the growth program. If the member wants further supplementary information about the number of public servants currently employed by police, I am happy to provide that by way of supplementary information as well.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: And, based on this budget, the number in 2016–17.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have a growth program for police officers; we do not have a growth program for public servants. I am happy to provide those figures by way of supplementary information.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister cutting public servants?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, member, I am not cutting public servants. Our election commitment was very specific—it was for 550 additional police and police auxiliary officers. I am more than happy to provide the member with the current number of public servants by way of supplementary information. I am happy to provide the number of public servants, sworn police officers and police auxiliary officers currently employed by WA Police, and the predicted increase in the number of sworn police officers and police auxiliary officers as a result of the growth program by 2016–17.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I seek one bit of clarification?

The CHAIRMAN: One last follow-on question to this.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Given that the minister cannot, or will not, tell me the anticipated number of public servants in 2016–17, can she tell me what they were in 2008 before the 200 from the last election promise were added?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can provide the information for the sworn FTEs in 2008 and sworn FTEs at the current date. I am happy to provide that as part of the supplementary information.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Does the minister mean unsworn officers? She means unsworn, I think.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, unsworn public servants.

The CHAIRMAN: We should be able to glean from *Hansard* exactly what is required in those numbers.

[*Supplementary Information No A34.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Chairman, can I seek some clarification from you?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister undertook to provide two separate lots of supplementary information. Have two numbers or one been allocated for supplementary information?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I allocated one number; but if you would prefer that two supplementary numbers are allocated to those —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I understood that that was what the minister committed to.

The CHAIRMAN: I take the second number to be the civilian numbers.

[*Supplementary Information No A35.*]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have a follow-on question from that of the shadow minister for police. The actual commitment by the government was not necessarily 550 additional officers—it was for the recruitment of 720 police officers over the next four years. That commitment was made during the election campaign, and the minister is saying that she believes she can recruit 720 police officers over the next four years. I was a party to the 2008 promise of 500 police officers over five years and certainly, as the member for Midland has said, it was to match the number the then Labor government had promised. My concern is that we have not matched that commitment at all. I know there is a graduation on Friday, but I would like some figures of actual police officers in 2008 when we took over government, because we were only in government for two years —

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear a question and I can ask you to refer to a budget page.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am just following on from the one that the member for Midland mentioned.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to page 481.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, it is a follow-on question, Mr Chairman, that I think has great significance.

The CHAIRMAN: Get to the question then.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The question is: how can the minister possibly guarantee that she is going to recruit 720 police officers over the next four years when we have not been able to recruit 500 police officers over the past five years? That is my question. Would the minister please provide by way of supplementary information the number of sworn police officers in September 2008 when we took government, and the number of sworn police officers—I am happy to include auxiliary officers—at today's date? Can I also have by way of supplementary information the number of public servants in WA Police in September 2008 and the number of public servants

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

today? We promised 200 public servants to support police officers as well. Can I have that by way of supplementary information?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like to answer the member's question. He referred —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: You would like to ask me a question? By all means!

[5.20 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member referred to the figure of 720 and it is important that I address that. At the time of the election campaign, we had 170 left to recruit in the program of 2008 to recruit 500. We have now recruited 70 of those and we have 100 remaining of that commitment. At the time of that policy document going out to the community, we had 720 police and police auxiliary officers to recruit. We now have 650 because we have recruited 70 of that 2008 tranche. I am more than happy to provide by way of supplementary information the sworn police officer strength and the public servant strength within the police department as at the date of the election in September 2008, what those figures are now and what they will be as a result of the new growth program of this government.

[*Supplementary Information No A36.*]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is because I want to know the number there now. The minister will attend the graduation ceremony on Friday. Those officers have already been counted in the numbers. That happened when they signed up to become police officers. They have been training for six months; they are sworn police officers. They will simply graduate on Friday. They would be included in that number. That is why, if we have the number at today's date, it will virtually give us a 99.9 per cent true comparison with the number we should have after being in government for five years. I was party to that announcement; that is what I am saying.

Dr A.D. BUTI: If or when the government meets the target of an additional 550 police officers and auxiliary officers, what will be the projected ratio of police officers to population at that time compared with the number today? Will it be one police officer to 1 000 people? What is the ratio of police officers to population today, and what will be the ratio if the minister achieves the additional 550 police officers?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Unfortunately, without the benefit of a crystal ball, I cannot predict the population of Western Australia. I understand where the —

Dr A.D. BUTI: The minister has estimations; come on.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Can I answer the member's question? The police-to-population ratio is one of the measures used to compare jurisdictions on whether the number of police officers is right for the population centres. That is one of the tools that police use. In putting to the community the commitment of this government to increase our police numbers and police auxiliary numbers by 550, we did not do that in the context of a police-to-population ratio; we did that in the context of what we saw was a commitment that we could realistically achieve.

Dr A.D. BUTI: That is not my question, though. My question can be answered by way of supplementary information. The government would, of course, have projected the population increase for the next four or five years. It bases its budgets and forward estimates on that. Bearing in mind projected population increases in the state of Western Australia, when the minister says that she will achieve 550 additional police officers, what will be the ratio of police to population?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the commissioner to respond to that question, but those are not figures that we analyse and collect. As far as I am aware, the police department does not collect and analyse those figures. That figure of a predicted police-to-population ratio in the context of the growth program, whatever the population of the state may be in 2016–17, is not, to my knowledge, a figure that we have at our fingertips. But I will ask the commissioner —

Dr A.D. BUTI: Does the minister have the current ratio?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the commissioner to elaborate on whether we routinely keep those figures and keep track of that.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: We do have a current ratio, but I am just checking to see whether we have the current ratio.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We can certainly provide that by way of supplementary information. I do not think we should do those calculations in this place. I am prepared to provide, by way of supplementary information, the existing police-to-population ratio for the state.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Dr A.D. BUTI: Is the minister honestly telling me that she cannot provide the expected ratio in four or five years?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Member —

Dr A.D. BUTI: The government does it for education.

The CHAIRMAN: Hold on, member for Armadale. If you have asked the minister a question, I would like to hear the minister's answer.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am prepared to provide the existing police-to-population ratio based on the information that we have available at the moment, but, no, I am not prepared to provide a prediction of what —

Dr A.D. BUTI: The minister is not prepared or she cannot?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am not prepared to predict the population of the state in 2016–17 and what the police —

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is phenomenal. The state government does not know the estimated population —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Treasury has a prediction; it is in the budget papers.

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is absolutely phenomenal.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has told us that she will provide the numbers for the current time.

[*Supplementary Information No A37.*]

Mrs G.J. GODFREY: I refer to the spending changes table on page 482 of the budget papers, and in particular the police and community youth centres funding. Can the minister please outline the allocation the government has provided for police and community youth centres across Western Australia?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am very pleased to answer the member's question. We have committed \$10.25 million over this budget period for PCYCs. Police and community youth centres are a very important part of our strategy on crime prevention. We have put \$250 000 towards some consultancy work with the Western Australian Federation of Police and Community Youth Centres. That is to assist it to achieve the reforms consistent with the review that we initiated into the PCYC program late last year. The Federation of Police and Community Youth Centres has now been operating for over 71 years. It is a very important part of youth services in Western Australia. During that time it has provided programs and activities for young people, young offenders and young people at risk of offending. Peter Browne, JP, conducted the review in December 2012, and that review came up with a range of recommendations that the government and, indeed, the commissioner have adopted. We have put \$10 million towards an infrastructure fund to assist PCYCs to refurbish and upgrade their existing centres, but also to increase their capacity to work with young offenders in areas in which they do not presently have a footprint. We have identified a need for the federation to seek the services of an external organisation or an appropriate government organisation to develop the financial expertise to transition from its past history of management in police to the future, which will be civil management as a not-for-profit agency. The goal is to ensure that the federation has the capacity to continue to deliver its very high-quality youth services, but it needs to deliver those services in concert with other agencies and also develop a contemporary and businesslike manner in the way in which it delivers those services and the consistency with which it delivers them across the state.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer the minister to the line item "CCTV Network" under the spending changes on page 481. There is \$200 000 in the 2013–14 budget. At the recent election, there was reference in the Liberal Party election promises to a \$5 million crime prevention infrastructure fund and capital grants for CCTV infrastructure. I am wondering where I will be able to find the \$5 million.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for raising the CCTV program. We have a Liberal Party 2013 election commitment for building a better CCTV network. That was based on doing an assessment of our CCTV program. Since September 2008, the government has approved funding of \$2.96 million for the implementation of 88 CCTV projects in local government.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am asking about the future and how it compares with the Liberal Party's commitment.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is in addition to our \$7.4 million Public Transport Authority CCTV network and our monitoring room, which has given us monitoring capacity of 1 363 cameras.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have a point of order. The minister appears to read out just general information on the topic that I ask a question about rather than addressing the question that I ask. I would ask the minister to

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

respond to the question that is asked, rather than reading out some history of what the Liberal Party did in government over the past five years.

[5.30 pm]

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, member. I ask the minister to address the member's question.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I was trying to set the context of the strategy. The member is quite right. Over the four years, \$5 million will go towards an ongoing crime prevention infrastructure fund, which will focus on closed-circuit television infrastructure, and \$8.5 million will be spent to enhance the police facility at Maylands. We want to build capacity at Maylands so that it can access live feeds from compatible CCTV systems. We want to resource a dedicated police CCTV project team so that we can better use CCTV as a crime prevention tool and to improve police response times. This year, we have funded \$200 000 for the planning and development of our state's CCTV strategic plan. Once that planning and development of the strategic plan have been done, we will go back to Treasury with a business plan that will detail how we will implement the remainder of that funding.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Given that the Liberal Party promise was very specific—\$5 million would be provided over the next four years for that CCTV fund—why is the money not in the budget? It is not as though the government has to spend \$200 000 to work out what it will cost to do something. The government gave a commitment to put \$5 million into a community fund, but it is not in the budget. Did the minister make a budget bid and lose? Why is it not there?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There were three aspects to the commitment. The first aspect was to develop a state CCTV strategic plan. That plan does not exist. The \$200 000 in this budget is for the development of that strategic plan. We need a strategic plan because over time CCTV has been funded by federal, state and local governments. There is also a Blue Iris program that catalogues CCTV cameras in the community that may be available to police for investigative purposes. I looked at all of that and thought we could get a better bang for our buck with the taxpayer spend. If we have a strategic plan that details how the CCTV infrastructure is best invested, it will be a very good tool that will also inform the decisions of local and federal governments when the tranches of funding come through. This year's funding is \$200 000 for the strategic plan for the CCTV network. Once that strategic plan is in place, we will prepare a business case for cabinet for the \$5 million over four years for the crime prevention infrastructure fund, for the CCTV infrastructure and for the \$8.5 million to enhance the police facility at Maylands.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: To clarify, of the \$13.5 million pledged as a Liberal Party election commitment in March, only \$200 000 is in the budget.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is the first year of four years of government.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: There is nothing in the out years.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, there is not; I have explained why it is not there. We are putting \$200 000 towards the strategic plan. Once that plan is in place, the remainder of the commitment will come into the budget. We remain committed to the initiative. The funding will be considered in future budget processes.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is an unfunded election commitment —

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, do you have a question?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I want the minister to clarify whether this is an unfunded election commitment for which the minister will make a budget bid in future years to maybe get a better bang for our buck—to quote the minister—and maybe do it for less. Is that what the minister is suggesting or does she remain committed to the \$13.5 million pledge?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, I am suggesting that we start with the strategic plan. We have put \$200 000 in this budget towards the development of the state's CCTV strategic plan. Once that strategic plan is developed, and we have a business case to put to cabinet, it will go to cabinet and the remainder of that funding will appear in future budget submissions.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have always been a very huge fan of CCTV, as many people would know. During the election campaign there was a promise that \$13.5 million would be spent on more CCTV cameras and the establishment of a state CCTV strategic plan. I have heard all the stuff about \$200 000 for the development of the strategic plan, but what has been done so far to develop that plan and when will it be made public?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: So far in developing the strategic plan, this budget provides an allocation of \$200 000 for the development of the plan. Once the plan is developed, it will be made a public document and that will inform

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

the business case and the allocation of the remainder of the funding commitment, which the government remains committed to and which it will deliver over the next four years.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister cannot show me anywhere in the budget papers the \$13.5 million that was part of the promise made. Another promise that was made was that all the government's election promises were fully funded, but there is no funding whatsoever in this budget. Am I right in saying that there is nothing in the forward estimates, because anything that appears in the forward estimates would go onto the state debt?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No. The member will find in this budget \$200 000 for developing the state CCTV strategic plan. Once that plan has been developed, the business case will be put to cabinet for the remainder of the funding. It is a funding commitment that we made to the community that we said we would deliver over the four years of government. We remain committed to deliver that project.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I accept what the minister is saying.

The CHAIRMAN: The member has one last follow-up question.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is my question. If the government is that committed, why has the minister not put some money in the forward estimates to cover it? The government promised \$13.5 million. All the minister has come up with is \$200 000, which, quite frankly, is not good enough. I do not believe that is keeping the election promise made by the minister and the Premier. There should be money in the forward estimates that adds up to \$13.5 million. Why did the government come up with the figure of \$13.5 million? Did the minister pick that figure out of the air? The minister must have had some sort of analysis of what the government would need to have for the CCTV cameras and the strategic plan and everything else. That is a lot of money, yet there is nothing in these budget papers to show where it is coming from. I believe that if it were put in the budget papers, it would simply increase state debt. Am I right in saying that if that money is put in the forward estimates, it will show up as an increase in state debt? The minister might want to get advice on that. It is important that she answer this one.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for his advice. What I can tell him is that the way the commitment has been put together and the way we will fund the commitment is to first establish a strategic plan.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Why did you not do that before —

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, member for Midland! The minister is answering the question.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The remainder of the commitment will be delivered over the four years of this government. I want to clarify that on numerous occasions in this place the Premier has said that when a business plan is developed, put to cabinet and approved, the funding will be appear in the budget and in the out years. In the absence of a strategic plan for CCTV, we have provided \$200 000 in the budget to fund the strategic plan. Once that plan is developed, we will have a business case. We will take that business case to cabinet, and we will deliver on our commitment over the four years of government.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I have a further question to that question and then I have my substantive question.

Effectively, no community in Western Australia will get CCTV before the end of this year under the promise made in March. That is the reality.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The crime prevention infrastructure fund, which was the election commitment, includes developing a strategic plan —

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No, no—the minister has already said that.

The CHAIRMAN: Member!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am asking a specific question.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a follow-on question.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No. It is the same question, but the minister is continuing to use the same answer of \$200 000. I am not interested in that. What I am asking is this: is it true that through the minister's promise made at the March election, it is not possible or it is unlikely that any community that the government promised would have CCTV installed will get it by the end of the financial year, which is halfway through next year? There is no money in the budget for this financial year except the \$200 000 for planning. It is a straight answer—it is either yes or no.

[5.40 pm]

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member is correct. There is \$200 000 in there for the strategic plan, and the funding for the remainder of the CCTV infrastructure and the enhancement of the facility at Maylands will be delivered over the four years of this government. We remain committed to the program and the funding will be considered in future budget processes.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I refer to the table on page 482 of budget paper No 2, under the heading “Spending Changes”, and the four royalties for regions line items. I assume that the first one is for the regional police incentives program. What is the total cost of the regional police incentives program? When will the program be implemented?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The regional police incentives program is a 2013 commitment to provide \$10.5 million in incentives to police officers who are working in hard-to-fill regional locations. That funding is distinct from the traditional district allowance payments made to police officers. The funding will come via royalties for regions and the member can see from the budget papers that \$10.5 million will be divided between \$2.5 million for 2013–14; \$2.5 million for 2014–15; \$2.75 million for 2015–16; and \$2.75 million for 2016–17. It is going to be used over four years as part of our strategy for placing and retaining officers in regional centres that have traditionally been hard to fill or centres that, for various different reasons, become difficult to fill. The program will soon be underway; we have basically been awaiting the budget process to start the implementation of it. At this point, we envisage that the payments for officers will be backdated to 1 July 2013.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Will the regional incentives package be renewed or renegotiated at any stage through the forward estimates?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: At this time, the commitment through the royalties for regions program is for \$10.5 million over four years from 2013 to 2017. Obviously, as we near the end of that period, we will look at the success of the program and assess whether it is still required and actually doing what we wanted it to do, which is to help us to attract good officers to those regional centres and to keep them there for longer periods of time.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Just a final question on regional incentives, but also the total employees of the department. How many 457 visa holders are there, either sworn officers and/or other police service staff? That is the first question.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: None.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: None? I thank the minister; I have no further questions.

Mr C.D. HATTON: I refer to page 482 of budget paper No 2, under the heading “Spending Changes”, and the line item “Out-of-Control Gatherings Bill 2012”. What steps is WA Police taking to address out-of-control parties?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for the question. Out-of-control, rowdy gatherings had become a significant problem across the suburbs of Perth. To meet the growing number of out-of-control gatherings, we have committed to funding of \$7.26 million over five years. Of that, \$1.51 million in 2013–14 is to expand the current dog squad operation by an additional nine dogs, which also includes the associated staff, vehicles, equipment and running costs. It also provides the running costs for the deployment of two police transport vehicles. The government also provided capital funding of \$1.62 million last year to purchase and fit out two transport vehicles for the purpose of dog transport. They have now been fitted out and deployed across the metropolitan area. Between 15 December 2012 and 20 July 2013, 573 people were apprehended and processed by the police transport vehicles. Three of the nine dogs have now been recruited and are undergoing training. An additional three police officers have been recruited for the dog squad, and cabinet also approved drafting of amendments to the Criminal Code and the Criminal Investigation Act in respect of nuisance social gatherings. Amended provisions were drafted for the Criminal Code to outline a range of activities that could give rise to the offence of failing to take reasonable steps to avoid a social gathering becoming a nuisance to neighbours and the local community. We have also amended the Criminal Investigation Act 2006 to give police the power to enter a place, either private or public, or vehicles, to issue an order to cease and disperse and to also prevent the continuance or renewal of a breach of the peace, and to issue directions or take reasonable measures to secure a property and restore order. We have also made a provision allowing a court, when convicting an offender, to impose on the offender a requirement that it decides is necessary to ensure that the offender behaves in a more desirable manner. The order would not reduce a sentence, because the sentence would already have been brought down, but a breach of an order can incur a penalty of \$12 000 or 12 months’ imprisonment.

All in all, I think the response to the out-of-control gatherings legislation has been positive. Certainly, police are managing out-of-control gatherings to greater effect as a result of the new legislation, and also as a result of

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

having new transport vehicles that can transport up to 14 people from out-of-control gatherings to a place where they can be processed. They have proved to be very effective in helping to disperse such gatherings.

Mr C.D. HATTON: The out-of-control gatherings legislation seems to have been successful. Is the minister also saying that the two transport vehicles and, I think, two dog transport vehicles are sufficient and effective?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: They are part of the program; we still have some more dogs to recruit and train. Not every puppy is the right kind of puppy or has the right kind of temperament to be turned into a general purpose police dog, but we have had 16 parties declared out of control, and only one of them had been registered with police prior to the declaration. The member will be happy to know that none of them was in his electorate! They have occurred in a number of areas: Mandurah, Rockingham, Armadale, Canning Vale, Clarkson and Belmont—member for Belmont! What we can say is that the police are now far better able to respond to out-of-control gatherings, given the additional equipment and better legislation to allow them to enforce public order.

Mr C.D. HATTON: I have one more follow-on question. Is there any evidence to show a cultural demographic for these parties?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No. I might ask the commissioner to comment on this, but as it happens, it seems to me that there is no particular ethnic group that chooses to have a party that becomes out of control and mismanaged. I will let the commissioner respond as to whether he has determined any particular trend; I think it might be linked more to age than cultural demographics.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: I think the minister is correct. There is no particular demographic that stands out above any others in the noisy or out-of-control party issue; we have not really done any research on that, so there has been no really accurate modelling done on that. The age demographic is probably the most interesting, and it is usually sub-22, sub-23, down to adolescents, I suppose, who would make up the bulk of the people we deal with in those circumstances. But there certainly is not one ethnic group that stands above the others. In fact, a lot of those parties are quite mixed; there are a lot of different people at them.

[5.50 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Chairman, can I ask a follow-up question?

The CHAIRMAN: You have a follow-up question, member for Hillarys?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, and then I have another question, but I would like to follow up on this one if I may; it is a very short one. We were talking about the dog squad, and a year ago the Premier and the minister announced that the government would allocate \$1.2 million to WA Police by 30 June this year—that is, 2013—to double operational general-purpose dog numbers from nine to 18. Is the minister saying that this money has been allocated? That is the first part; in other words, has this promise been fulfilled? What are the current numbers in the dog squad? Can the minister answer those questions first of all?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will have to refer to the commissioner to get the number of dogs in the dog squad. The commitment was to double the size of the dog squad with the general-purpose dogs —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: From nine to 18, yes.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: From nine to 18. So, of that commitment, we have three dogs working at the moment. We have six left to recruit and train, and the money is there to do that. But the issue around the dogs is in trying to get the appropriate temperament of dog for the program. I will get the commissioner —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: So poor old Rumble is having to do all the work of the missing dogs. He is a good dog—he will have to work overtime!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No. If the member likes, I could provide that by supplementary information. We would need to go back and check. We have general-purpose dogs, which are the dogs used for the out-of-control gatherings, but we also have detection dogs. We have a range of dogs that do —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, these were general-purpose dogs, and the minister and the Premier made the announcement a year ago, in June, and said the money was available—\$1.2 million—and this would be completed by June this year. The promise was made a year ago; this June it should have been completed—obviously it is not—and they were operational general-purpose dogs going from nine to 18.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: They cannot find dogs with the right temperament!

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the minister can just conclude what she was saying.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: What I will say is that that commitment has been funded. The issue we have at the moment is in recruiting the dogs, but I will get the commissioner to respond to that. It is certainly not in any way, shape or form a withdrawal of funding or a withdrawal of will that has resulted in our inability to recruit the remaining six of the nine dogs that would enable us to double the number of general-purpose dogs from nine to 18. We have three of them out working at the moment; we have six to fulfil the commitment and the money is there. I will let the commissioner talk to the issues we have in recruiting the dogs.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: So when does the minister anticipate the extra six that are missing—that poor old Rumble is having to make up for—will be in place? I would hope it would be within a year, rather than in four years' time.

The CHAIRMAN: Wait for the minister to answer, please.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the commissioner to respond.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: I think clearly we want to get them in place and we want to use them, but an ongoing problem for bringing dogs into the police force—it has been ongoing for some years now—is getting dogs that pass the test, if I can put it that way; it is quite rigorous. With a lot of them, we find out after we get them that we cannot train them; they are not suitable or their personality is not correct. There is a high failure rate. I do not think it is through any lack of funding; it is more the difficulty in getting the right number of the right dogs and getting them through training, so that is our major challenge. But we are obviously keen to get them on as soon as possible.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: When is it anticipated that they will be out there operating?

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: I do not have the exact details on that—somewhere between six and 12 months, but I could not give the member that information without going back to the dog squad and asking it. But, as I said, it is problematic, and it has been problematic for some years, trying to get the right sort of dogs out there.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can I ask the question I was going to ask?

The CHAIRMAN: No. The member for Armadale has been trying to ask a question for quite some time.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I just want to know whether the first nine dogs are all still operational.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a simple question.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide that by way of supplementary information, but my understanding is that we currently have 12 general-purpose dogs—the original nine, plus three. In the event that something untoward has happened to one of the existing contingent of nine dogs, I will provide that information by supplementary.

[*Supplementary Information No A38.*]

Dr A.D. BUTI: I refer the minister back to page 481 of the *Budget Statements* under “Spending Changes” and to the 2012-13 temporary advertising freeze and the recruitment freeze. It is stated that it is temporary, so I would like it guaranteed that that will not continue in the following years. Can the minister give us some details of the measures being taken in regard to that freeze, and how that will affect the fact that the government is trying to recruit 550 additional officers in the recruiting process itself, and then will be supporting them when they are officers?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It was 720, member.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We approved a temporary freeze on general government agencies' operating expenditure on advertising and the procurement of goods and services, consumables—for example, printer cartridges and those sorts of things—administration, communication and consultants. Services and contracts expenditure was excluded from the procurement freeze. It resulted in a \$0.46 million expense limit reduction for 2012-13 for WA Police. The impact on WA Police of the temporary advertising freeze was a reduction in the expense limit and the savings have basically been harvested from the advertising costs. There are no future impacts of the freeze, and, as I understand it, the advertising freeze has not impacted on our recruitment program.

Dr A.D. BUTI: So is the minister guaranteeing that that freeze will not continue into the following years?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, but that was a temporary freeze as part of a government initiative to look at reining in spending, which involved the advertising freeze and also the reduction in procurement—notebooks, pens and printer cartridges; those sorts of things. It is not anticipated that that is going to continue.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am also looking at page 481 of the *Budget Statements* and referring to the bottom part of the page and those cuts. This time last year we had the efficiency dividend listed there as a change, so it is obviously not a change. But just to refresh the minister's memory, the 2012-13 efficiency dividend as listed in last year's budget papers was \$21.184 million. It then went up to \$33.458 million in 2013-14, and progressively by 2015-16 it was up at \$59.56 million. I asked last year whether I could get a breakdown of whether those savings had been found, and they had not been found at that stage. Have those savings now been found, and what is the efficiency dividend component for 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The efficiency dividend for the last budget was \$28.3 million.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That was after it was added to. It was \$21.184 million at the time of the budget; then there was a further efficiency dividend, I believe.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Police have worked very hard to achieve that efficiency. It was originally \$21.2 million, and then a global savings target and procurement savings were added to that. Police have managed to harvest those savings through a range of measures around fleet rationalisation and enforcing and having far stricter adherence to the police vehicle policies. There have been some fringe benefits tax savings. We have reduced travel by 30 per cent, there has been closer attention to allowances, and police have been spending a fair bit of time looking at overtime and making sure that overtime is rigorously assessed as being required. We have looked at reducing our legal staff in-house, and looked at how much we are spending on our external legal advice. Also, there has been generally far more prudent management of stationery and consumables expenditure. We have also made some changes to the management of our impounded vehicles. A lot of impounded vehicles are now being stored at zero cost to the agency at Maylands, so we have managed to harvest some savings through that process as well.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Could the minister give me a breakdown of how the \$28 million was achieved? The minister has given me some broad headings there, but next to those broad headings could she put the savings that have been achieved? Basically, the minister says the \$28 million in savings has been achieved—I am not debating that—but exactly what are the component make-ups of the \$28 million, with the dollar amount next to it?

The CHAIRMAN: It being 6.00 pm, we will now adjourn and recommence at 7.00 pm.

Meeting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

[7.00 pm]

The CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with division 39, WA Police. Before we start, the member for Hillarys would like to make a short statement.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I would like to make a short statement to explain to the committee why I am sitting on this side of the house and particularly why I am sitting with Labor members. It is because I have been precluded by government members from sitting with government members to take part in this committee as a full committee member. I am aware that I can, as a member of Parliament, ask questions, but only, according to the rules, if everybody else has asked their questions. I have a feeling that that is not going to be the case tonight.

Mr P.T. MILES: Point of order, Mr Chairman.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Do not be clever.

The CHAIRMAN: I will take the point of order of the member.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The government does not even have three members there; there are only two of them.

The CHAIRMAN: The member wants to make a point of order. As far as I am concerned, he can make a point of order.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I would not if I were the member.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Wanneroo.

Mr P.T. MILES: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The point of order is whether it is acceptable for members to make statements during the committee hearing process.

The CHAIRMAN: I have checked this with the Clerk, who said that it was okay so long as it was very short.

Mr P.T. MILES: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Mr Chairman, you can see the problem I am having with certain Liberal committee members. The point is this: I want to put on the record that I will be lodging a complaint with the Public Sector Commissioner tomorrow about staff in the minister's office, because I was told in front of two witnesses that they have done everything they can to preclude me from being on this committee. I wanted to make that quite clear. That is why I am sitting on this side of the house with Labor members.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that, member. I seem to remember that before the dinner break the member for Midland had asked a follow-up question.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I had just asked a question. I am happy to repeat it if the minister does not recall it.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be best if the member started again.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think I recall the question.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like the member to state the question again.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I will state it succinctly. The minister advised that \$28 million worth of savings had been found in the last financial year. She gave a number of headings of areas in which savings had been found, such as fleet vehicles, FBT, travel and overtime. I asked for a breakdown, by line item, of where that \$20 million of efficiency dividends had been found. Because the efficiency dividend increases in future years, I also want to know whether those further efficiencies have been found and the details of those.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: With respect to the \$28 million of savings as a result of the efficiency requests under the previous budget, while that total has been achieved, we do not have a line item reconciliation of the areas that I mentioned, which were areas that the police were looking at in trying to come in under that revised budget total. We do not have individual line items for each and every area such as fleet savings and reducing travel by 30 per cent; that was a general overview of the areas that had been looked at by each of the agencies within the police to ensure that they found those savings and came in within the budget that they had been allocated. I cannot provide the member with a table as such. If the member puts a question on notice about savings for a particular area, we can interrogate that through the different sections of the police, collate that data and get it to the member.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I will follow on from that question about the efficiency dividend. I have already given some of the figures; for example, in last year's budget papers the efficiency dividend for 2015–16 was listed as \$59.564 million. I asked as part of that earlier question whether the minister could tell me what was the flowthrough of that, because this time last year I said the efficiency dividend was listed in the budget papers as \$21.184 million and in her answer back to me the minister referred to it as being \$21.2 million, which was simply a rounded figure; the minister obviously did not have the \$21.184 million figure given to her by Mr Kannis. Subsequent to that there were further efficiency savings, and the figure that was handed back to Treasury was \$28 million, as the minister specified. I asked just before the dinner break for the current efficiency dividend figures for 2013–14, 2014–15, 2015–16, 2016–17 and 2017–18. How much of that efficiency dividend has been identified? What is the outstanding amount in each of those years in which the agency has not been able to identify the savings at this point in time?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There is no efficiency dividend line in this budget; there is a budget allocation. The police are presently undertaking a fairly involved reform process, which is looking at ways in which we can engage to ensure that we deliver the most efficient police service we can have. We are constantly looking at ways to harvest savings and to make sure that there is no waste. When a government continues to expand a budget and continues to provide more resources and funding to an agency, as we have done with WA Police over the years that we have been in government, it is incumbent on that agency to ensure that it is delivering that service in an efficient manner. As part of the reform process, the police expect to find a more efficient way of doing business and will ensure that they can deliver that service with value for money in mind.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister can use whatever euphemism she likes—she can call it a reform process or an efficiency dividend. The fact of the matter is that WA Police is still required to make those savings as part of its budget. The global amount of the budget is listed on page 481 of the *Budget Statements*. Why will the minister not be honest with me and tell me how much money needs to be returned to Treasury this year and in each of the out years?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Is the line item the member is referring to the \$300 million global savings target?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Does that equal the efficiency dividend outlined in the Parliament this time last year or has that amount gone up or down? That is why I am asking the question. How much is WA Police coming up with every year? If the minister is saying that \$300 million is now the global amount, how is that broken down

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

year by year? Have the savings been made? Have savings been identified? If not, what are the outstanding amounts year by year?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The \$300 million global savings target, which I assume is the line item the member is talking about, is being achieved by looking at where we employ legal staff —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That has all been done this year. Further savings have to be made, so where are those further savings going to come from?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The further savings—the two to six per cent efficiency dividend—are in those general areas. The police have been given their budget, which is an increased budget from previous years, and then savings are being harvested through the range of measures I referred to earlier—we are looking at a more efficient allocation of overtime and at making sure that we judiciously spend the procurement budget for each of the areas. As I understand it —

[7.10 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: How much are the targeted savings for each of the years?

The CHAIRMAN: Follow-on question, member for Midland.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is the same question; I am just trying to get an answer.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The budget is there. The budget that the police have been allocated —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The efficiency dividend line item has been taken out. I am asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, would you allow the minister to answer the question please.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I wish she would.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am at a loss to know which line item the member is referring to. Is she referring to the total budget allocation or the appropriation? We have the global savings target, which I have explained is about looking at our legal staff.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Perhaps this will make it clearer: over what period will the government make the \$300 million global savings target, and can the minister provide a breakdown year by year? Can she answer the simple question: has she identified where she is making the cuts to achieve that global savings target?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The \$300 million global savings target is to reduce the sector-wide spend on legal services. A total of \$300 million has been allocated for 2013–14.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is government-wide, and police are a small component of that. Is that what the minister is saying?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We are reducing legal staff employed by agencies by 10 per cent, with a savings reduction of \$330 000 on legal services in 2013–14. That is the current position. WA Police has contributed \$1.36 million towards this initiative as part of its share of that \$300 million global savings target.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is not what I am talking about. I am glad we have clarified that. The amount of \$300 million is across government.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is across government.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am not asking about that; I am asking about the police budget. It is a fact that the minister has to make budget savings. She can call it efficiency dividends or whatever she likes. Last year I was not advised how the minister was going to save \$59 million by 2015–16. Has the minister identified that saving? Are those amounts the same? For example, last year I sat here and was told that the efficiency dividend was \$21 million and the minister was going to look for it. Later in the year, the Treasurer came out with a much higher figure. Then he went back a bit and it ended up at \$28 million. I want the same clarity that the member of Parliament sitting next to me gave me this time last year. I do not see why that minister could provide me with that information and this minister cannot.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the acting executive director of police, Mr Anthony Kannis, to give an answer.

Mr A. Kannis: Just to ensure that we are talking about the same numbers, last year the government's two per cent efficiency dividend was \$21.2 million. The equivalent amount for this year is \$33.5 million.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is right. That was listed in the budget papers. Last year the \$21.2 million ended up going up to \$28 million. Last year, \$33.5 million was listed in the budget papers. Is that the same this year?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr A. Kannis: The reason that the \$21.2 million got up to \$28.2 million was that it included the global savings target of \$2.8 million, procurement savings of \$2.9 million and then the FTE salary cap and salary savings requirements of \$1.3 million. That is how we got to \$28.2 million in 2012–13. The equivalent figure in 2013–14 is \$33.5 million for the two per cent to six per cent efficiency dividend and \$3.3 million for the government's \$300 million global savings targeted amount. They are in addition to the global savings target that is referred to in this year's budget.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I thank Mr Kannis for providing that information for 2013–14. I also asked whether I could have that same information for the out years of 2014–15, 2015–16 and 2016–17 if it is available. By way of example, I have stated a couple of times previously that last year we were told that \$59.5 million would need to be found in 2015–16. I want the same information that Mr Kannis provided for 2013–14 to be provided for those out years.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have allocated the police budget through the out years. Those efficiency measurements —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have asked what the numbers are; I am not asking for an explanation of what the government is doing or why. I just want the facts. I just want the numbers. This is budget estimates and I want to know about the budget. Mr Kannis clearly has the information and I am asking the minister to let him give the information to the Parliament.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have no objection to Mr Kannis giving the information to the Parliament. The efficiency dividend that the member is referring to that was in last year's budget is not a line item in this year's budget. The budgets have been allocated and agencies are required to continue to look for an efficient way of delivering the service. Within police, we have some targets that we want to achieve and we will go to work on achieving some of them. Some of them will be achieved around recurrent spending. Mr Kannis can certainly advise on the proposed efficiency savings target for police that we are looking at in the out years. In the context of our reform program and everything else that we have going, once we start getting past this year's budget, we are looking at a different environment and a different set of budget papers next year.

Mr A. Kannis: Is the member asking for the savings measures that we are proposing to implement for 2013–14?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am asking for the global amounts. Mr Kannis advised the Parliament that in 2013–14, the figure was \$33.5 million plus the \$3.3 million that he referred to. I want those same figures for 2014–15, 2015–16 and 2016–17.

Mr A. Kannis: The equivalent figure in 2014–15 is \$46.4 million on top of \$3.5 million for the global savings target, which comes to \$49.9 million. In 2015–16, the figure is \$59.6 million plus \$3.5 million for the global savings target, which comes to \$63.1 million. In 2016–17, it is \$68 million plus \$3.5 million, which comes to \$71.5 million.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Just referring to the capital works, when can we expect Cockburn and Mundijong police stations and the western suburbs hub to be completed and ready for operation?

[7.20 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have gone back to re-scope Cockburn police station because we have had to relocate the Fremantle district office. The Fremantle complex had problems with asbestos and a range of other issues so we had to move our district team out of the Fremantle office. We have gone back to the drawing board with the Cockburn police station. We are revising that project to basically make it a bit bigger and aiming to potentially relocate the Fremantle district administration unit in Cockburn. The land acquisition for Cockburn has commenced. The 2013–14 planned expenditure is \$670 000 and the estimated cost of the project at the moment is \$20.49 million. I refer to page 490 of the budget papers. We envisage that Cockburn will be finished by the end of 2016–17 and, as the member can see, the bulk of the funding will come in in 2015–16. Mundijong Police Station has the potential to accommodate 20 FTEs. There has been quite a lot of growth in that corridor so we need that facility there. It is funded to \$8.02 million and has been approved as part of this budget process. We have planned expenditure of \$3.22 million for 2013–14 and that facility is expected to be completed in 2015. I think the member had one other question.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: There is \$25 million for the western suburbs hub; I can read the budget papers, but there is nothing for it for the next few years. What is the commitment to that; is the government really going to do it; and, if so, when will it be completed?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We anticipate the commencement of the western suburbs hub to be in 2016–17.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Why is there a delay?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We expected that project to be completed by the end of 2018.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I make the point that the member for Cottesloe was critical in about 2001–02 that we were not getting on and building it. Why is that taking so long, especially given the Premier made a commitment to it more than five years ago and said that it would be built within two years?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have reprioritised our asset investment. The issue with the Fremantle district office and the fact we have had to relocate that administrative centre in leased premises have meant we have had to prioritise other works ahead of the western suburbs police station, but we remain committed to it. We anticipate it will be completed by 2018.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is not the real fact that the government just did not get the money in the budget for it? Are there any real practical reasons for why it has been planned for about 17 years now and the Liberal Party has been in government for the past five years and keeps promising it and not delivering it? Is the real problem that the government is in too much debt and it cannot afford to build the station?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the commissioner to comment on this. We look at our asset investment program for police and, as time goes on, we need to reprioritise things for various reasons. For example, a bad tender came in for the western metropolitan district accommodation upgrade well above what that project had been scoped at and we had to go back to the drawing board for that. The upgrade of the police stations has gone out to a tender process again. We want to deliver these projects while ensuring that we get good value for money from the taxpayer spend. In addition, on occasion, other areas become a priority.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: How does the minister know that?

The CHAIRMAN: Member!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: With the western suburbs police station —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That will be beyond this term of government; the minister may not deliver it at all.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Police officers who would be operating from the western suburbs police station are currently housed in acceptable accommodation. We need to reprioritise our expenditure as we see fit.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is the same accommodation the Premier repeatedly said was substandard.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like the commissioner to respond about the way we prioritise our asset investment program. We have an asset reinvestment program and we work quite closely on ensuring that we invest on an as-needs basis in the priority areas where we have growth in numbers and requirements for police officers to be accommodated, so that they can do the job of policing most effectively.

Mr K.J. O’Callaghan: The minister has already referred to Fremantle Police Station, which is our second-largest facility in the metropolitan area. As the member is probably aware, about 18 months ago we were advised that it required a substantial amount of work to the roof alone at a cost of about \$12 million. At that stage, a decision had to be made about whether we invested in a building that was already aging, difficult and probably not up to modern policing standards, or we moved off that site altogether and came up with an alternative. Given that the Fremantle complex is probably the single-most important station we have after the Northbridge complex, it forced us to reconsider the size of the Cockburn facility as well. As the member is probably aware, Fremantle police are in leased accommodation for the time being and that needs to be resolved. From my perspective, some of the discussions we have been having are about reprioritising the capital investment program so that we can deal with that matter first.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is a matter of the government having limited money in the capital works budget; it cannot do everything and it has to prioritise. I expect, minister, that the answer to my question about there not being enough money available is that the real reason it is not proceeding is that the government is running up so much debt. While I am on that topic —

The CHAIRMAN: This is a further question, since the member answered the first question herself.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: On police stations, during the election campaign, the Liberal Party promised a 24/7 station in Ballajura. I cannot see it. What has happened with that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We were pretty clear in the election commitment that the Ballajura police station would form part of the \$67 million program for accommodation as part of our growth program. Ballajura is referred to.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is there a line item on page 490?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think under “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency” there is a reference. On page 491 there is reference to “Police Facilities—New and Replacement Police Facilities Boost to Police Resources—

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Accommodation Infrastructure Upgrades”. There is \$7 million of that coming in 2013–14, with \$20 million a year allocated in the out years.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: How much will the Ballajura station cost?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commitment in the election campaign for Ballajura was for \$12.5 million, from memory, and it was very specific at the time that that commitment would come from the \$67 million infrastructure program to house the additional boost of 550 officers to police resources.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister give us a breakdown of the \$67 million? The minister said that so much refers to Ballajura. What other replacement police facilities, boost to police resources and accommodation infrastructure upgrades does that \$67 million refer to? I would have thought there would be some mention of Ballajura police station. It was an election promise, and it certainly looks as though it has not been kept.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We were very specific that Ballajura police station would be funded as part of the \$67 million boost for the police facility. It was very specific in the policy document that that \$12.5 million approximate allocation for the Ballajura police station would come from the \$67 million. The remainder of that amount is flexible within the police budget. There will be an expansion of some police facilities.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister tell us by way of supplementary information what they are? The minister cannot just pick a figure out of the air. I want to know what that \$67 million will be spent on. I would have thought Ballajura was a line item, as are the Mt Magnet, Mundijong, west metropolitan and western suburbs facilities. We are talking about a substantial police station. That must be the major part of the \$67 million. I want to know what that \$67 million is being allocated to, and I think it is quite reasonable to ask that.

[7.30 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is not an unreasonable question at all, member. As I said, \$12.5 million of that \$67 million will go towards Ballajura. I will let the police commissioner answer. We have not worked out as yet or allocated the entire \$67 million through the out years.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What makes the minister come up with \$67 million? Why not \$70 million?

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys, could you let the minister answer, please.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like an opportunity to actually answer. I was going to defer to the commissioner to answer that. We also have here Mr Gary Lord from our assets area who will be able to give the member an idea of where some of that money will be allocated and where those accommodation upgrades may be expected. We expect that the accommodation upgrades will most likely be needed in the outer metropolitan area, which is where we have growth, but I will let the commissioner answer.

Mr K.J. O’Callaghan: The \$67 million really refers to the extra accommodation requirements that would be required to house the extra 550 police officers. We have to increase capacity if we are going to employ that many police officers.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We are not going to put them all in Ballajura, commissioner, for sure!

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys, would you let the commissioner answer, please.

Mr K.J. O’Callaghan: There is a whole range of issues. We are currently going through a reform process. As the member knows, last week we announced a change in the policing model in response to the south east metropolitan district. As we go through that reform process, it will require us to rethink some of the accommodation. The member will know that we put 50 extra officers into the south east metropolitan district. As part of that, we have to refurbish Armadale Police Station. There will be a lot of other changes, but we have not advised the government exactly what those changes will need to be yet, until we have been through the reform process and had an audit of exactly where we need to make those changes. To give an example, if we increase the number of rapid response units, such as the regional operations group, we will need accommodation for them south of the river. That accommodation needs to be factored in; we need to work out what style of accommodation we need, where it is going to be, what leasing arrangements fall out of doing that sort of work and the refurbishment arrangements. So it is pretty early days for us yet in advising the government exactly where we want to spend that money, but some of the money has already been allocated to Armadale Police Station and we have announced that publicly. Some other work will be progressing shortly.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can I ask how much is going to Armadale Police Station? I am asking for a breakdown of the \$67 million. The minister does not just pick \$67 million out of the air. Even if it is on the back of an envelope, the minister must have some idea where she will spend the \$67 million. That is what I am asking. The minister must have something. That is what I want to know.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am happy to answer the member's question. If the member turns to page 201 of budget paper No 3, he will see that increased police resources is referenced there and states —

An additional \$67 million will be spent from 2013–14 to 2016–17 to build a new Police Station in Ballajura and expand existing facilities to accommodate increased police resources.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What page is this?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is page 201 of budget paper No 3. In the policy document that we released, we said —

Some of the areas the money will go to include: —

That is in reference to the \$67 million —

- \$12.5million to build a new purpose-built police station for Ballajura
- Capacity upgrades focusing on the East Metropolitan, North-West Metropolitan, South-East Metropolitan and Peel districts, which include stations such as Armadale, Canning Vale, Gosnells, Forrestfield, Ellenbrook, Clarkson and Mandurah.

I will ask our director of asset management, Mr Gary Lord, about it. In calculating the \$67 million, there is a calculation that is done by asset management around the approximate cost of accommodation for police officers. I defer to Mr Lord to further explain how that calculation is done by police.

Mr G. Lord: I have just been advised by Mr de Mamiel as well that it is budget paper No 2.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the adviser tell us which paper he is looking at? He is saying budget paper No 1 —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, I said —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister was saying page 201, and I thought it was budget paper No 3.

Mr G. Lord: It is budget paper No 3; sorry.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is budget paper No 3.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I was looking at that one and then somebody else said, “No, it's budget paper No 1.”

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is on page 201.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister tell me where it says anything about Ballajura police station?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There is a table at the top and then there are the headings “Western Australia Police” and “Asset Investment Program Review”.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Under the heading “Increased Police Resources”, there is specific mention of the new police station at Ballajura forming part of the \$67 million allocation. I will get Mr Lord to talk about how we arrived at the \$67 million figure that police use when looking at the cost of accommodating police officers in stations.

Mr G. Lord: When we are looking at accommodation, we look at square metreage, which is a government standard for accommodation. The administration size is 15 square metres per person; however, for police, we work on around 18 to 20 square metres per person. Without knowing the full extent of where all those stations will be expanded or built, we have applied the government size, which is then adapted to the police building code of about 18 to 20 square metres per person and then we use the government rate on that. Basically, we came up with a figure and some of that figure has been already nominated for Ballajura, but, as we say, we will define the others closer to the time when the police review is finished and we have a firm position on the new policing model and where those resources need to deploy from.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: So Ballajura may not happen. Can Mr Lord answer that? Is he saying that Ballajura may not happen—it depends on the review?

Mr G. Lord: No, I did not; I said that Ballajura had been nominated within the \$67 million. I am saying that the remainder is not.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Lord is reiterating what is on page 201 of budget paper No 3; that is, the Ballajura station will be built as part of the \$67 million infrastructure program.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Next year, will we expect to see Ballajura police station properly listed under the heading “Works in Progress”, which is a standard heading in the budget papers? Page 490 of the budget papers

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

has “Works in Progress” and it lists the police stations that are in progress. Clearly, Ballajura station is not in progress; otherwise, it would be listed there. It is listed under the global amount of \$67 million, and the minister referred to that budget paper. I do not want to discuss that. All I would like to know is, given that only \$7 million is available and that also has to house the 550 officers, according to the commissioner, when will we see the Ballajura police station commence? What kind of staffing complement does the minister anticipate it will have?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I do not have in front of me the commitment for the Ballajura police station as we put it out to the community. The government remains committed to the project. Obviously, we need to go to work on the procurement of land; no land has been allocated as part of that. But there will be available land in and around Ballajura, I am sure, where we would expect to put a resource such as this. Similarly with Cockburn, the work has been done at Cockburn; the land is being held aside and we are in the process of acquiring land —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The former minister allocated the land there. I am specifically asking about the timetable for Ballajura.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The \$2 million for site acquisition and design will go in 2014–15. Our commitment was to commence construction at Ballajura in 2015–16. As part of that commitment, the station will be a modern facility, consistent with all our other police facilities and with the police building code. It will be far better than the 2009 shopfront that was closed because it was an inappropriate facility for police officers to operate from. We have made that commitment; it has gone out to the community. We said that we will pay for it out of the \$67 million that we have allocated for the accommodation upgrades to house additional officers. It will operationally hold whatever complement of officers the commissioner decides is required at the time that it is constructed, and that will depend on the demand profiling done for that precinct at the time of construction.

[7.40 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Why is it different from Morley where the Liberal Party made a commitment to the number of officers? Why did the minister do that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commitment for Morley, as I recall it, was for an upgrade of the facility. We are proposing to put in more female toilets at Morley. It is not a very modern facility and additional space is needed. We want to build some capacity into Morley so that, with the upgrade, it will potentially have the capacity to accommodate 80 police officers.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: But that was the commitment. Was the commitment to have 80 officers there?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, the commitment was for an upgrade to Morley Police Station. A caveat I would like to put over accommodation and the way we build our police stations is that, through the reform program, we are having a look at the way police officers are accommodated and what their requirements are. With technology, so much policing is now done through our vehicles. The information and communications technology systems in the vehicles allow police to operate in a much more mobile fashion and there is less of a requirement for them to be behind desks in police stations. With the reform program, we are trying to build and streamline the processes around policing so that there is less of a requirement for desks and more police officers in vehicles out on the streets. The way we build our stations therefore in future as a result of the reform program may in fact change over time.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Chairman, I would just like an answer to my question. I asked the minister whether next year we would see “Ballajura Police Station” under the heading “Works in Progress” or whether it would be kept continually under the heading “Boost to Police Resources—Accommodation Infrastructure”, which the Commissioner of Police has said is mainly to house 550 police officers.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I said in the media release that \$2 million will go towards site acquisition and design in 2014–15. The member will see that in the budget when we determine the location for that proposal.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: If the minister is dinkum, it has to go there. Does the minister understand that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I understand that the member says that but —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is true.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — that will appear as a line item in the budget when we determine where the site will be.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I have a question following on from the question on works in progress and specifically on police stations. I note the minister’s statement earlier that the works in progress at Mundijong Police Station are in response to the growing population out that way. What population is projected to be in the area of that police station once the new station opens?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will defer to the commissioner, but I can say that a range of reasons sit behind the relocation of Mundijong Police Station. Some reasons are to do with wanting the site to be in a more conspicuous location. I am sorry; I have forgotten the member's question.

Mr P. PAPALIA: What population will the police station serve? The minister referred to the growing population as the justification for a new police station.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes. I think Mundijong is now part of Peel, but there is a growing population pushing out through that area, particularly around Byford where there has been a lot of subdivision development. The commissioner has more information on that for the member.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: I think that is the main pressure point for us down that way. That corridor south of Armadale in the Byford area has the growth that Mundijong Police Station services. Mundijong townsite has not increased significantly but Byford certainly has. That is why we need extra space and people there.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Which is the closest of the larger police stations near Mundijong? Are the larger ones in Armadale and Pinjarra?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the commissioner to answer that.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: The closest to Mundijong of the larger police stations is Armadale, which is a 24-hour centre; then further south is Pinjarra, which is not a 24-hour centre; and then, of course, across to Peel itself to Mandurah.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I have another follow-up question and the minister knows where I am going with this.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Join the dots!

Mr P. PAPALIA: It strikes me that the justification for the new Mundijong Police Station is incredibly similar to the justification for a police station approximately halfway between the Rockingham and Mandurah hubs. I suspect, albeit I cannot say off the top of my head, that the population in the area between Rockingham and Mandurah far exceeds that in the vicinity of Mundijong. Am I right? Is that a reasonable assessment?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I cannot speak to the population growth through those areas but I do know that there are a number of pressure points at Mundijong station and the area to which it delivers. Those operational pressure points are really best explained by the commissioner.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: I think one of the things we have chosen to do with the Mandurah area in particular, or that strip between Rockingham and Mandurah, is to go to a rapid-response team. We are therefore moving quite a number of people in regional operations groups down that way, because we want more mobility through places such as Golden Bay, Singleton and Secret Harbour—a range of them—rather than putting a police station in one of those little suburbs. We have been talking to government for some time and our preference is for more mobility and more flexibility with our resources in that particular corridor. That is why we have not been asking for a police station at Secret Harbour.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Understanding all that, a rapid response team has been located in Armadale as well, has there not?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the commissioner to answer. The rapid response group, the south metro regional operations group, that was an election commitment of the government has been looking at being located somewhere in and around the Rockingham region, and I believe we are working towards that. There were some other issues with Mundijong Police Station. Mundijong actually has a lockup that is made out of jarrah. It is very, very old. It is a really old building.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The Secret Harbour one is made out of thin air!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mundijong Police Station really is no longer fit for purpose. There are a couple of demountables at the back of Mundijong Police Station that are actually propped up on bricks.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am not criticising Mundijong getting a police station. I am just extrapolating the argument to suggest that the justification is almost identical.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think it is important to point out that the existing station at Mundijong is no longer fit for purpose.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Okay, beyond that part.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The reason for the new Mundijong Police Station is the need to build a facility there that is fit for purpose and that is fit for a modern policing environment. It is actually worth going to the current station there, knocking on the door and having a look at it. I have never seen a jarrah cell before. There are iron bars on the cell doors. Admittedly, that cell I saw is not being used by police officers at Mundijong. But the fact that it has all been cobbled together and propped up on bricks is a pretty fair indicator that it is just not fit for purpose, and that is the reason Mundijong station has been prioritised as a rebuild. In addition to the pressure points, a modern policing environment as far as policing goes is about where police officers need to be accommodated and the way that policing is changing. I think the commissioner has a little more to offer on that issue for the member.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: I think the issue with Mundijong is largely historical and has been going on for some years now. We have been complaining about the actual facility itself. It is in need of an upgrade. It is a very old facility and it is simply not fit for purpose. A lot of the work we are doing around Mundijong is bringing that station back up to modern standards. I guess if that debate had started today, knowing that we would have a new reform in process and we would be going to greater mobility in places like south east metro and the Peel district, we might not be having this discussion about Mundijong. This change in the way we are doing policing has come a lot later. I would make another point about rapid-response units in south east metro. South east metro is by far and away the busiest district in the whole of the state, as I am sure the member appreciates, and it is a stretch to get a rapid-response team south of Armadale. Typically, when they are deployed, they get tasked straightaway and so they end up getting to Gosnells and Kelmscott and never getting south of there. We are therefore keen to maintain Mundijong Police Station. But, as I say, a lot of the Mundijong issues are historical and have been around for a number of years, and we are just trying to solve the infrastructure problem there.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I have a last follow-up question on the deliberations on the location of the southern response team. How far through is the minister with that process? Is it far away before a decision is made on that team's location?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We are working on the kind of facility we need for accommodation for those officers. We are fairly close to resolving where we are going to place those officers. A final decision of government has not been made on where they will be housed, but we know we need them in or around the Rockingham area so that from there they can be easily deployed across Peel and south east metro. I will defer to Deputy Commissioner Dawson because Mr Dawson has been working on that project.

Mr C.J. Dawson: In regard to the Rockingham–Peel area we have relocated 50 officers to existing premises alongside the railway line. They are premises the member may have been familiar with previously. So, those officers are part of the regional operations group, and they have a broader responsibility, as opposed to just the railway policing elements. There is a larger reform, as has been indicated in previous responses, which will not only couple up the transport hubs, but also support the local police from both Rockingham and Peel. In addition to that, they are not precluded from further support from Perth CBD-based officers and traffic officers from Midland, who have greater mobility, in addition to those who have been located. The 50 in addition to the existing police at Rockingham and Mandurah are being accommodated at the railway premises.

[7.50 pm]

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is interesting. Have the officers who were part of the Rockingham rail unit and who moved to the city been moved back?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Obviously, the advantage of the regional operations group is that those officers are trained to a higher level in public order responses and those sorts of things. They are better at responding to out-of-control gatherings and that kind of incident management. We are looking at moving those officers with that extra skill into Rockingham, but we have not made a final decision on where that unit will finally end up. We thought it was important to get the officers out there and mobile and providing that support.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have a follow-up question on the Morley Police Station. I have looked online and I have found Mr Ian Britza's, the member for Morley, newsletter from May 2012 in which he stated 80 police officers would work out of the Morley Police Station by May 2013. Clearly, the government has not done an upgrade of Morley Police Station. Based on the minister's earlier answer, she implied that the government is looking at different ways of doing things and the plan is to upgrade that station sometime in the future to put in more female toilets and to cater for up to 80 officers. Does the minister stand by the government's commitment to employ 80 police officers at Morley Police Station at any time in the future?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The government's commitment with the west metropolitan upgrade program was for upgrades of the police stations in Scarborough, Morley, Mirrabooka and, I think, Warwick. Warwick has been completed.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am asking only about Morley. I want to know whether the minister stands by her commitment to put 80 officers there. Perhaps the minister would like to comment on whether any Liberal Party member can promise a number of police officers at a station. Could the minister be honest with us about that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commitment of the government around the Morley Police Station was very clear. The commitment of the government is that the Morley upgrade would occur as part of the west metro accommodation upgrade program. We were building the capacity in Morley so that Morley could accommodate up to 80 officers, should that area require it in the future. We have the land at Morley in place and the upgrade will give us the capacity for those 80 officers.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What Mr Britza promised us was not true then. He has broken that. That was a lie.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Morley will be refurbished so that it will have the capacity for up to 80 officers to work from there should the existing model of policing prevail.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: There is no commitment by the minister or the government to place 80 officers there at any time in the future.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think I have answered the question.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: This is something very close to my heart. I refer to the road trauma trust account—the RTTA—on page 490. Money was expended for 49 concept cars and two concept motorcycles. My question is: are they all now out on the roads in the districts and in Midland, where the bulk of them were going to be? Are the two motorcycles out on the roads doing the job now? How much time do those 49 vehicles plus two motorcycles spend out on the road doing a great job of catching unlicensed drivers, people driving stolen vehicles and so on?

Mr J. NORBERGER: Can I confirm whether you have registered my desire to ask a question? I remember getting your attention before the member for Hillarys. I am wondering whether I was overlooked. I take a great interest in the police portfolio and I am looking forward to —

The CHAIRMAN: You are after the member for Hillarys.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The 48 vehicles from the advanced traffic management vehicle project are all out on the road, as I understand it. There were some issues with the concept motorcycle project. There were technical and functional issues and some legal limitations around the operation of the motorcycle. I will need to defer to the commissioner so that he can explain the issues with the motorcycle trial, but the concept cars, the ATMVs, are certainly very well used by police. They are a terrific resource.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: There should be 49.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: We suspended the motorcycle trial and we will return \$41 000 to the RTA. There were significant power management problems with the motorcycles with all the extra equipment on them. There was some difficulty in trying to generate the power on the motorcycle given the limited battery space to power all the technology needed. There were also some occupational safety and health issues with the placement of the equipment on the motorcycles. We wanted to focus on the advanced traffic management vehicles before we did any further experimentation with the concept motorcycles. We have terminated that program for now because of the technical difficulties in fitting all this stuff to the motorcycles.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Should there perhaps be “(-\$80 000)” under 2013–14? If that money has gone back to the RTA, does it show somewhere in the budget that it has gone back? More importantly—I am not very worried about that—can the minister give me by way of supplementary information the number of hours each of those 49 concept vehicles spend on the road? Someone told me they spend a lot of time in Midland. That would disturb me if that is the case. We spent a lot of money on those and they are fantastic cars. One would hope that they are on the road 24/7, basically.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: With the motorcycle trial, \$41 848 of the \$80 000 is to be returned to the road trauma trust fund. It is not reflected in the budget papers, as far as I can see, but that needs to occur. We have put another \$138 000 towards the ATMVs. That was to deal with the cost associated with some unexpected equipment repairs and unanticipated issues with those vehicles.

[8.00 pm]

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

We can certainly provide as supplementary information if that is required the actual hours that those vehicles are on the road.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, I would just like to satisfy myself that those vehicles are really being used to the maximum because they are a great benefit to Western Australian police.

[*Supplementary Information No A39.*]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The supplementary information that I will provide is the number of traffic hours that are being clocked up by the advanced traffic motor vehicles since the inception of the program. I would like to update the house, separate to that supplementary information, that since those vehicles came online in April 2013, 1 112 vehicles were detected with a driver with no current motor driver's licence, 443 unregistered vehicles were detected, and there were 108 intercepts for vehicles of interest. For more serious offences, 50 outstanding warrants, 50 stolen vehicles plates and 36 priority alerts were detected. The vehicles have proved to be a very formidable road policing tool, and the police officers love the ergonomics in them and they really love working in them.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: My question is on the Road Trauma Trust Account. What have police applied for funding from the Road Trauma Trust Account through the Road Safety Council? As a member of the Road Safety Council, what has the minister applied for and what are the police getting from the Road Trauma Trust Account? The minister has not published anything on the Road Trauma Trust Account, which really disturbs me, and I am concerned that the minister might be covering something up. I do not know why the minister has not published it already; it was published much earlier than this time last year. I want to know what police have applied for and what they will get from that fund in relation the road safety.

Mr P.T. MILES: Point of order. I do not think we are on to division 33 yet, which deals with this.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, it is not. It is on this page here, my friend; under the RTTA.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Have a look at page 482.

The CHAIRMAN: Members! Member for Midland! Member for Midland, it is not for you to answer.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Point of order. I clearly heard the member for Hillarys referring to the member for Wanneroo as an imbecile.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, I did not.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I clarify that? That was me. If the member would like me to apologise and withdraw, I will.

The CHAIRMAN: I would.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I apologise and withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the member.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Perhaps the member for Joondalup should withdraw for accusing me of saying something that I did not say.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There is a lot for you to learn, my son, alright; a lot for you to learn.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys, further to your question.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Why do you not be quiet? Get back in your box.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Do not be a bully.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have asked a question and I would really appreciate the answer.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I would appreciate —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am asking under the police portfolio what has been applied for and what has been allocated, if anything has been allocated. This is a perfectly justifiable question on page 490, down the bottom, under "Road Trauma Trust Account".

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is on page 482.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is on page 482.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Chair, I am really keen to answer this question and I have just been waiting for a gap in the conversation to do so. The Road Trauma Trust Account is actually service 7; we will come to that after we have finished with Western Australia Police. Police traffic and road safety programs will be allocated \$14.7 million. No doubt we will interrogate those further when we get to the RTTA budget after this division.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can we not interrogate them now?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It does not form part of the police budget at this point in time.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I take a point of order please? I have participated in police estimates probably even more than the member for Hillarys and the fact is that the road trauma trust account is actually scrutinised under the Main Roads budget, the police budget and also the Office of Road Safety budget, which falls under the Main Roads division tonight. Questions were asked in all three of those divisions during the estimates hearings, and that has been the consistent practice over the estimates periods for quite a number of years. I draw the minister's attention, for example, to the heading "Road Trauma Trust Account (RTTA) — Advanced Traffic Motor Vehicle Project" on page 482 and the figure of \$138 000. Clearly, this is part of the minister's budget. This is about the police budget spend. When the minister talks about the Office of Road Safety and the road trauma trust account, that gets allocated to a number of agencies and we can ask questions about that broad allocation. During the police budget, it is certainly established practice that questions can be asked about that component of the RTTA budget that is being applied to the police budget.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the member. Ultimately, the minister can answer yes or no to whatever she wants.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As I said, approximately \$14.7 million from the road trauma trust account will go to road policing and road safety initiatives. I do not have —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Last year the former minister provided us with a breakdown. Will the current minister be able to do the same?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will be able to do the same but it will be when we are dealing with that division and my advisers from the Office of Road Safety are here to provide us with a breakdown of all those programs. I have a total spend for the police, which is around \$14.7 million.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Last year during the police budget, the police minister provided that information about the police component. I am asking the minister as the Minister for Police, not Minister for Road Safety, whether she will provide a breakdown of that \$14.7 million and what has been allocated within the police service. What is the Commissioner of Police allocating that \$14.7 million to?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Just to explain to some of the new members here, the \$14.7 million allocation for police projects under the road trauma trust account actually appear in the road trauma trust account funding and is part of that expenditure; it does not appear in the police budget as part of the expenditure for this division. We will come to that —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: No. Excuse me —

The CHAIRMAN: Member! I want the minister to finish.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We will be coming to that in detail during the next division. I want to talk about it —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: This is embarrassing.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am more than happy to talk about it, but in the context of the budget in front of us —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: If you are more than happy to do it, just do it.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: My police advisers do not have that information with them. My office —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is ridiculous!

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Of course they have it. He knows it!

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: They know what they are spending it on.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, I call you for the second time. Member for Carine.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Firstly, can I put on the record that opening statement made by the member for Hillarys is 100 per cent false. No minister has approached my office before, during or after —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Point of order, Mr Chairman. This is not an argument from the member for Carine, who is actually the government Whip. I made a statement with the sanctity and the approval of the Chair.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That statement is 100 per cent false and it misrepresents my office.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the member for Hillarys. Member for Carine, let us have the question.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I refer to the asset investment program and “Works in Progress” on page 490, and the line item “Core Business Systems—Development 2011–15”. What will the core business systems development deliver?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The core business systems development 2011–15 is about some ICT infrastructure replacement programs and ICT core business systems development. What sits behind this is the implementation of a number of significant projects by WA Police. These projects include the non-traffic infringement management system, the licensing and registry system, the investigative case management system and the replacement of the obsolete custody and briefcase systems. WA Police currently utilise a number of IT systems in the management of its business processes. Often they require enhancement of existing systems and we need new IT systems to be implemented to deliver new outcomes relating to the state government’s legislative changes. When we make a legislative amendment, we often need to make an IT adjustment at that time. The progress of legislation from drafting to proclamation and then to implement the required IT changes takes some time. We are sort of caught in the position of police not being able to implement or go out to tender for a new IT system until they are certain about how the legislation has landed after having gone through both houses of Parliament.

[8.10 pm]

Two major projects are part of this core business systems replacement. One is the information and communications technology infrastructure replacement and continuity program, which is all about the need to maintain our critical systems, our equipment and basically our police IT network. There is the matter of computing equipment and different business requirements across the state. We also link in to other police jurisdictions such as justice, transport and emergency management streams and we are working on delivering more effective services that are critical to supporting policing operations. Some of the other projects that form part of this program are the motor driver’s licence photo legislation, immediate disqualification notices, custodial management, police judicial information exchange, criminal penalty infringement notices, web and content management and business intelligence solutions—these are some of the things that need to be managed as part of this core IT business systems replacement project. It is a really important project and I am really pleased to see that it is being funded. The police are certainly very interested in improving the IT environment in which they operate, and with IT running more smoothly and effectively, it will certainly reduce the process requirements for police. That is the dream and that is what we are working towards—better operational effectiveness for police and for the users of the police IT system.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to the income statement table on page 492. The third item under “Cost of services”, “Expenses” is “Supplies and services” and I note that in this year’s budget it is some \$7.4 million less than the estimated actual for last year. What supplies and services will be affected by this cut? The figure for last year is \$150 791 000 and this year it is \$143 349 000.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: What has changed with that is that communication expenses—computing, communications and couriers—had an estimated actual cost of \$9.2 million and the figure in the budget for 2013–14 is \$9.8 million, so there have been fluctuations up and down. There is some reduction in the retained revenue from proceeds of crime of \$1.4 million. Our police escorts function has been transferred to Main Roads, so there is \$1.5 million that police will not receive as a result of that. The government’s savings measure was \$7.3 million; corrective measure and procurement savings are up \$2.2 million. There is a range of different programs that have moved.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is that \$7.3 million government savings measure within supplies and services?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, that is around supplies and services—things like consumables.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is that like when officers cannot get a pencil at Rockingham Police Station and that sort of thing? When the minister says a certain amount must be lost from the budget across all activities, is that what that is about?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can assure the member that police officers are not being deprived of pens and notepads. Some police officers may perhaps be a little short on communication skills in trying to find their nearest pens

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

and paper, but I can assure the member that we are not depriving police officers of the things they need to their job.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Did the minister say \$7.3 million?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, that is part of the efficiency measure we were talking about previously.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is that included in this line item “Supplies and services”?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I refer to Mr Kannis.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That would account for the vast majority of the difference.

Mr A. Kannis: There is \$7.3 million of the efficiency dividend that has been applied to reduction in services and supplies.

Mr P. PAPALIA: So is that a line item about which the specific details of what will be lost are not yet known?

Mr A. Kannis: It includes a few contracts and things like that. Supplies and services include computer contracts.

Mr P. PAPALIA: How does that apply? Is it given to different units or is it not down to that sort of level that cuts are made to make up the \$7.3 million? Is it done at a higher level or right down to the bottom region?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will let Mr Kannis explain how those procurement savings are generally achieved.

Mr A. Kannis: It cuts across a number of ways. Some of it is applied to the portfolios. If we have a budget for a portfolio, we will reduce that portfolio budget. A part of that expenditure across a number of portfolios will be related to services and contracts.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Are any specific areas quarantined so if the commissioner sees something as more essential, nothing is taken from that area and it gets protected?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We quarantine front-line services, so the things the member talked about earlier like pens, paper and other things police officers need to do the jobs are quarantined from any kind of procurement savings.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister has advised that front-line services have been quarantined. If that is happening, can the minister explain to me why at some regional police stations—for example, I cite Laverton and Meekatharra—detainees being kept overnight have single officers conducting custodial care duties? Is that the result of budget pressure; and, is that the primary reason for this change in arrangements with a single officer on duty responsible for custodial care? Is the minister aware of that practice; and, is she aware of the risk it poses to the officers concerned?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The situation that the member for Midland has described has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with government procurement savings requests of police officers.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Why has there been this change of practice? Why are there not two officers like there always has been? That was the established practice.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have not finished my answer. I will ask the commissioner whether he has a response to the specific issue about custodial services at Laverton that the member talked about. However, it is a very specific issue that is not budget related and if the commissioner is not happy to be able to —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister says it is not budget related, but the officers say that it is.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will finish what I was saying; I had not actually finished my sentence. If the commissioner has the information he needs to answer that question now, I am happy for him to answer it. However, it is a very specific question that is not linked to the budget papers and if the commissioner is not comfortable that he can provide an answer now, I will leave it up to him to advise me whether he can answer or not.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is a cut in service.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is a cut in conditions for officers.

Mr K.J. O’Callaghan: It is not so much a cut in service as a reform in service. I do not think the corporate executive team believes that it is necessary to have two police officers at a police station like Laverton working all night long to look after a single prisoner or more than one prisoner. The officer in charge lives in close proximity to the station, so if there is a need to call the OIC back, there is no issue with that. We are looking at new ways of doing policing. We are looking at increasing our capacity to the front-line and my view is that in

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

those circumstances it is sufficient for police officers to manage a prisoner in custody by themselves, and if they need to call assistance, they can do so. That is a policy at the moment.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is this change in policy saving the police budget money; and, will the minister review this policy if somebody is seriously injured or killed?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is an operational matter. I am happy to defer to either the commissioner or the deputy commissioner to answer how it is being managed. It is certainly not a policy or budget decision of government; it is an operational matter.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The whole reform process is about meeting the minister's budget dividend.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, let the minister finish.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I did not come down in the last rain shower; we know what "reform" is code for.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, please!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will first address the accusation that the reform program is about delivering government savings; it is not. The reform program is about delivering a more efficient and effective policing service and changing the way that police interact with the community so it is more contemporary and we can do things more efficiently. With respect to the situation in Laverton —

[8.20 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: And Meekatharra, and possibly elsewhere.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — I think the commissioner has responded to that. I do not know whether the deputy commissioner has anything to add to that. But it certainly is not designed around achieving efficiencies as a result of the budget.

Mr J. NORBERGER: I refer to page 489 and the heading "Asset Investment Program". One of the works in progress that is mentioned under the subheading "Community Safety Network" is the regional radio network replacement program. What will be delivered by this community safety network radio replacement program?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for the question. The community safety network radio replacement program is a really important program. It comprises a number of components. The first component is a conventional digital radio network, or CDRN. We are replacing the current obsolete police analogue radio network with a CDR network throughout regional Western Australia. We estimate that 200 additional communication towers will be built as part of this program. There is a five-year delivery for this project from 2012 to 2016.

The second component is a trunked radio network, or TRN. The construction of the trunked radio communications network to the major regional centres of Albany, Geraldton, Kalgoorlie and Pilbara coast will involve 22 trunked tower sites, and there is a two-year delivery for this project from 2011 to 2013. This is a joint project between WA Police, the Department of Corrective Services and the Department of Fire and Emergency Services. This has been funded through royalties for regions.

The third component is digital radio terminals. This involves the deployment of WA Police, Department of Corrective Services and Department of Fire and Emergency Services digital terminal equipment and peripherals to provide a statewide standardisation of front-line digital terminal equipment.

The fourth component is site infrastructure services. WA Police will manage the site infrastructure services through the engagement of subcontractors throughout regional Western Australia. This component is about securing and preparing suitable sites for network implementation to support government and non-government users.

This is a really good program. I went to the launch of the rollout, in Kalgoorlie, and through the use of a little handheld radio, officers in Kalgoorlie were able to talk to corrective services officers in Perth as clearly as though they were standing right beside each other. This will be an amazing capacity builder and it will make a real difference to the way in which police officers operate in some of those areas. Hopefully, this program will eliminate a lot of the black spots that used to occur with the old analogue system. We hear stories from police officers about how they had to leave the scene of a traffic crash and drive to the top of the nearest hill in order to get some kind of radio signal so that they could communicate with the necessary people around the provision of emergency services. This project will provide a huge community benefit in the regions, and it is a very good project for improving our capacity to respond to incidents in the bush.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to page 489, point 7, “Traffic Law Enforcement and Management”. The aims are stated as being traffic law enforcement and management, deterring and detecting alcohol and drug-related driving offences, conducting stationary speed operations, and so forth. I would like to get some clarity about the number of hours of traffic patrols undertaken by WA Police in 2012 and in each of the four years preceding 2012. Is any of that operation paid for out of the road trauma trust account; and, if so, what component, and at what cost?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for the question. Traffic enforcement and management is conducted across 199 business units of police. But the majority—about 64.5 per cent—of the total traffic patrol hours is conducted across 19 units. With regard to the traffic-specific units, between 2008–09 and 2012–13 there has been a 23 per cent decline in the traffic patrol hours. In 2008–09, 479 264 traffic hours were logged by the traffic-specific units. That is down to 369 051 hours in 2012–13. With regard to our non-traffic units, in 2008–09 it was 224 491 hours, and in 2012–13 it was 201 941 hours, which is a 10 per cent decline. The sole purpose of the traffic enforcement group, or TEG, is traffic. The TEG has had an increase of 25 per cent, with 19 369 hours. The breath and drug testing unit has had a 3.3 per cent increase, with 1 235 hours. So overall, the metropolitan traffic units have had a 28 per cent decline in the number of traffic-dedicated hours.

But this area is quite interesting, because the decline in hours does not necessarily translate to a decline in contact with motorists. The actual number of vehicles stopped through traffic operations has increased. There were 996 513 vehicles stopped in 2008–09 and there were 1 265 590 vehicles stopped in 2012–13. So police are stopping 2.2 vehicles per traffic patrol hour now, versus 1.42 vehicles per traffic patrol hour in 2008–09. So there is an efficiency increase in what the police are doing of 56 per cent. With regard to breath testing —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Chairman, can I make the point that the minister is giving me a lot of explanation that I have not asked for, much of which can be gleaned in other papers. What I asked for was the total specific number of traffic patrol hours conducted by WA Police. I did not ask for a breakdown. I think the minister is giving that to waste time or something. Could the minister please give me the global numbers for traffic patrol hours for 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11, 2011–12 and 2012–13?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I actually find this kind of information and data very interesting.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am not saying it is not interesting. But it is not what I asked, and this is our time to ask questions.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: And I am glad I have been afforded a space to answer. I am happy to provide by way of supplementary information the total number of traffic patrol hours performed in the four years pre-dating this budget year. Is that what the member asked for?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is what I asked for, minister, for the four financial years pre-dating the 2012–13 financial year.

[*Supplementary Information No A40.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister able to tell me tonight the total number of traffic patrol hours that was conducted in 2012–13?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will check to see whether we have that information available. Mr Hodges can provide that information.

Mr S. Hodges: The total number of traffic patrol hours recorded for 2012–13 was 564 658.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister may need to provide this by way of supplementary information, or otherwise by way of a corrected answer to the house when it sits, but on 8 August, in answer to parliamentary question on notice 854, the minister advised that the total number of traffic patrol hours in 2012–13 was 570 792. Also, in the WA Police annual report on page 154, the number of traffic patrol hours in the preceding years is very different from the number that the minister gave me in answer to question 854 that was asked in the Legislative Assembly. Can the minister explain why that is the case? Just by way of comparison, on page 154 of the WA Police 2012 annual report it lists the traffic patrol hours for 2010–11 as 155 549. The minister said in her answer that the figure for 2010–11 was 645 292. Those numbers are nowhere near each other. For 2011–12, the figure in the police annual report is 146 861 and in the minister’s answer it is 583 714. Again, those numbers are not even close. When I asked the minister the question tonight, I was given an alternate answer for 2012–13. What is the source of all these different answers and the reason for this disparity? Perhaps the minister cannot answer that tonight, but I would like to know that by way of supplementary information.

[8.30 pm]

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will go some way towards answering that question tonight, because I am sure it is of interest to the committee. The way in which traffic hours are calculated is somewhat complex. The police have key performance indicators that dictate how traffic hours are performed, calculated and, indeed, reported. We have specific traffic units and then devolved traffic operations out to metropolitan units. Some of the metropolitan traffic units end up responding to priority 2 and 3 calls, as the community would expect them to. Their capacity to spend their time solely on traffic duties is therefore reduced. I am sure most members in here would agree that it is more important for a police officer to respond to a priority 2 call for assistance than to try to stop somebody for a traffic infringement, which is also probably the way the community would want that action to be prioritised. With respect to the different figures that are floating around for traffic hours, Mr Hodges will be able to offer a detailed explanation for members as to how some of those disparities can occur and how the different calculation methods can be used to create a somewhat confusing result.

Mr S. Hodges: Within the system we have what we call a daily traffic return. Police put in a daily traffic return that records the number of hours. We have recently been going through a data-cleansing exercise, because we have identified that police officers have continued to put in different traffic hours. For instance, if Mr Kannis and I were in a police car, we might put in that there were two traffic hours performed, whereas someone else might put in that only one traffic hour was performed between the two people. We have been going through a data-cleansing exercise by going back over previous years to try to identify and cancel out those anomalies. That is where changes in the figures will start to be seen. That is why we put in the caveat that it is a point-in-time figure and that it is subject to change if we do find anomalies.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I did ask for some clarification by way of supplementary information. I appreciate the information that the officer has provided, but I am still no clearer on what is the correct figure. The difference between the figures on page 154 of the annual report and those provided in the minister's answer to question on notice 854 is not just a little bit—they are over double, and in some cases closer to triple, the number of hours. These are not little accounting processes; there is a significant disparity. I do not know whether to believe the answer the minister gave in Parliament or the police annual report. The numbers are not close—they are widely different. I am seeking an explanation of why they are so different and I also want to know which set of figures is correct.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I understand what the member is asking me but I think it would be particularly confusing to try to articulate that by way of supplementary information in this environment. I would like to answer the member's question. I would really appreciate the member putting a question on notice and I can then provide a detailed answer.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have already asked a question on notice! I asked this question in June and the minister gave me an answer in August that includes figures that are way different from those in the annual report. I do not know whether the minister has misled the house. I do not know which figures are correct. They vary by hundreds of thousands of hours. The minister has told me to put a question on notice and to wait another three months. I do not think that is acceptable. If that is the minister's standard, I think we are wasting our time.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, member!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am really asking this question on behalf of the member for Mandurah, who has had to go to the other committee.

Mr P.T. MILES: I have a point of order. The member for Hillarys is asking a question, as I understand it, for the member for Mandurah, who is obviously not here. Surely a member from our side should be getting a question sometime soon. Also, is the member for Hillarys being treated as a Labor member in this chamber tonight or as a Liberal member?

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Members, thank you! He is still entitled to ask the question.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I am asking the question.

Mr P.T. MILES: Is the member asking it as himself or as the member for Mandurah?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: He is himself.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am not a puppet.

The CHAIRMAN: He is a member of the committee; he can ask his question.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr Chairman; I am glad you know the rules. I refer the minister to page 492 of the *Budget Statements*—it is not a difficult question—and the line item on employee benefits under “Expenses”. How many officers were retired medically unfit for the years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 to date, and how many officers in this category have applied for an ex gratia payment from the government for injury, illness or conditions attributed to their work as police officers? The commissioner has acknowledged that post-traumatic illnesses are emerging as an increasing challenge. What will the minister do to support officers into the future who have workplace-induced illnesses?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would be happy to respond to that question but I suggest that it is very detailed. I have looked around at my advisers and none of them has that specific information with them today. I request that the question be put on notice because it is more broad ranging than the budget papers.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister provide that by way of supplementary information? I do not want to put the question on notice. It is quite easy to give supplementary information. The officers will know how many police officers will be in that position during those years. It is not a lot.

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, do you want to provide that by way of supplementary information?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, Mr Chairman; I am not prepared to do that by way of supplementary information, and I will explain why. The request was very detailed. It is around the medical retirement of officers. I cannot even remember the rest of the question; it is a very detailed question. It would not be realistic to expect that information to be provided in this forum. With respect to the sensitivity of the information being requested, a question on notice is more appropriate. I will respond to that question in very good time when it is placed on notice.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can I just follow up on that? It is a very simple question. How many officers were retired medically unfit for those years—2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 to date? That is a simple question with a simple answer. Surely the minister can answer that question by way of supplementary information. That is the main crux of the question. The second part was: will the minister support the officers who were designated as being unfit?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have a point of order. The minister on previous questions said that she looked around at her officers to see whether they had that information and because they did not, she did not answer the question. I ask her to do the same this time. The minister should look around and see whether her advisers have that information. If they do not have it, will the minister provide it?

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is not difficult. It may be that the people around the minister have the information.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have already answered the question, Mr Chairman.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys, thank you!

Mr P. PAPALIA: Specifically with respect to officers who are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, and with, I hope, our far more heightened awareness of that challenge, does the minister have a strategic response to that problem? Is work being done to ensure that we provide better services for not only the officers who are affected, but also their families?

Mr J. NORBERGER: I have a point of order, Mr Chairman. Just so that I can follow the conversation, what page is the member referring to?

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am following up a question that has already been asked.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Page 492.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That page number has been given; wakey-wakey!

[8.40 pm]

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, the question was coming through the Chair. It relates to the first line item, “Employee benefits”, under the heading “Cost of Services” on page 492.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: With respect, the member’s question is about —

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is specifically about post-traumatic stress.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That would relate to officer welfare. I would have to defer to the commissioner to talk about the in-house management of officers suffering post-traumatic stress disorder.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: There is quite a rigorous process for managing people with post-traumatic stress. There is access to a number of medical services. I think the question refers to what we ultimately do with someone with post-traumatic stress who cannot be rehabilitated. Is that correct?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Partly. As we learn more about this challenge, we are aware, for instance, that it affects far more people than just the individual involved. We have seen families of police officers affected by those suffering from post-traumatic stress. I wonder whether we have a strategy for how we respond as time goes on, ensuring that we are benchmarking ourselves against the best responses. There is a lot out there in the military. People around the world are changing the way they respond. Are we ensuring that we are up to date and providing people with the best support?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commissioner has a response. I am sure that the deputy commissioner, Chris Dawson, has something to add to that as well.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The minister would be aware that it was of interest to union members.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: Peer support officers keep an eye on police officers at station level. They know what signs to look for. They can provide immediate support. Sometimes the best support for people who are suffering from stress or anxiety disorders comes from the coalface, with people they are working with. That peer support officer program has been in place for a number of years. It is quite successful because they build quite a strong rapport with the police officers they work with. At the next level, through our health and welfare department, we have a number of sites. We have a chaplaincy service as well that is well aware of these sorts of problems. The chaplaincy service is often out late at night dealing with all sorts of issues. Remember that police officers who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder are not just suffering because of things they have seen on the street; some may have issues in their personal life. They may have relatives who are sick. A range of issues cause stress amongst police officers. We are well aware of that. We have a psych service and an outsourced psych service as well.

One of the things we are looking at now is how we manage police officers with post-traumatic stress long term. Many of them may not be able to work their full career. We need to think about how we connect them to other types of employment and how we retrain them to move on. Currently it is not possible, for argument's sake, to move police officers between WA Police and the public sector if they can no longer work because of stress disorders. That is a pathway that we want to develop and work on. This is all part of the reform process; it is not just about providing more efficient street-level operations. We want to have mechanisms for dealing with those types of officers. For argument's sake, currently—the union would be interested in this in particular—there is no system of compensation for officers who get post-traumatic stress. That is really important. In the past, we have seen that officers who are often the most successful in getting ex gratia payouts, say from government, are those who are able to develop a high media profile or their circumstances are of interest to the public. That is not the case, sadly, with people who suffer from post-traumatic stress, and often they leave the organisation without adequate compensation. We want to explore the possibility of a compensation model for police officers who are no longer able to work; that is, what they are paid if they are going into permanent disability or, if they are not going into permanent disability, to connect them with other types of jobs. That would require a radical rethink of the existing conditions that officers work under and their award and it would require cooperation from the police union if we were to move to a compensation-based response.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I would like to place on the record that I think that is a key issue. There needs to be a change. There is a group that is inadvertently excluded from the system. It is just something that occurs because of the nature of our system. They are the ones we encounter. They come to see us. They have spent their payout on their mortgage and then they have nothing to live on because they cannot work. It is not recognised.

Mr K.J. O'Callaghan: There is an inherent amount of unfairness in the process that exists today. I have had discussions with the minister about this. It would be fair to say that I am very keen to try to resolve that. It would take some goodwill from the police union to modify the EBA to be able to do that sort of work.

Mr P.T. MILES: I refer to works in progress and completed works on page 490. The minister and the commissioner came up to Clarkson prior to the election. There were new works to build the Clarkson Police Station extensions so more detectives could be housed there. I know that is nearly completed. When will that be completed and when will those detectives be housed?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Indeed, there has been a refit to Clarkson Police Station to accommodate those additional detectives. I would need to refer this question to Mr Lord, who is looking for the information. The commissioner

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

and I went to a community forum in Clarkson. One of the local members, the member for Ocean Reef, raised a number of issues with me about the volume of crime. The commissioner's response was that Clarkson required a team of detectives to go to work in cracking the back of volume crime in that precinct. In order to house those detectives in Clarkson Police Station, we needed to do a refit and refurbish the facilities. That was undertaken not as a separate stand-alone project; that was done out of the police asset capital works program, just a general allocation. I will ask Mr Lord to respond.

Mr G. Lord: I do not have an exact date for completion but it is nearing completion.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am happy to provide, by way of supplementary information, the expected completion date for the upgrade to Clarkson Police Station to accommodate those additional detectives.

[*Supplementary Information No A41.*]

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to the table under "Spending Changes" and the line item "Criminal Organisations Control Bill 2011" on page 481. I am interested in seeing the projections for the costs associated with implementing that legislation. Could the minister give us an indication of what that comprises?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As the member is probably aware, the Criminal Organisations Control Bill is legislation—it is yet to be proclaimed—that will target outlaw motorcycle gangs. We provided recurrent funding of \$640 000 in 2013–14, increasing to \$700 000 in 2016–17, and \$2 million in capital funds for the information and communications technology system enhancements to support the introduction of the bill. For this legislation to be enacted, we have funded some additional FTEs to perform tasks required under the legislation such as compiling applications, identifying criminal organisations, processing control orders for members and associates of the declared organisations, looking at a database of declared criminal organisations and performing the dedicated intelligence operations. The funding provided is for six police staff. The funding for the 16 police officers will come from the 550 additional officers program. Other states have implemented similar legislation. A number of High Court challenges are in train in other states. The police are doing a lot of work to ensure that once this legislation is proclaimed, we have a very robust system within police and the legislative parameters that sit underneath that legislation to ensure that we will be in the best position to defend any of those High Court challenges when they come to us as a result of this legislation.

[8.50 pm]

Mr P. PAPALIA: With respect to the likelihood of a High Court challenge, I was recently in Queensland and they had just defended a case in the High Court. I am assuming the minister is watching what is going on there. Prior to going ahead with any action in the state, so that we do not repeat mistakes, does the minister intend to wait until we see whether Queensland successfully employs its legislation?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There are two issues there. We have our legislation and we are looking at getting our systems lined up to ensure we can robustly enforce our legislation. Yes, we are also keeping a watching brief on what is happening in other states. I will defer to Deputy Commissioner Chris Dawson to go into a little more detail about what is happening in some of the other states with those High Court challenges.

Mr C.J. Dawson: The criminal organisations that are likely to come under the scope of this legislation in other jurisdictions—South Australia, New South Wales and Queensland—have all had long litigious processes, some taking a number of years. We have sent one of our most senior commissioned detectives to visit each of those jurisdictions and liaise closely with the specific dedicated police and legal officers who have already been engaged in the same processes. He has been able to report back that the amount of effort required is best placed by putting in a great amount of detail and effort, as opposed to putting up an application that is not thorough and exhaustive only to be thwarted legally. We anticipate that, regrettably, it will be quite a protracted process. I am not commenting about the legislation itself, but about the target groups exercising quite litigious processes and being prepared to expend a lot of resources to make sure they use every appeal mechanism possible. One, we have commenced; two, it is quite litigious; and, three, it is different from a normal prosecution brief that we do because we need to have a totality of the picture of the organisation we are seeking to have declared and then we have to have the means to monitor it. There is an information technology communication build to provide the right system to support such applications and the six FTEs that have been appropriated. Now that the budget has been provided, we are in the process of recruiting the right type of people and they will include legal officers so we have the right resources to deal with it.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Thank you. It is great to get my second question in in the last two hours!

Mr P. PAPALIA: Join the opposition and we will give you some questions!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That is okay. I look forward to my third question next hour; hopefully, before I fossilise!

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member for Carine should go home while he is on a winner!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I refer to page 483 under “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency” and refer to Western Australian police reform. What steps is WA Police undertaking to complete this reform?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is a very good question. I think the reform program is really important. We are using that as a mechanism in an effort to get more police officers out on the front line. I might ask the commissioner to respond on the reform. We have a number of tranches of reform. We have talked about local policing, getting better control over policing activities, directing that police activity and looking at demand reduction of police services. Local policing feeds into reducing demand for emergency assistance, if we like, for police.

Mr K.J. O’Callaghan: The minister is correct in terms of us developing greater efficiency for front-line responses. As the member is probably aware, the demand for policing services and the number of police calls for assistance is going up quite significantly at the police assistance centre. There were 1.1 million calls last year. We expect that by 2015 it will be something like 1.6 million calls for assistance, so we need to maintain our response capability. That means rethinking the way we deploy police. Part of that process will be to go through a very detailed discovery process of exactly how police are deployed, what police do, where they go and what decisions they make. That process is called an activity-based costing process, and it is being headed up by Deputy Commissioner Brown. Questions will be asked of every segment of the organisation on exactly how time is spent, so we can understand that a lot more accurately, and then we can redirect those resources to the things most important to us. As our population increases and the demand for policing service increases, we have to be able to maintain our response times and keep them within the key performance indicators that have been set. It will mean rejigging the organisation and being able to do that.

One of the things we are looking at is, I guess, shielding response police from local police and investigative police. There are probably three groups of police that will be deployed in the future. Let us look at the metropolitan area model—a group of police who will respond rapidly to problems. Then there will be a group of police who will do the follow-up working—working with victims, conducting investigations, dealing with kids, serving restraint orders and providing some protection and a range of other activities that we do not want response police getting into because that simply slows down response times, given some of those response police could be off doing a job that might take four, five, six, seven or eight hours. We have to look at a range of other issues to increase the capacity in the front line. One of those is being spoken about quite significantly; that is, red tape reduction. There are a lot of process issues—both policy-driven issues and compliance issues—that have been imposed upon us by external oversight agencies, coroners, courts and a range of other things that get layered up year after year. Of course, they create a lot of compliance and process time, so we need to think about how we reduce that. We are also very keen to look at legislation that imposes compliance on the police. The whole focus of the reform is to try to free up the resources to deal with the things that matter most and to create local policing teams that the community can connect with so that they see more police driving around and have more direct interaction with their police officers. I guess that is the basis of the reform. I have spoken about some of the employment changes we have been thinking of. It is about making sure we maintain that very important front-line service, which is under increasing demand. If we do not come up with a better model, some of those response times will deteriorate.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Hopefully, the minister is anticipating this question because it generally gets asked every year. I draw the minister’s attention to her services and key efficiency indicators, which start on page 486 and continue from “1. Intelligence and Protective Services” to “7. Traffic Law Enforcement and Management” on page 489. Under each of those services is listed a number of FTEs for 2013. In service area 1, there are 736 FTEs; area 2, 629; area 3, 578; area 4, 228; area 5, 3 498; area 6, 779 and area 7, 1 558. Given the total number of FTEs in this budget over those seven service areas, I am seeking from the minister a breakdown of the number of FTEs for police officers, auxiliary officers and all forms of unsworn and other staff that are provided as part of that 2013–14 budget.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will defer this question to Mr Hodges.

Mr S. Hodges: This is calculated by police officers conducting a survey for two weeks of every year when they contribute their time against the service. The number of FTEs there is an effort number; it is not an FTE number. We calculate it out as an FTE, but it is not an official FTE number, so we could not officially break that down. It accounts for a number of hours of effort against the service.

[9.00 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I realise that the minister will not have this in front of her and she pointed out to us earlier that she has not participated in police estimates previously, but I will just point out to her what happened last year. I will quote from an extract from *Hansard* the answer we got on 29 May 2012 from the former police

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

minister in response to questions from me and the former member for Balcatta, Hon John Kobelke, for example. It states —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will give it to the member.

I will give the projected total FTE breakdown by employee type as at the 2011–12 estimated actual: police officers, 5 611; police liaison officers—was APLO—15; police auxiliary officers, 140; police staff, 1 763, crossing guard traffic wardens, 125; and wages clerks, 43. That is a total of 7 000.

That is the kind of information that, in my experience, has traditionally been provided at estimates committees. Therefore, I ask the minister to provide the same information that has been provided by previous police ministers, and I cited last year's example.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I cannot believe how helpful I was!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The former minister was not that helpful, but he was certainly a lot more helpful than this minister!

I note that that was a 2011–12 figure, so I will just highlight that further down that same page states —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: For 2012–13 the estimated actual is: police officers, 5 679; police liaison officers—was APLO—15; police auxiliary officers, 174; police staff, 1 806; crossing guard traffic wardens, 125; and wages, 49 ...

And then we asked about what wages were and so forth and there is a bit more detail. But that information has always been provided at estimates and I ask the minister to provide that information tonight. If the minister cannot provide it tonight, she can provide that information by way of supplementary information.

[Ms W.M. Duncan took the chair.]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I went through and looked at some of the requests for information. I have just been given a really interesting table. I think that Mr de Mamiel will be in the best place to find his way around that very complicated table and explain the breakdown for members.

Mr M. de Mamiel: I have here a breakdown of police auxiliary officers and police staff, which basically identifies that at the end of June 2013 there are 160 police auxiliary officers, 14 APLOs and 1 829 police staff. I do not have in front of me the number of police officers at 30 June.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can provide that. The number of sworn police officers at June 2013 is 5 704. That is the approved strength; the actual number of officers is 5 713.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am seeking total staff. What I want is exactly the same information that I got last year and that has been provided in the past. The minister has not told me, for example, how many crossing guards there are and what is happening there. I am interested in the staff who are not sworn police officers or auxiliary officers and their numbers, too. Yes, the number on 30 June 2013 will be useful information, but I am asking: what is listed for the budget for 2013–14? The previous minister gave me that answer in estimates last year.

The CHAIRMAN: What the previous minister did is probably not relevant. We are asking the current minister, member for Midland. The member has mentioned that before on several occasions, so let us move to the minister's response.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Madam Chair, I think that you are kind of entering the debate by your comment, but what I am suggesting is that this is information that has been readily available to all police ministers, in my recollection. It is information that was provided last year. I have asked the minister whether she can provide the same details tonight, as other people have, but if there is some hiccup, surely she can provide it by way of supplementary information. I am just asking the minister to do that.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We can provide across the entire organisation the actual breakdown of police officers, auxiliary officers, police staff, crossing guard wardens and wages staff such as cleaners et cetera, but we cannot provide it per business unit —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is okay.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — which is what the member asked for previously. We cannot provide that information.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is not actually.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: If the member wants a breakdown of the total FTE —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I clarify that I would like a breakdown of the FTE as of 30 June and the FTE that the 2013–14 budget is predicated on.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide that by way of supplementary information, Madam Chair. Just to clarify what I am providing: at 30 June 2013, the number of police officers, police auxiliary officers, police staff, the breakdown of crossing guard wardens, I believe—what was the other one?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: All categories of staff.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: All the categories of staff across the organisation as at 30 June 2013.

[*Supplementary Information No A42.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: And —

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a further question?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister undertook to provide that, and I asked for the 2013–14 breakdown—that is, the same as the estimated total that previous minister gave.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the minister happy to include that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am happy to provide the estimated figure for the 2013–14 financial year.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be included in supplementary information A42.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Does the minister have any plans to cut the number of crossing guards? I refer to crossing guards as part of that FTE number, which presumably is under the heading of “Traffic Law Enforcement and Management”, but if it is not under there, it must be somewhere in the budget. Is there any plan to reduce the number of crossing guards or to redeploy them elsewhere?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There are absolutely no plans whatsoever to reduce the number of crossing guards or traffic wardens.

Mr J. NORBERGER: I refer to the line item “Expanded Video Link Technology at Regional Police Stations — Rapid Justice Initiative” on page 481 under “Spending Changes”. Can the minister outline what this funding will be used for?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Rapid justice is an election commitment of the government. This involves the funding for Sunday and night courts for magistrates and an expansion of our videolink technology at regional police stations. There is an opportunity through that videolink technology for offenders in regional police stations to have their bail hearings, remand hearings and all those sorts of things conducted in a more efficient fashion. Part of the commitment for the Sunday and night courts is being funded out of the Department of the Attorney General’s budget, but the funding for the videolink technology is in the WA Police budget. A total of \$126 000 over three years from 2014–15 has been provided, which will allow us to expand court services and to more effectively deal with our detainees in some of those regional centres. There is also \$70 000 in capital funding for that initiative, which comes in in 2014–15. This initiative is expected to expand our station videolink technology at Karratha, Geraldton, Broome, Albany, Kalgoorlie–Boulder, Northam and Bunbury, which will ensure that those stations can access the services at the new Perth police complex. The Sunday and night courts will enable our judicial officers to be available at the new Perth police complex on Sundays and when necessary at night to deal with bail and remand decisions. We are also looking at opportunities to fast-track traffic and impoundment matters. On average, cases in the Magistrates Court tend to take several appearances to resolve, even if they are very minor offences, so the enhanced videolink technology will enable us to have those matters in the larger regional centres dealt with in a more prompt and efficient manner. It is a really good program. It is in the interests of not only the victims of crime, but also the police and the community to ensure that justice is dispensed rapidly and effectively. Getting offenders in some of those regional centres into hearings and dealt with by magistrates means they can move through those lockup facilities far more quickly, which then translates into a reduced burden on officer time in those centres for managing offenders while they are in custody.

[9.10 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: My question relates to page 491 under “Police Facilities—New and Replacement Police Facilities” and so on. I would like some information about the three new mobile police posts and additional police patrols in identified high-crime areas that were announced during the state election. I think \$A3.7 million was promised over four years to acquire, operate and staff the additional mobile facilities. Where in the budget does it actually say that, or is that part of that magic \$67 million? When will those MPFs be established and where will they be located?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That initiative will be considered as part of a future budget process. It is not in these budget papers, but it is a commitment that the government is intent on delivering.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: But when the announcement was made by the Premier, I think, the impression was that they were a matter of priority. I do not remember where they were to be located. Was one mobile facility to be located at certain times in Scarborough?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The mobile police facilities are actually mobile trailers—a lot of people in the community call them mobile lockups—that can be deployed to events. They have been used as part of the summer crime strategy at Scarborough.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, I am referring to the police posts that the minister was talking about, not lockups.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, these were mobile police facilities. They are more mobile trailers used by police officers.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, not the ones the police take to out-of-control parties.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: They are not the police posts with the blue and white checks and a phone. We are talking about the mobile facilities that police trail around and use at —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think the minister called them police posts.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, member! Instead of going backwards and forwards, can we get the minister to answer the question, otherwise it is difficult for Hansard.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As I said, they have not been funded as part of this tranche in this budget process, but they will be part of a future budget consideration.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: To follow on from that, they are not even mentioned in forward estimates. The minister cannot pinpoint anywhere in the budget papers where they are mentioned. It is all very well saying they are going to be there later down the track after the next election, but is this another broken promise? It looks like it is if they are not mentioned anywhere in the budget. Following on from that, in regard to police overtime to provide targeted patrols in crime hotspots, has this begun; and, if so, when, where and how will the funding be distributed?

The CHAIRMAN: That is an additional, different question, is it not, member for Hillarys?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, it is all part of, and a follow-on from, the one on page 491, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us just deal with the first half, which was —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is easier to get the answer to that one.

The CHAIRMAN: Did the minister have any further point?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Generally I wait for someone to finish speaking before I start, Madam Chair, so I thank you for the opportunity to respond. The commitment the member referred to, as I said, has not formed part of this budget. It is a commitment that the government and I as police minister are committed to delivering. It will be considered as part of a future budget round. Those commitments were to be delivered over the four-year term of this government and indeed we are committed to ensuring that we deliver on our election commitments over the next four years.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: To follow on from that, still on this subject: the government said during the election campaign that it was committing \$3.7 million for those MPFs. If the government is going to make that promise, surely it must be somewhere in the budget process even if it is in two years. It is nowhere in the budget at all. I can understand why people would say that is a broken promise, because it is not at all identified there. The government said the money was there. It promised it over four years. It is not anywhere in the forward estimates at all.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have answered the question.

The CHAIRMAN: It was really the same question, member for Hillarys. Are there any other questions on division 39?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: My question is on community safety. Can the minister advise me where the money is for the Nyoongar Patrol that was promised during the recent election campaign?

The CHAIRMAN: Can the member for Midland give a page reference and a line item?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Yes, on page 484 under the heading “Lawful Behaviour and Community Safety”. Can the minister tell me where I can find the monetary amount?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 21 August 2013]

p280b-313a

Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Rob Johnson; Dr Tony Buti; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Chris Hatton; Chairman; Mr Paul Miles; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I appreciate the member drawing the house's attention to the commitment around the Nyoongar Patrol. That will be funded through the Department of Indigenous Affairs budget.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The \$900 000 is in the Indigenous Affairs budget, is it?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I must confess to not having examined the Indigenous Affairs budget, but we made that announcement with the then Minister for Indigenous Affairs, and that commitment, consistent with the existing Nyoongar Patrol, was to be funded from the Indigenous Affairs budget.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I understand \$5.4 million was committed for a consolidated graffiti vandalism enforcement act. Is that anywhere in the budget?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commitment to the graffiti program —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is that under the Department of Corrective Services or Police?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is a program on which we are going to work with Corrective Services. We did promise to provide \$1.35 million a year to fund the supervision of clean-up activities by graffiti offenders as part of the new legislation. That commitment was around drawing together the various different references to our graffiti legislation and have it all fall under one piece of legislation that covers graffiti. The funding for the penalties and the actions that will fall out of that new graffiti legislation will be funded when the legislation is brought to this place.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the extra resource of \$800 000 for Crime Stoppers provided, or not?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am not sure where Crime Stoppers occurs in the budget papers. I will need to take that question on notice.

The CHAIRMAN: What information is the minister going to provide?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Could the member articulate her request again for me?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Has the \$800 000 that was promised in the recent election campaign been provided for Crime Stoppers?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I recall that we are providing the Crime Stoppers funding from the proceeds of crime funding pool. However, I will need to clarify that and I am happy to provide details on the funding of the Crime Stoppers commitment by way of supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No A43.]

The CHAIRMAN: Are there further questions under division 39?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There are, Madam Chair, but, unfortunately, if we ask any more we will never get on to road safety, which I think is extremely important.

The appropriation was recommended.