

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

**Division 3: Premier and Cabinet, \$147 917 000 -**

Mr P.W. Andrews, Chairman.

Dr G.I. Gallop, Premier.

Mr M.C. Wauchope, Director General.

Mr G. Hay, Assistant Director General.

Mr D. Hatt, Chief Policy Adviser.

Ms L. de Mel, Executive Director, Office of Multicultural Interests.

Mr G. Klem, Director, Regional Policy.

Dr B.E. Hobbs, Chief Scientist, Office of Science and Innovation.

Ms J.L. Sales, Acting Executive Director, Office of E-Government.

Mr K.A. Jones, Consultant, Corporate and Business Services.

Mr R.M. Ireland, Director, Environmental Policy.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr P.W. Andrews): This Estimates Committee will be reported by Hansard staff. The daily proof *Hansard* will be published at 9.00 am tomorrow. Members should not raise questions about matters of general concern that do not have an item of expenditure in the consolidated fund. The Estimates Committee's consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed. We are dealing with estimates of expenditure and that should be the prime focus of this committee. Although there is scope for members to examine many matters, questions need to be clearly related to matters of expenditure. For example, members are free to pursue performance indicators that are included in the *Budget Statements* while there remains a clear link between the questions and the estimates. It will assist in the committee's examination if questions and answers are kept brief, without unnecessarily omitting material information. It is the intention of the Chairman to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered, and that both questions and answers are short and to the point.

The Premier may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee, rather than ask that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. For the purpose of following up the provision of this information, I ask the Premier to clearly indicate to the committee which supplementary information he agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the Premier's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk by 6 June 2003, so that members may read it before the report and third reading stages. If the supplementary information cannot be provided within that time, written advice is required of the day by which the information will be made available.

Details in relation to supplementary information have been provided to both members and advisers and, accordingly, I ask the Premier to cooperate with those requirements. I caution members that if the Premier asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk's office. Only supplementary information that the Premier agrees to provide will be sought by 6 June 2003.

It will also greatly assist Hansard staff if, when referring to the program statements, volumes or the consolidated fund estimates, members give the page number, item, program and amount in preface to their question.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I refer to the table on page 69. The increase in the overall budget allocation for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is \$49.89 million, or over 50 per cent, from an estimated actual of \$98.02 million in 2002-03 to an estimated \$147.91 million in 2003-04. The explanation states that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet includes two new outputs in 2003-04: the Office of Road Safety and the Office of E-Government. Can the Premier provide a breakdown of the impact of those two new outputs on the department's overall budget? In other words, what is the cost of those two inputs, and what would have been the total budget allocation to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in 2003-04 had those two outputs not been included? What is an apples and apples comparison?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will give the Leader of the Opposition an analysis of the difference between the two figures. I suggest that we use the figure of \$98.025 million, which is the 2002-03 estimated actual. The figure of \$143.676 million is the recurrent figure. The other figure just includes transfer payments within the department. The real difference is \$45.651 million. That is the real comparison to make in recurrent expenditure.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: What is the actual increase in the size of the department, taking out road safety and e-Government?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Other factors are included in the difference between those two figures. The significant movement reflects a decision to reduce the appropriation in 2002-03 for science and innovation, native title and crime prevention grants, because those moneys will not be spent. The reason is that there has been a 70 per cent increase in the 2002-03 science grants appropriation. The long-term nature of grant agreements has resulted in significant underspending, and that money will go forward to 2003-04. I can go into more detail on that if the Leader of the Opposition wishes. The expenditure on native title grants has been delayed by protracted negotiations with native title claimants. Crime prevention grants are also long term in nature and are drawn down over a period of several years. The amount involved is \$22.258 million for those three items. This amount has now been included in the 2003-04 appropriation. The net effect of reducing the 2002-03 appropriation by \$22.258 million and adding \$22.258 million in 2003-04 is a movement of \$44.516 million. In effect, the actual outcome from 2002-03 is different from what the budget said, and that is reflected in the difference between the budget for 2003-04 and 2002-03. The increase in expenditure reflects a recent history of underspending on grants, which has previously been carried over. Treasury has now advised that the appropriate treatment is to re-cashflow those items and to reflect them in the out year appropriations. This has the effect of being more transparent, and it saves on costs associated with the capital user charge.

The variations that have been approved in the budget process for 2003-04 are the repositioning of the grants to the tune of \$44.516 million. I have given the Leader of the Opposition the reasons for that. The other changes are native title general grants, an increase of \$2.025 million; the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Swan River colony, an allocation of \$1.250 million; functional review implementation costs, full year impact, \$1.718 million; Gordon inquiry implementation costs, full year impact, \$2.574 million; parliamentary electorate officers, an increase of \$685 000; additional funding for the policy office, \$600 000; multijurisdictional terrorism and crime, an increase of \$100 000; the Dubai office, which was not in last year's budget, \$600 000; the physical activity task force, which was previously funded from other agencies and is now in this budget, \$200 000; and the Government Media Office, \$255 000. All of those increases amount to \$54.523 million. Offsetting those increases are native title grants, under which there was a one-off payment in the Burrup of \$3.501 million; the re-cashflowing of the science grants, \$1.478 million; the Functional Review Taskforce, \$1 million; the functional review recommendation savings in the first year, \$500 000; the Office of E-Government, \$1.258 million; accrual reduction in depreciation, \$552 000; and other accrual movements, \$1.069 million. Those amounts total \$9 358 million. Offsetting the \$9 358 million against those increases gives a figure of \$45 165 million, which accounts for the difference in the appropriation and forward estimates table in division 3. I think that gives the detail of the differences between the two years. The specific question asked by the Leader of the Opposition on what it would have been if none of those factors was included is difficult to answer. I ask that we take that question on notice and get a specific answer.

[4.10 pm]

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No. I asked simply: what was the budget for 2003-04 compared with the estimated actual for 2002-03?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I gave the details of that.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I acknowledge two additional functions in road safety and e-government. I request by additional information a table comparing, on an apples with apples basis, the estimated actual for the current financial year with the budget for the coming year, detailing the difference accounted for by those two items. I am trying to find out the increase in funding for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I have outlined clearly the specific increases. However, I will take that question on notice and provide that figure.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Premier clarify the information that he is agreeing to provide?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I believe the Leader of the Opposition is after - he can correct me if I am wrong - the difference between the actual expenditure in 2002-03 and the budget in 2003-04 without the inclusion of road safety and e-government.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes.

[*Supplementary Information No A17.*]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to the third dot point on page 69, in particular to the Premier's role in oversighting and implementing the recommendations of the Gordon inquiry and the whole-of-government approach to family violence and child abuse. Will the Premier expand on what that role will entail in the next financial year?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: As the member knows, the Gordon inquiry made a range of recommendations that have been accepted by the Government. Focusing in the first instance on the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

departmental budget has \$2.874 million for 2003-04. The initiatives on which that money will be spent are: first, a community partnership fund of \$400 000, which will aim at building relationships between government and indigenous communities by funding projects that demonstrate collaboration between government agencies and individual indigenous communities and addressing priorities identified through the Gordon inquiry; secondly, \$2.219 million on a program to address the place management security and community building needs of indigenous communities; and, thirdly, \$2.3 million on a community futures foundation to foster cooperation between government, business and the indigenous community. The areas that will be targeted for this expenditure are yet to be identified, but the budget allocations have been made. Departmental resources have been redirected to respond to collaboration issues, including examination of existing training programs, staff and resources for the implementation of a secretariat and significant work on new legislation to encourage government collaboration. These efforts are being duplicated by other government agencies.

I will go through the programs across the Government outside the framework of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The Government has committed a total of \$17.720 million in 2003-04 for initiatives associated with the Gordon inquiry, representing \$13.425 million in recurrent expenditure and \$4.295 million in capital expenditure. Capital works approved in the Gordon inquiry response to occur in 2003-04 are as follows: expanding the child protection unit at the Princess Margaret Hospital for Children into larger premises; expanding the sexual assault resource centre; and constructing three multifunctional remote facilities in Warburton, Docker River and Kintore. The current expenditure for 2003-04 includes improving service delivery to individuals with need in these areas; employing 15 additional child protection workers, in addition to the 10 already budgeted for in 2002-03, at an estimated cost of \$3.062 million; expanding services at the Princess Margaret Hospital child protection unit, at a cost of \$769 000; employing 14 skilled Aboriginal support workers to provide practical counselling and assistance to vulnerable Aboriginal children and youth, at a cost of \$1.271 million; and expanding services and staff at the sexual assault resource centre, at a cost of \$800 000. Funding has also been committed to programs that will work closely with indigenous communities and families to find solutions to individual problems. These programs represent a new way of the Government doing business. For example, in 2003-04 there is a program to address the place management needs of communities and the security and building needs of indigenous communities, to the tune of \$2.219 million; the development of culturally appropriate Aboriginal counselling approaches, at a cost of \$200 000; a safe places initiative to work with communities to identify safe persons and places for Aboriginal women and children and the development of community-designed safety strategies, at a cost of \$317 000; the expansion of the strong families collaborative case management approach and maintenance of the indigenous families program, at a cost of \$1.872 million; and the community partnership fund that I mentioned earlier, at a cost of \$400 000.

Government has also directed existing funds to the priorities identified by the Gordon inquiry through a domestic violence liaison officer appointed to each police district - eight officers altogether - with new money covering support costs only, not full-time equivalents; police officers to be placed at remote facilities as they are constructed - there was some publicity about that when we announced our response to the Gordon inquiry; the quarantining of \$500 000 from the sport and recreation fund to specifically assist Aboriginal communities; the quarantining of \$300 000 from crime prevention funds to specifically assist Aboriginal communities - I thank the member for Perth who has assisted in that area; and the quarantining of \$300 000 of regional investment funds to respond to the needs of Aboriginal communities.

Members will note that is a very comprehensive funding program to deal with the Gordon inquiry. That comprehensive funding program will also be backed up with legislative initiatives later in the year to establish mandatory reporting of sexually transmitted diseases and other aspects to ensure proper reporting; and other legislative initiatives that the Minister for Police, the Attorney General and the Minister for Community Development have indicated. That is a very comprehensive response to a major problem in our community.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I refer to the major policy decisions at page 70. The Government Media Office has been allocated an extra expenditure of \$255 000. Is that related to additional funding for the creation of the community liaison unit and the country media monitoring referred to on page 76?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Yes.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: How many FTEs are attached to that unit; where are they located; what are the classification names and levels; and from what funds did the additional \$255 000 come? Also how much additional funding will be provided to establish the new strategic communications function within the Government Media Office referred to on page 76; how many FTEs will be required for that function; and what is the purpose of that function?

[4.20 pm]

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will go through each question asked by the member and if I do not get to them all, she should let me know. First, we have allocated \$160 000 to establish a strategic communications function in the Government Media Office. A similar function was undertaken by the previous Government with the funding of one FTE and professional services to the tune of \$280 000. This position will coordinate government communications and ensure that the Government of Western Australia and its agencies are properly represented to the public. The Government Media Office full-time equivalent proposed allocations for 2003-04 are as follows: the director and his support staff for media monitoring, 20; communications unit, one; media advisers, who are associated with the ministers, 17; community liaison unit, four.

The Leader of the Opposition asked specifically about the community liaison unit. It has been playing a very important role in ensuring that the Government's regional cabinet meetings are properly organised and function well. Liaison has been set up with all regional areas that we visit to facilitate proper cabinet meetings in those areas. If I may draw comparisons with earlier budgets, when the previous Government left power 41 people were involved in the media office. In our first year there were 35; in May of this year there were 41; and next year there will be 42. The one new position will be the communications position that I spoke of when I initially answered the question. There is, therefore, one extra officer compared with the Court Government's staff in February 2001, but there are four community liaison officers playing a much broader role than that performed by the media office under the previous Government. I think that probably answers all the questions.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Do the functions of the community liaison unit include preparing material for backbench members of Parliament?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It is liaison between the Government and the community.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: In what form?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It assists in the presentation of the Government's policies and programs throughout the community.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Does it prepare material for newsletters, publications and circulars going out in the names of individual backbench members?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It assists members of Parliament in the work that they do in the community.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Could the Premier be more specific? Does the unit prepare written material, for example, that would be included in newsletters and local material distributed by members of Parliament in their electorates in the names of their electorates?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: In relation to regional cabinet meetings, the unit prepares information that can be used by members of Parliament in the way that they carry out their duties as members. The unit makes sure that government policies, programs and expenditure priorities are understood and can be communicated to the public.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Premier is not answering my question.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I think I did answer it.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: He is not answering my question. Does that unit prepare material to be used in local electorates by individual members of Parliament?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I would assume that if the Government is to ensure that its members of Parliament know what they are doing, the unit would assist its members of Parliament in getting across the proper presentation of policies, programs and expenditure.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Could I seek additional information in writing to confirm that if that is the case, the unit does not provide material to be used by local members in newsletters or local communications in their electorates under their names as members representing their electorates?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: What is the point?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I would like the Premier to check and to confirm or deny, as the case might be, whether this unit and its officers are preparing material for individual members of Parliament to be used in their names in their electorates?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I would be very surprised if the unit were not preparing material that is used by local members, because it is preparing material on the basis of what the Government is doing and, therefore, that would be picked up by members of Parliament.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I want to know if this unit is dealing with members of Parliament and their preparation of material for newsletters.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: It applies essentially to government backbenchers. I do not get any material from it.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The unit is preparing material on the Government's budget and on its priorities. I would be very surprised if the members were not picking that up and using it.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I would be surprised too.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Just as under the previous Government it was doing exactly the same thing.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Perhaps rather than be flippant -

Mr J.N. HYDE: Your members used that material to attack us.

The CHAIRMAN: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I ask the Premier for additional information and that he check with his office and confirm in writing whether this unit is preparing material; and, if so, what sort of material is used by individual members in their electorates.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will get the Leader of the Opposition some material on precisely what the unit prepares that is used for presenting the Government's policies.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am not interested in that. I am asking a specific question about its function.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition will get a specific answer.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: If I do not, I will be recording that the question has not been answered.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition will do what he does. I have no control over what he does.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Premier presumably has control over the functions of his agency.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier has agreed to provide information. Could the Premier clarify what it is?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will provide information on the work of the community liaison unit. That was the question.

*[Supplementary Information No A18.]*

Mr C.J. BARNETT: With respect, Chairman, that was not the question.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the information that the Premier has agreed to provide. If it is not satisfactory, that question needs to go on notice.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I would like it recorded that the Premier has not taken up the question asked.

Mr J.N. HYDE: You had eight goes at the question.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I have answered it very well.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I just want to complete the questions on the Government Media Office. What was the total budget of the Government Media Office?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The cost of the Government Media Office in the last year of the previous Government was \$3.35 million; in 2001-02 it was \$2.408 million; in 2002-03 it was \$2.842 million; and in 2003-04 it is \$3.068 million. We are still spending less than was spent in the last year of the previous Government.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Page 70 refers to parliamentary electorate offices. The Premier has said there is about \$600 000 of extra expenditure. Which offices are receiving that extra expenditure? What is the amount for each office? I do not expect the Premier to have that information with him now. What benefits are those offices getting for that \$600 000?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The expenditure is right across the board. I will give the member the general facts and if there are any issues that he wants followed up, perhaps he will let me know. In 2003-04, \$2.4 million will be allocated as a result of policy decisions. The amount relates to salaries and allowances of approximately \$960 000, which resulted from the public sector general agreement. Accommodation accounts for approximately \$800 000 due to general rent increases of around 10 per cent and about one-third of the members relocating to generally more expensive offices. Computer services account for an approximately \$475 000 increase. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet will charge \$250 000 for information systems as a fixed charge. The remainder consists of an increase of approximately \$100 000 for contracts for electorate management systems, air charter and car hire. The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal has increased the entitlement. Fringe benefits tax on vehicles and benefits for members account for an approximately \$95 000 increase. There has been a significant escalation in liability over the past two years, and the forecast increase for 2002-03 is 5.7 per cent and for 2003-04 it is 6.7 per cent. That expenditure will be across the board. Is the member happy with that?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Not quite. Concern has been expressed by my members that some of the software in their electorate offices is not at the same level as that in the metropolitan area. I am not concerned about most of the items to which the Premier referred.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The computer services category is contained in that list.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Some of my members' electorate staff are concerned that some of the software is not as up to date as that in the metropolitan area.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Could I request that the member contact the department about that? I am sure that it will look into it. As the member would know, the departmental staff conduct regular visits to and talks with electorate staff. They would be happy to follow up on that.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: It is more about servicing some of the computers. I would be happy to give the Premier a phone call about that.

[4.30 pm]

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: Dot point 8 on page 76 refers to the Government's Middle East trade office in Dubai, which opened this year. What are the achievements and what position does that put the State in for this coming year?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Government's Middle East trade office was opened recently. I led a trade and investment mission to that opening and was accompanied by 99 people. It was very successful. Fifty-six businesses were represented and contracts for value-added agribusiness products were secured.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: What dollar value did that generate?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I have been trying to get that figure. I do not have the exact figure. Many companies that participated in that mission, and others who have an interest in the market, are planning visits to the United Arab Emirates during the next 12 months. Since that time, one important development has occurred; namely, the decision of Emirate Airlines to schedule daily return flights from Dubai to Perth. That is crucially important for our business. Since the trade office has been established, daily return flights from Dubai have been scheduled; and there has been a lot of spin-off from the trade mission.

I refer also to some other important developments this year. Two companies represented Western Australia at a major regional health trade exhibition called Arab Health. Following that exhibition, the office helped one of those companies to establish contact with a major hospital in the UAE, and both companies were provided with good prospects in that area. One specific contact was made as a result of that trade exhibition. In February 2003 at a Gulf Foods exhibition, Western Australian interests had a major success with the trade office coordinating Western Australian representatives, which constituted 31 of the 61 Australian companies represented. Of the 12 000 attendees, it is estimated that 2000 attended the WA exhibit and more than 1 000 inquiries were registered. In addition, the local media gave exposure to WA's exhibit. Members will be aware that our agricultural products in the United Arab Emirates are going extremely well, which was confirmed by the response to our stand at that exhibition in February.

The Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries visited Oman and the United Arab Emirates when that exhibition was held. The office assisted the minister in that visit. He also visited the Omani minister for petroleum and gas and had discussions about using Curtin University's flair gas technology. Members will be aware of the important work being done at Curtin University. The Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries took Curtin University people with him on that trip. The trade office also assisted Minister Chance in meeting the UAE minister for finance and accompanying him to the Gulf Foods exhibit.

Earlier this month, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure held discussions with Emirates Airlines and the UAE minister for transport and telecommunications, and support was provided. For 2003-04 the Middle East trade office intends to undertake other initiatives: work with the Western Australian Master Builders Association to coordinate a WA construction industry trade mission for the Big Five Building Industry exhibition in early December this year. The office is also working with education service providers to organise an education trade mission possibly in October 2003. The trade office is working with AGWEST International to promote WA's agribusiness project management capabilities, with the aim of securing a major agricultural development project in North Africa. Together with the National Food Industry Strategy Ltd, the office has worked to facilitate the establishment of a WA fresh food consolidator to supply the Spinney's supermarket chain in the UAE on a year-round basis. The feasibility of such a project is being studied. Spinney's is the big supermarket chain in that area.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Opportunities have arisen for WA with the reconstruction of Iraq. Following the cessation of hostilities in Iraq, the regional director of the WA trade office in Dubai is currently assessing a strategy for maximising benefits to WA for the reconstruction of Iraq. Many WA companies have registered on the Austrade web site with interest in reconstruction opportunities. The regional director visited Kuwait earlier this month and plans to return shortly. It is now an appropriate time for anyone interested to prepare capability statements and seek appropriate agents to represent them. A proposal recommending the appointment of a trade representative in Kuwait is now being developed for consideration. We have had a successful year. Our trade office was opened, our trade mission travelled to UAE, and we convinced Emirates Airlines to commence daily flights. Given the problems in South East Asia due to severe acute respiratory syndrome, that direct route is a tremendous development for Western Australia for not only our tourism industry but also our agricultural and education services and our construction industries. We have participated in all those events in the Middle East. Following the cessation of hostilities in Iraq, we will work on maximising opportunities for Western Australian businesses. The Middle East trade office is one of my Government's initiatives that has borne fruit for the businesses and people of Western Australia.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: Is there some way we can quantify in dollar terms the direct and indirect benefits. It is great to talk about these initiatives, but there must be a way that we can quantify them.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: As the trade figures come in, we will be able to look at that impact. As we talk to our universities and colleges about their success, we will get statistics. The office was set up only last year and all those events occurred this year. As the figures become available, we will be able to get a more objective assessment of the overall economic impact.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Reference is made on page 77 to the European office initiatives for the coming financial year. Can the Premier provide more detail on the role of that office please?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Major initiatives planned for 2003-04 are as follows: Offshore Europe 2003, which is a major oil and gas exhibition in Europe. In fact, I attended that in 2001 and gave a speech. It is scheduled again this year for September. Stand space has already been confirmed and both the European office and the Department of Industry and Resources are busy promoting our involvement in the exhibition. I believe the King of Norway and the British minister for energy attended our exhibit last year. Our participation in Offshore Europe is expected to involve a ministerial-led business delegation and a group of companies. It will be held at Aberdeen, Scotland.

I refer to Emigrate 2004. Business migration remains an important inward investment tool, particularly in view of the business skills and technical competencies it can bring to the State. The trade office expects to participate in both the immigration fair in York, scheduled for June 2003, and the larger Emigrate 2004 show scheduled for March 2004. I refer to the agricultural sector. Further promotional activity in the pig and dairy sector is planned as a means of broadening the potential catchment area for the pig and dairy sector investment into Western Australia. Efforts to convert existing initial UK and Danish farmer interest in this State will continue while avenues for further promotional activity, possibly to include further inward farmer visit programs to Western Australia, are to be explored.

Some farmers have visited Western Australia. A total of 55 farmers came here in October and November 2002 to examine the pig and dairy industry in Western Australia. To date, this initiative has led to one farming family moving from the UK and setting up a farming business here. Eight farming families are in the process of obtaining migration visas with the intention of either purchasing farming enterprises or joint-venture enterprises and a further three families are intending to work in the industry in this State for a year before committing to relocate. We have had a successful year with the pig and dairy farmers of Europe coming here to Western Australia.

The European office will also continue to devote time and resources to work with the Western Rock Lobster Development Association in an attempt to achieve an autonomous tariff quota for western rock lobsters of up to 2 000 tonnes per year. This is a very important issue. I applaud the efforts of Mr Bob Fisher, Western Australia's Agent General, in pressing the Europeans on this issue. Hopefully, later this year we will have a successful outcome from the lobbying that has been conducted in Europe. As members know, lobbying for the rock lobster industry in Europe is not easy because the French have strong views on this matter. However, we have gotten good support from the British Government. Bob Fisher has gone to Europe on a regular basis to lobby for Western Australian rock lobsters to be sold in Europe.

[4.40 pm]

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Is the Agent General getting enough rock lobsters for himself?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Western Rock Lobster Development Association has been working closely on this matter with the Agent General. He has done a great job and I applaud his efforts. We will wait and see what can be announced later this year.

Finally, the office will continue to work with the various Western Australian universities and TAFEs to develop the State's educational profile and strengthen the recognition gains made in 2002-03. In addition to consolidating its position in Western Europe, the office will examine the education sector marketing opportunities in Eastern Europe. It is interesting to note that some northern European countries actually spend money on educating their students overseas rather than on expanding their higher education systems. The model that has been developed for Western Australia is based on the Scandinavian model. We hope that achieves some benefits for Western Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we continue, I inform members that we have been on this division for 35 minutes and have gotten through one round of questions. The Speaker has made it clear to me that if we do not get through more questions, I will do the 11.00 pm to 12 midnight shift every night. I want more questions to be asked and shorter answers to be given.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: How many overseas trips have been taken by each parliamentary secretary in 2001-02 and 2002-03, and what has been the total cost of those trips?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The parliamentary secretaries have been on some overseas trips. I do not have that information to hand. I will take that on notice.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I want information on overseas trips taken by individual parliamentary secretaries.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is easy to provide.

[*Supplementary Information No A19.*]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer the Premier to page 89, output 7 -

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That is the point I am trying to raise. I would like the Chairman to clarify this matter. We would be better off if we worked sequentially through the outputs rather than jumping around. We will get there.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee. That would seem to be the most useful way to do it.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: We will get through the outputs.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I can spend five minutes on the question now or 25 minutes on it later; it is up to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It would be logical to do it in the order in which the papers are presented.

The CHAIRMAN: If the member asks a short question, we can take it from there.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Forget it.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I refer the Premier to page 84, senior executive service members -

Mr C.J. BARNETT: We would be better off if we dealt with each output in turn.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee. If members are going to argue about it, they might as well ask their questions. The member for Kingsley can ask her question followed by the member for Girrawheen.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I refer to the number of senior executive service members. In 2001-02, 391 SES members were provided for and in 2003-04, 362 are provided for. I do not know whether the Premier knows the number of SES members, including CEOs, when he came into Government in February 2001. Has the Government so far met its proposed reduction target that it outlined at the beginning of 2001? The *Budget Statements* estimate that in 2002-03 there will be 785 redeployees, yet in 2001-02 there were 576. How many of those redeployees have been registered on redeployment for periods greater than three months, six months, nine months and 12 months?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will answer the first question and take advice on the second. In February 2001 there were 422 members of the senior executive service. The Government has set a target of 362 SES members. Presently, there are 337 SES members. The original figure of 422 SES members included 21 positions in the Department of Education and Training that are no longer included in the SES. If those positions were added in order to provide a like-with-like comparison, the current number of SES officers would be 358. We have achieved our target and reduced the number of SES members.



Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Should 21 SES members be deducted from the 2003-04 target of 362 SES members?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: No.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Will the figures actually increase?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: No, currently there are 358 SES members.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Minus the 21 in education, which brings the number down to 337.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Yes. However, for a like-with-like comparison, the figures are 358 and 422.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Does the target of 362 SES members also exclude the 21 SES members in education?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will ask the director general to answer the member's question.

Mr WAUCHOPE: The estimated target of 362 SES members in 2003-04 is a comparison made on the same basis as the other figures we are looking at. We expect some increase in the number of SES members as the positions are filled in the course of the year. The SES positions are a moveable feast; some are filled and some are not.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Does the target of 362 not deal with vacancies?

Mr WAUCHOPE: No, it deals with actual people.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Not vacancies? How many vacant positions are there?

Mr WAUCHOPE: I could not tell the member off the top of my head. I will take that question on notice.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The target we set was 362. Currently, a like-with-like comparison shows that we are under that target. There are currently 358 SES members.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: By way of additional information, will the Premier provide the number of vacancies as at February 2001 and as at 2003-04, to give a like-with-like comparison for the estimated target of 362.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The February 2001 figure was 422.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Does that include vacancies at the time.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I assume so. That is just people. Does the member want the number of vacancies as well?

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Yes, please.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We will do our best, but it will be difficult to provide that information. As the member knows, there has been a major overhaul of the public sector in Western Australia.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Is the figure of 422 a like-with-like comparison with the target of 362 SES members in 2002-03 in terms of vacancies?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It is.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Would the Premier provide the number of vacancies to the department's best ability?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We say with some confidence that we are achieving the target reduction we set. The second question was more detailed.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: It related to redeployees. The number of redeployees has increased from 576 in 2001-02 to 785 in 2002-03. I would like the department to identify how many of those redeployments have been registered for more than three, six, nine and 12 months.

Mr HAY: The figure shown is not the number of redeployees; it is the number of services provided from that area. That includes the number of registered redeployees, the number of entry level people appointed and so on. The number of redeployees is much smaller.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: What is the number of redeployees?

Mr HAY: I will provide the member with the precise number later. There are about 190 redeployees. We can provide the member with supplementary information about the length of time that they have been registered.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: By way of additional information, I ask the Premier to provide a breakdown of the estimated 785 redeployees and a breakdown as to the length of time they have been on redeployment.

The CHAIRMAN: I will need to clarify what information the Premier will provide.

[4.50 pm]

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I refer to page 84 of the *Budget Statements* and the public sector management recruitment and redeployment services, where reference is made to a target figure of 785 for the 2002-03 estimate. The member requested a breakdown of where those people are located, and how long they have been on redeployment.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I sought a breakdown of the 785, and a further breakdown for the redeployees regarding the length of time involved.

[*Supplementary Information No A20.*]

The CHAIRMAN: Did the member for Kingsley ask for the number of vacancies in the special executive service?

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Yes.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We got that earlier. I said that we will attempt to provide that, but it may be difficult to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: We will allocate a number.

[*Supplementary Information No A21.*]

The CHAIRMAN: If members are unsure about numbers, I become unsure because members continue discussion or if members do not hear me say a number, they should stop me.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: I refer to the tenth dot point on page 79. A major achievement of 2002-03 reads -

In conjunction with the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department implemented a strategic framework to monitor and improve Western Australia's negotiation and management of Commonwealth Special Purpose Payments.

How successful or, more importantly, how unsuccessful has that program been?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The obvious area in which we have not been as successful as hoped is with the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality. The Government has progressively increased funding to fight salinity in Western Australia. The budget has increased from approximately \$32 million under the previous Government to over \$40 million a year over three years from 2002-03 to 2004-05 under this Government. The estimated total expenditure on salinity over the seven-year period 2000-01 to 2006-07 is over \$275 million. We established a salinity task force to review the State's salinity program. This Government's response to the task force report was to continue the baseline funding for government agencies for existing programs, such as protecting buildings in rural town from rising salinity, improving water quality in key catchments and conserving biodiversity. However, the Government also responded with a number of initiatives throughout the community. I will not go through them now. As the member for Ballajura knows, the Government is still trying to negotiate the bilateral agreement with the Commonwealth Government. The Prime Minister has agreed to initially match the \$31.412 million in state expenditure on salinity. The \$31.412 million is included in the budget papers, but spread across the budgets of the Water and Rivers Commission, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Conservation and Land Management. The Government continues to negotiate the process by which additional commonwealth funds would be available for the Wellington Dam recovery project and the farm forestry program. The State's \$32.2 million for farm forestry is included in the budget papers. The State's \$15 million contribution to improve the water quality in the Wellington Dam is part of negotiations between the Water Corporation and the Water and Rivers Commission. The Government is still negotiating on that matter.

The State had a disagreement with the Commonwealth on the housing bilateral agreement because the goods and services tax allocation was not included in the payment to the State, yet GST is still included in the cost of housing. The State has a disagreement with the Commonwealth on health because it reduced the amount of money given to the State, when compared to the amount under the previous plan, to the tune of \$100 million a year.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: I heard the Prime Minister on radio saying that our revenue from the GST would compensate for the reduced allocation.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is a common argument from the Commonwealth. The fact remains that the State receives less under the GST than it would have received under the previous arrangement. That does not avoid disagreement with the Commonwealth on the special purpose payments. It is the same old story: the Commonwealth comes up with the grand ideas, and attaches strings to the expenditure of commonwealth money and makes it difficult for the States. The State Government is holding ongoing discussions to resolve those matters.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: The top of page 80 outlines output 3, management of policy. Listed are seven key policy areas. Please outline the time and cost with each of those programs. I refer to citizens and civics, crime prevention, economic policy, environmental policy, regional policy, social policy and sustainability.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The member wants the amount spent in each program, and what else?

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I do not expect the exact amounts, but the expected time taken in each area.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will give the Leader of the National Party the breakdown figures. This area relates to the policy office. The budget estimate for 2003-04 is \$11.864 million broken up as follows: policy coordination and review, \$2.412 million; crime prevention, \$6.171 million; environmental policy, \$418 000; economic policy, \$316 000; regional policy, \$375 000; social policy, \$246 000; sustainability policy unit, \$301 000; citizenship and civics unit, \$535 000; severance payments, nil; and executive and corporate services overheads, \$1.090 million. I think the member knows what the programs do from the headings.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Yes. Is there a mechanism to work out the time factors involved in each of those areas? Are they equally active? The figures indicate that that is the case, as they are pretty much the same amount for all policy units, give or take \$60 000. What sort of horsepower is in those units?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: They basically have the same number of FTEs, but the director of the policy unit has indicated that citizenship and civics has a grant program; therefore, it is a little higher in number of FTEs. They are all pretty straightforward. The member can gather from their titles what they do.

Mr J.N. HYDE: I refer to page 80 of the *Budget Statements* and the policy output, crime prevention unit. I draw the Premier's attention on my laptop to a map of inner city streets in my electorate used for streetwalking, and a variety of attached images for certain streets that glorify streetwalking with texts like "Having kids and using drugs" and "homeless heroin addict" and "It's a pretty amazing power - to make somebody feel good". Some of my residents found copies of the map in their streets. This map for the "Sexy Streeties Project" is also accessed on the web from the Phoenix web site - [www.fpwa-health.org.au/phoenix.htm](http://www.fpwa-health.org.au/phoenix.htm) - and then by clicking through to SWOPWA, the Sex Street Worker Outreach Project of WA.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I make a pretty obvious point of order. The member raises an important issue, but the Estimates Committee is designed to ask questions about the budget to the Premier, not a chance to raise the member's concern about streetwalking in his electorate.

The CHAIRMAN: The member is referring to page 80 and the indented "crime prevention". The question and tag are now coming, I presume.

Mr J.N. HYDE: Yes. Although the map has prominent acknowledgment that it is funded by the State of WA through ArtsWA, the Lotteries Commission and the former Government's graffiti program, I understand the funding came through crime prevention areas in the Department of Premier and Cabinet. I understand that funding was made available from a grant provided in the previous Government's last budget. What is the Premier's view of the material and the fear of my residents that it is attracting streetwalking onto their streets?

[5.00 pm]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It was an expenditure that did not in any way relate to the purpose for which the fund was set up. I am sure the previous Government, which set up the fund, would agree if it looked at the expenditure. The previous Government set up a fund as part of its graffiti program to provide an alternative for urban art to those who may be inclined to engage in graffiti. That was contracted out to a group called the Community Arts Network Western Australia, which would then distribute grants to the community. I am advised that funding for the project to which the member has referred was provided from the 2000-01 allocation to the graffiti program and was transferred to the Office of Crime Prevention in October 2001. It is an inappropriate expenditure of money. I am not very impressed that government money was spent in that way. I am very pleased to say that that allocation is no longer part of the budget. However, it again raises the issue that we have had to deal with before, in which the Government uses a non-government agency to determine how money will be spent and, because it is an indirect relationship, it may make decisions that are inappropriate from a government policy point of view. The member correctly pointed out that this is an incorrect expenditure of that money. There is no way that that expenditure was related to the reduction of graffiti. It has happened, but it raises the same issue that we had to look at recently; that is, the Department of Health issue in which money was spent in a way that was inappropriate. I agree with the member. I can point out to the committee that that fund is no longer available, but the issue of non-government agencies determining how money is spent without any direct reference to the Government remains an issue with which we must deal.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I refer to output 2, the management of matters of State and specifically to ministerial offices. I am happy to receive this by way of supplementary information. Can the Premier provide the estimated actual for 2002-03, the projected budget for 2003-04, the number of full-time equivalent staff and the number of

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

staff seconded from agencies and departments for each ministerial office, as well as those of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party?

[Mrs D.J. Guise took the Chair.]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will provide some information, but I think the member will have to put that question on notice.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I seek that information by way of supplementary information.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will treat it that way if he wishes.

[*Supplementary Information No A22.*]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I point out to the member that under my ministry, as at 1 May 2003 the ministerial office staffing was 171.6 FTEs, plus 24 FTEs paid for by other agencies who were seconded into the offices. Under the coalition Government, there were 210 people in ministerial offices, plus 11 staff paid for by other agencies. The comparison is 171.6 under my Government and 210 under the previous Government. If we add in the staff paid for by other agencies, it is 195.6 as opposed to 221. If members want to have that argument, I am happy to have it, because my Government has trimmed up on these officers in the interests of the taxpayers of Western Australia.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am interested in the responsibility for the management of state matters. I refer to the last dot point under major achievements for 2002-03 on page 79. It states that support was provided for the State's involvement in the major counter-terrorism exercise conducted in March 2003. Can the Premier give us an indication of the outcomes of that exercise?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: In March 2003 Western Australia hosted the national counter-terrorism exercise "Raw Horizon". All the national and state bodies came together in Perth. It involved the activation of the joint crisis management arrangements outlined in the new national counter-terrorism plan, including activation of the state crisis centre - my notes indicate where that centre is, but I do not think I should tell anyone where it is - and the national crisis centre in Canberra. It tested all aspects of Western Australia's operational policy, policing, emergency services and support agencies, and involved collaboration with the following commonwealth agencies: the Attorney General's Department, protective security at the commonwealth level, the Australian Defence Force, the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, Emergency Management Australia and the Australian Federal Police. The state agencies involved were the Police Service, the Fire and Emergency Services Authority of Western Australia, the State Emergency Management Committee, the Department of Health, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the office of the Attorney General.

It was a very interesting exercise. I was involved in the exercise at one stage. The final report on the exercise should be released soon. As with all other participants in the exercise, my role will be assessed by those who are looking into it. It was a good operation because it brought together the agencies. They conducted a simulated exercise related to a particular terrorist incident and they looked at how different people and the agencies responded and the sorts of problems that may emerge. I am happy to indicate to the Parliament how it went when we get the final report. There is good cooperation between the Commonwealth and the States in combating terrorism. We have agreed with the Commonwealth on legislation. We will cooperate with it in on-the-ground resources and activities. We have allocated \$100 000 in this year's budget to get better coordination of our own efforts as a Government in relation to the Commonwealth and we will bring someone in to assist us to do that.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: As a further question, will future exercises of that nature be rolled out as the year goes by?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: They are quite expensive to host. They are held from time to time. Western Australia was chosen as the site this year, but I am not aware whether any other exercises are planned in the near future.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to the last dot point on page 85, which refers to the Functional Review Taskforce. Can the Premier give an estimate of the cost of the task force to date?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The cost of the Functional Review Taskforce was \$1 004 057.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Is that completed?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is the cost of the task force.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: However, not the review itself?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: No, but costs will be associated with that.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Are there ongoing costs associated with the review?

[5.10 pm]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The functional review costs for this year will be \$4.33 million. I will give the member a bit of background so he has the details. As he knows, the functional review was undertaken in the second half of 2002. I mentioned the \$1 million cost of that review. The final report was delivered to Cabinet in December 2002. Parts of the report were endorsed by Cabinet in 2002 and early 2003, and five other recommendations will be considered later this year. Cabinet approved further work to be undertaken on corporate services and procurement issues. A special unit within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is coordinating the implementation of the review's recommendations, with special responsibility for corporate shared service reforms. That unit is headed by Ron Mance, whom I think the Leader of the Opposition would know. The functional review implementation team reports to the strategic management council, which comprises all of the chief executive officers who meet regularly with me as Premier, and liaises closely with the Department of Treasury and Finance to ensure consistency between corporate services, procurement, capital investment and asset management reforms. The Department of Treasury and Finance and the functional review implementation team have appointed a consulting firm to strategically review corporate services provision and procurement within the Western Australian public sector and propose models for common shared corporate service and procurement provision. The report and business plan for each is expected in July-August this year. Planning to implement any approved corporate service reform will be progressed during the year, but reforms may require a significant up-front investment and will take two to three years to implement and up to five years to achieve full results. Although the business plan will quantify potential savings due to the reforms, we estimate that they will be in the region of between \$40 million and \$50 million per annum commencing in 2005-06. The preliminary estimation of the costs involved in implementing the recommendations is salaries and allowances, including on costs, \$1.8 million; accommodation, \$333 000; consultancies, \$1.6 million; and other contingencies, \$600 000. That comes to a total of \$4 333 000.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I refer again to the use of the ministerial air charter. How many times has the ministerial air charter been used by each of the ministers and parliamentary secretaries, and by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the National Party in 2001-02 and 2002-03 up to the present time? I am happy to receive the answer by way of supplementary information.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will take that as a supplementary. I do not have those details with me.

[*Supplementary Information No A23.*]

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I refer to page 70, major policy decisions, and the second last dot point, policy office, additional operational funding of \$600 000. What is the purpose of that additional funding, and how is it broken up in terms of the number of full-time equivalents and the types of employment contracts that they are under, and items such as vehicles, mobile phones and credit cards?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The additional \$600 000 represents our commitment to the development of the policy office and comprises all of the different units that I outlined earlier in response to a question from the Leader of the National Party.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: It is additional funding, is it not? What is the purpose of that additional funding?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We are developing the policy office. As the member knows, when we came into government we reviewed the performance of the policy division and came to the conclusion that this is the amount of money we need to spend to have a proper policy office for government.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: How much does the policy office cost in total in a year?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I went through that figure with the Leader of the National Party. The total is \$11 864 000.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Why is there \$600 000 on top of that \$11 864 000?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It is not on top of that \$11 864 000. It is included in that amount.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: What is the purpose of that \$600 000? Is it for tables and chairs - setting up and establishment costs?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is our commitment to that office. I have partly answered the question in my response to the Leader of the National Party's question, but I am happy to give a more detailed explanation of what the extra \$600 000 is for.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Can the Premier provide by way of supplementary information a breakdown of the whole \$11 864 000?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Yes.

[*Supplementary Information No A24.*]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to page 81, dot point seven under major achievements for 2002-03, the state water strategy for Western Australia. A number of activities have been undertaken under the state water strategy this year. What does the Premier envisage as the key outcomes of the water strategy and his ongoing work in this area?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The department coordinated consultation on the state water strategy, which included a series of water forums held across the State and a water symposium held at Parliament House from 7-9 October 2002. The department also coordinated and had input into the content of the state water strategy. That strategy was launched on 19 February 2003. With regard to the impact of the strategy, I will refer to a number of things. Firstly, I am delighted that the public of Western Australia is involved in the development of that strategy. I have the figures that I released late last week. The Waterwise rebate scheme has topped \$1 million, with \$326 900 in rebates for the purchase of 1 093 new bores, \$574 800 in rebates for 3 832 water-efficient washing machines, \$30 300 in rebates for 3 030 water-efficient shower heads, and \$68 250 in rebates for 611 rainwater tanks. We are very pleased that the public is fully participating in that rebate scheme. Secondly, the public has participated magnificently in the sprinkler restrictions. This year we have saved 50 gigalitres of water, which is absolutely vital given the low level of water in the dams at the moment. Thirdly, we have launched the water re-use project in Kwinana, which will allow the industries in Kwinana to re-use their water rather than waste it. However, we still have a major problem in Western Australia. We must find a new source of supply. We are investigating developing the south west Yarragadee aquifer, and that has attracted some controversy, but we are working through those issues. We have looked at the possibility of a desalination plant. On an economic basis, a desalination plant is more expensive than developing the south west Yarragadee aquifer. We will have to continue with our public involvement in conservation and we must find a new source of water. At the same time we hope that we will get more rain than we have been getting in the past. The reduction in rainfall in the past 20 or 30 years is serious. In the past five years, there has been a further reduction in the average rainfall, which has put even more pressure on our water system in Western Australia. We have a major problem and it must be addressed. The public has responded very well. We want the public to continue to be involved with us on this issue. We need to do a lot more to achieve a long-term solution to our water supply problem in Western Australia. The state water strategy has been a big success. However, many chapters remain to be written before we can say that we have completed the task at hand. The second phase of the water strategy will be released in June-July this year.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to page 71, output 10, which is support for the implementation of state road safety initiatives.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is being handled by the Minister for Police.

[5.20 pm]

The CHAIRMAN: Output 10 is not part of the outputs that we are discussing in this session.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I refer to dot point 2 under major achievements for 2002-03 of output 3 at page 81 relating to the regional investment fund and regional investment tours. What projects are related to the regional investment fund and will the regional investment tours continue?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Yes, there will be a continuation of the regional investment tours, which have been very successful. I will make some comments on the success of those tours when we discuss the next division. The regional investment fund has been very important for the regional areas of the State. The fund is broken up into the regional development scheme administered by the regional development commissions; the WA initiative scheme that funds projects across regional boundaries; and the regional infrastructure funding program that funds major regional infrastructure projects. There has been a strong emphasis on tourism-related projects, which indicates the extent to which the tourism industry and the partnerships that have been developed between local governments, local businesses and State Governments are starting to come up with very creative ideas on how to promote the State of Western Australia. At the same time some very good projects have been funded that deal with indigenous Western Australia. We have quarantined more than \$2 million for indigenous projects to promote jobs and opportunities for indigenous Western Australians. A summary of those projects that have been funded to date are: 301 regional development scheme projects valued at \$6.02 million, 39 regional initiative scheme projects valued at \$2.3 million and 22 regional infrastructure fund projects valued at \$12.8 million.

The member for Mandurah would be aware of the Fairbridge redevelopment in his electorate and I thank him for ensuring that when I visited Peel recently the Fairbridge people gave me a briefing on what they were doing. That is a very important development that will play a role in the State. I say to the Leader of the National Party

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

that there are also some very good projects in the wheatbelt. They include the gravity discovery centre, which the Leader of the National Party would know about, and the work that we are doing in Northam, which he would also know about. I will not list all the projects. It has been a good scheme and we are very pleased with the partnerships resulting from it.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: I refer to dot point 10 at page 82 relating to the insurance crisis. I request an explanation of some of the initiatives taken in 2002-03 and, more importantly, what initiatives are proposed for 2003-04.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: As the member for Ballajura knows, legislation has passed through the Parliament to deal with this issue; that is, the Civil Liability Act 2002, the Insurance Commission of Western Australia Amendment Act 2002 and the Volunteers (Protection from Liability) Act 2002 dealing with the status of volunteers. In the Parliament currently is the Civil Liability Amendment Bill 2003, which is very important legislation that deals with the relationship between individual responsibility and collective obligation. In answer to the question on initiatives that are planned for this year, we must deal with the medical indemnity issue. The Attorney General and the Minister for Health are working on legislation to reform the medical indemnity problem. We want to get the Civil Liability Amendment Bill through the Parliament and I thank the Opposition for the support it has given to that important legislation. On the medical indemnity issue there has been good cooperation throughout Australia between the Commonwealth and the States to bring about a new framework that will reduce the cost pressure that has existed on premiums and give some breathing space to non-government organisations and small businesses in the community to enable them to develop and prosper.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I draw the Premier's attention to page 85 and to budget paper No 3 relating to the Functional Review Taskforce. On page 53 of budget paper No 3 is a table showing the projected savings under the task force for each of the four years with a total by agency over those four years and a total of \$238 million for all agencies. Although that table shows the monetary savings, what are the FTE reductions? I want to know the anticipated FTE reductions by agency and in total as a result of the recommendations of the Functional Review Taskforce.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition knows that as a result of the functional review we amalgamated education and training and the industry departments and created changes in the Departments of Treasury and Finance and Premier and Cabinet. To achieve those savings, some positions will clearly go from the government sector. Every year about 3 500 Western Australian public servants leave the public sector. We have also put in place a redeployment program. We have improved our severance offer to people when redeployment is brought into play by structural and functional change within government. The best estimate currently is that 770 positions will go from the Government as a result of the functional review. Some of those positions can be met through redeployment. As I said, 3 500 people leave the public sector every year and there will therefore be some redeployment possibilities. Some of those positions are currently not filled and will not be filled. There is also the possibility of severance. We are improving our severance offers to public sector workers in Western Australia. The Leader of the Opposition wanted to take that across agencies.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes. If the total is 770, which I find remarkably small, I want to know how it breaks down between agencies as per that table, because the dollars have been allocated to agencies.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The functional review people gave us an estimate. I do not know whether that estimate can be broken up specifically across agencies. If the Leader of the Opposition asks that as a supplementary question, we will see what we can get for him.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier is agreeing to provide that as supplementary information?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Yes.

*[Supplementary Information No A25.]*

The CHAIRMAN: Before I give the call to the member for Alfred Cove I am advised that some speakers are waiting to ask questions. Including division 3, there are 12 divisions to get through in half an hour.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: I refer to the management of policy at page 80, in particular social policy, and the last dot point at page 83, which states that the department will participate in the health reform committee. In relation to social policy, I refer the Premier to smoking in public places. As the Government said, the policy is in place for workers. In the hospitality industry only five to 10 per cent of workers would be employers; the rest would be employees. I know that the review is currently with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Will we have to wait for a review of that issue by the health reform committee before we know what will happen? Workers in the hospitality industry are exposed to environmental tobacco smoke seven and a half hours a day; that is, 37.5 hours a week. Why are we having a health reform committee? Is this another committee making another review? Reviews were conducted last year. I refer to the review of accident and emergency departments and the review of strokes. Recommendations from those reviews have not been implemented. When this

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Government came to power it disbanded the metropolitan health service boards and set up a new structure. Is the Government now intending to spend more money on a new health reform committee? It seems to be the case that as soon as something is comfortably in place, it is changed, yet we do not see any changes in health. What is happening?

[5.30 pm]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The first question the member asked related to the portfolio of the Minister for Health, so I would refer the member to him.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: You said in the House this week -

The CHAIRMAN: The member will ask her questions through the Chair.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: In answer to the second question, a departmental officer is participating in the health reform committee. The role of the health reform committee is to look at the delivery of health services throughout Western Australia to see if the State can bring about better efficiencies in the way in which services are delivered, because at the moment health costs are growing at a rate of seven or eight per cent throughout Australia. This is posing a huge difficulty for every State Government. The Commonwealth has shifted costs onto the States through its aged care policies and its failure to adequately support bulk-billing in the community. There is also a shortage of general practitioners in Western Australia. We will deal with that cost shifting at a political level and keep pressuring the Commonwealth. As for the costs generated in our own system, it is incumbent on us to look at ways and means of controlling those without impacting on good service delivery. That is the aim of the health reform committee, and a member of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is on that committee.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: How much will the health reform committee cost? Health services are failing. Could that money not be better spent on health service delivery?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Budget paper No 3 refers to the health reform committee. It will cost \$500 000 in 2003-04 and \$800 000 in 2004-05, which is a total of \$1.3 million.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Page 73 contains a table. The last column has a note relating to multiculturalism which states -

Community surveys will be conducted during 2003-04 to establish the baseline for this indicator, however at time of compilation of this budget, it was not possible to reliably estimate a target.

If community surveys are to be conducted during 2003-04 to establish a baseline on the extent to which the principles of multiculturalism are accepted and practised in Western Australia, what is the estimated cost of these community surveys and will all the results be made public?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The director indicates that we are not doing that survey any more. Some \$20 000 was allocated for it, but it has been deemed that this is not a good time for getting the sort of information that we need.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: The fourth dot point on page 82 refers to the major achievement of the department's work on the impact of the ageing population on the public sector. At what stage is this work and what will be its future outcome?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: A discussion paper on the ageing workforce phased retirement schemes and whether they are an option for the public sector has been published. It focuses on the issues surrounding phased retirement in the Western Australian public sector and addresses a number of policy and communication issues. A two-year joint research project into the implications of an ageing population for public sector recruitment and retention in Western Australia is scheduled for completion in September 2003. A number of major outputs will become available throughout this year, including survey results on recruitment, selection, retention and early retirement issues faced by the Western Australian public sector. The research primarily focuses on how these issues affect different occupational groups across the sector and should help to highlight the most vulnerable segments of the current workforce. There is also a review of the anticipated future changes in the demand for and supply of labour in the Western Australian public sector and a model which can be used to predict the flow of staff in and out of the sector. All of this information will be progressively released during 2003-04 and will be published as part of the workforce beyond 2000 series. The department is trying to get to grips with the longer term issues of how ageing will affect public sector recruitment and retention. This work is carried out in conjunction with the Centre for Labour Market Research in order to look at those implications. We will be publishing throughout the year.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: Does it also look at the retirement age of public servants, their retirement plans and so on?



Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: As I understand it, that is not really part of the study. The study is looking at how the public sector can keep in tune with developments going on in the broader society.

The CHAIRMAN: Although I saw signs of consternation or relief, depending on whether members want to stay here until nine o'clock or not, I advise that this session will go through to 9.00 pm, although I presume that the committee will try to finish division 3 by six o'clock.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: On page 90 one of the major achievements referred to for 2002-03 is the anti-racism strategy. Will the Premier give me an update on the progress being made?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: In November 2002 an evaluation of anti-racism strategies of other western nations was completed. This has guided the development of projects in areas prioritised by the anti-racism steering committee that I chair. These areas are sport and racism, local government and racism, the public sector and racism and schools and racism. We identified those areas as being important ones in which we could make a difference and a significant contribution. Each of these projects will be developed and piloted in conjunction with the relevant public sector agency. For example, the project related to the public sector and racism will be undertaken in conjunction with the Equal Opportunity Commission and the Public Sector Standards Commission and will be piloted in three public sector agencies, including central agencies such as the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The public sector project will focus on recruitment awareness raising and service delivery. That is a constant theme that we get. We have not achieved adequate targets for people from non-English speaking backgrounds coming into the government sector. As for the schools project, the Office of Multicultural Interests is working in conjunction with the Department of Education to develop a program that will be piloted in selected schools with large, diverse student populations. The aim of the project is to ascertain the extent to which racism, both individual and systemic, is manifest within the schools, and to develop and implement effective strategies to address racism in schools. The anti-racism steering committee is also developing a paper on racial and religious vilification, which will come out for comment later this year. Once the anti-racism strategy has been launched, an advisory committee of prominent Western Australians will be appointed to oversee the implementation of the strategy and to advise government on ways to establish a more inclusive multicultural society in Western Australia.

To give a quick summary, I chair the anti-racism steering committee. The committee has targeted those four areas as being of particular importance. It is now getting into the process of looking at pilot schemes to see how it can follow up on the ideas that have been developed in the committee. As the committee gets its full report back to the Government, the committee will need assistance from the community in the report's implementation. We cannot have an anti-racism strategy that is isolated from the community. That has been the key message that has been brought to the anti-racism steering committee by its members. The committee has also put out a multicultural charter for public comment which outlines the principles of living in a multicultural society and getting the balance right between the core values of our community as a democratic society that respects the rights and interests of people and a multicultural society where there are differences. That is the big challenge.

[5.40 pm]

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I refer to cost efficiency on page 81 under output 3, management of policy. The average cost per hour of provision of information has increased from \$73 in 2002-03. The estimated cost for 2002-03 was \$109, and the estimated cost for 2003-04 is \$137. Paragraph (a) refers to the Federal Affairs and Indian Ocean Territories functions being transferred from output 3 to output 2, reducing the FTEs in this output by seven, and increasing the cost per hour. However, the estimated number of FTEs has decreased by one. Why has the hourly cost increased given that the FTE figure has not really changed?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I cannot provide an answer at this stage but I will provide supplementary information on the reason for the increase in the average cost per hour of the provision of information from \$109 to \$137.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: The explanation sought is in relation to the reduction of FTEs, which is only one, not seven.

[*Supplementary Information No A26.*]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to the fourth dot point on page 88 outlining major achievements for 2002-03. What plans are in place to commemorate the centenary of this place and the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of European settlement?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The year 2004 represents the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary unless one is the member for Albany, who might take a different view! I need to see the member for Albany about two football results on the weekend, but I have not been able to get hold of him. Next year, Western Australia will also be celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the construction of this Parliament. The amount of \$1.25 million

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

has been set aside for those celebrations. The only announcement made so far is that both the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council will hold a sitting in regional Western Australia. Such sittings were very successful in Victoria, Queensland and the Northern Territory. In Victoria, the Assembly visited one place and the Council went to another. I think the Speaker referred this morning to the work we are doing on that. Although an announcement has been made, exactly where the two Houses will sit has not been determined. I have established a committee to advise the Government on how to celebrate those two events next year. The committee consists of Professor Tom Stannage; Mr Michael Lewi; Dr Jenny Gregory; Dr Lenore Layman; Professor David Black; Professor Harry Phillips; Ms Betty O'Rourke, from the Constitutional Centre; Dr Sue Graham-Taylor; Janice Dudley; Leela de Mel, who is with us today; Irene Stainton; Noela Taylor; Kate O'Shaughnessy; Hon John Cowdell, President of the Legislative Council, who is the chair of the committee; Professor Geoffrey Bolton; Mr Glen Bennett; Dr Rhonda Jamieson; Mr Ben Harvey, from my office; and Cassandra Landre, from the Constitutional Centre. They have been putting together ideas for the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary celebrations. We will be in a position fairly soon to announce what we will do. It is not just a matter of celebrating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary through new initiatives. We will link up with some existing programs that will be carried out in 2004 and badging them with the anniversary.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Should the Leader of the Opposition have been invited to nominate a representative?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I assure the Leader of the Opposition that it is a very good committee and I am sure he will agree that it is representative of our community. The Government will make an announcement on the projects that it will fund.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to support for the Premier as Minister for Public Sector Management under output 4 on page 83. The fourth dash point refers to support for organisational restructuring and promotion of whole-of-government management improvement strategies and special projects. For a number of years, the Department of Health's performance audit has not been ratified by the Auditor General. Is there capacity within the public sector management area to assist the Department of Health with its performance audit?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Mick Reid committee, which is examining the health system, will in a sense deal with some of those issues. Is the Leader of the National Party's main concern the follow-up by the Auditor General?

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I am asking apropos my past position as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, in which committee, as the Premier will understand, I have an ongoing interest. This year it took five months to get the health department's reports ticked off, subject to qualification by the Auditor General. The Auditor General made it clear in his annual report on the Department of Health for this year that the department was having significant problems handling performance audits. It obviously needs some assistance. I believe that it is a cultural matter within the health department.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: There is no allocation in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet budget to that effect.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: How do we deal with it?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It must be dealt with by the Director General of Health.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: The department does not seem to have the desire to do it.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: I refer to management of policy under output 3 on page 80. The community will be disappointed when people realise the \$1.3 million -

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Government has increased the appropriation to health by 9.7 per cent.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: Let us look at that increase in terms of proportion.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Is the member for Alfred Cove saying that it is too little?

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: Many people will consider that the Mick Reid health review shows a lack of faith in the minister, particularly with continued smoking in public places. People knew the Government's position when it was the Opposition.

I refer to sustainability and environmental policy under output 3. One of the other commitments the Government gave was to cease logging in old-growth forests. Old-growth forests are continuing to be logged. The trees are just disappearing. I believe that moves will soon be made to log in Jarrahdale, near Perth. What is happening with the sustainability unit and the management of policy and environment while logging continues not only down south but also as near to Perth as Jarrahdale?

[5.50 pm]

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will not respond to those questions; they do not relate to my budget. The member has always had a different view on these matters from the Government. I would have thought she would be better placed supporting our decision to stop logging in old-growth forests. The member is entitled to her view.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: We said this would happen.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: What would happen?

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: You would log close to the towns and the people would see it. That is exactly what is happening. It is a disgrace.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We have saved all of our old-growth forests. We are the first State Government to do that.

I refer to the sustainability strategy. The strategy focuses on six areas: sustainability and governance, contributing to global sustainability, sustainable use of natural resources, sustainability in settlements, sustainability in the community and sustainability in business. We released a draft strategy that proposed 249 actions in 42 priority areas under these six goals. We have consulted with the community on the draft strategy. I point out that six workshops were held in Perth and 17 public meetings were held across Western Australia. Professor Peter Newman, director of the sustainability unit, has delivered 100 presentations on the draft strategy to community groups, conferences, universities, industry associations and agencies. We have consulted very widely on that document. Later this year we will conclude the consultation process and announce our strategy.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: As part of that review of sustainability, why has the Government neglected the environment?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is just not true.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I refer to the third dot point under major achievements for 2002-03 on page 94 of the *Budget Statements*, which outlines several initiatives including the inaugural Premier's awards for science, the Premier's research fellowships, the higher education contribution scheme support scheme for science teachers, and the Premier's collaborative research grants program. Will the Premier provide some extra information and elaborate on the rollout of those initiatives?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Premier's prize for achievement in science was established this financial year. I was very pleased that I was able to enlist the help and support of the ABC's science program when we gave out those awards. The shadow spokesperson for science, the member for Vasse, was also with us. That award raises the status of science in Western Australia and recognises some of the very high achievers. Fifty-three nominations were considered, representing over 20 organisations from the research community.

The research fellowship program the member mentioned provides a four-year \$250 000 fellowship to be awarded in 2002-03 and 2003-04. Expressions of interest were called for in November 2002. Thirteen expressions of interest were received and four were short-listed. That process has taken longer than we expected, so the funding will be provided in the 2003-04 budget. I will get a recommendation from the Science Council and the Office of Science and Innovation in June or July this year. The institution hosting the winner will be required to sign an agreement covering the conditions of the grant. That fellowship will be a plus for Western Australia because it will attract good scientists to Western Australia who attract value on their own merits. I note that Dr Bruce Hobbs, our chief scientist, is with us today. His philosophy is to make investments that attract further investment in Western Australia. With his background in the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, I am sure we will be able to do that.

The HECS refunds for science teachers were announced in last year's budget. We have been advised that the payment of HECS fees for 50 science teachers qualified to teach physics and chemistry would attract fringe benefit taxes for state teachers but not private school teachers. To avoid that, it is proposed - we will pay that fee this year - that future rounds will be converted to scholarships and awarded prior to graduation. The HECS reimbursement program will be provided for the 2003 intake of eligible government teachers. The Department of Education and Training will administer that initiative to government teachers through its final year scholarship program. Privately employed teachers do not attract an FBT obligation and will be reimbursed.

The Premier's collaborative research program, set up due to the Science Council report "Trends in Research and Development Expenditure in Western Australia", provides a grant of up to \$600 000 for a three-year collaborative research activity involving at least two state government agencies and an external research agency. The state government agency will be the project's lead agency. It will sign a memorandum of understanding covering the grant's conditions and outcomes and will be strongly linked to government policy. Some 56 expressions of interest were received. I will receive a recommendation in June or July this year.

In summary, the Premier's prize is up and running. The HECS refunds for science teachers is also up and running but will be converted to a scholarship program for government teachers. I was pleased to be at Willetton

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Senior High School on Friday, with the member for Riverton. Willetton Senior High School is a leading school in science in Western Australia. One of its students, along with other Australian students, had successfully won a trip to Russia to look at science related to its space program. When I was at the school, I made the point that we need more science teachers. These scholarships will get them into our schools. The Premier's research fellowship and the Premier's collaborative research grants program have taken longer to get up and running than we thought last year. However, I will be in a position to announce funding for them in 2003-04.

The CHAIRMAN: Members must be conscious of the time if they want this division put before 6.00 pm.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: We do not want the chairman to do that because we have not covered the output on science.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that in this division?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I imagine that the question will be put after we have dealt with the science issues.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I refer the Premier to output performance measures on page 92 regarding native title output 8 -

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is covered in another division. The Deputy Premier will handle that matter.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Which division?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It is covered under the Deputy Premier's division.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: No, it is page 92 under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It is covered by the Deputy Premier.

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: Has output 8 been taken out?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Road safety and native title are covered by the Minister for Police and the Deputy Premier.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I refer to the table on page 80 of the *Budget Statements*, which states that some crime prevention grants have been repositioned from the current financial year to the next financial year. What was the total amount of the grants that were repositioned?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: During the mid-year review, on advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance, \$1.804 million of crime prevention recurrent grants were repositioned in 2003-04 as the funds were unlikely to be required in 2002-03. This position was the result of a \$1.336 million carryover from 2001-02, the operational constraints of grant agreements and the generally scheduled payments of three or more years. Periodic instalments are paid on the achievement of agreed milestones. The Office of Crime Prevention also receives \$500 000 each year from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. That money comes from part of the proceeds from the sale of private numberplates, which is disbursed through grants programs. Funds were repositioned as follows: for 2003-04, the Safer WA fund received \$642 000; the state crime prevention strategy received \$326 000; the community policing fund, including the private plate revenue, received \$334 000; the crime prevention fund received \$352 000; and the community security program received no funding from the sale of private numberplates. Projects funded from the 2001-02 carryover received \$150 000.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I have another question on crime -

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will just finish the point. The projected grants expenditure for 2002-03 for crime prevention grant programs are as follows: Safer WA, \$314 000; the state crime prevention strategy, \$258 000; the community policing fund, \$253 000; the crime prevention fund, \$346 000; the community security program, \$1 million. That is a total of \$2.171 million. The estimated project expenditure in 2002-03 is \$546 000 with \$547 000 of contract commitments to be carried forward to 2003-04, and \$798 000 of the 2001-02 carryover was transferred to these projects with the approval of the Premier, supplementing the 2002-03 appropriation of \$295 000.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm.*

[Mr A.J. Dean took the Chair.]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: A question was asked before the break on surveys conducted by the Office of Multicultural Interests. Unfortunately, Ms de Mel misheard the question. The correct answer is that surveys will be conducted this year on the effectiveness of our multicultural policies. The design work on the surveys will start early in the new financial year, and the cost is yet to be determined.

A question was asked of me about the full-time equivalent savings from the functional review. As a point of clarification, the 770 staff savings I mentioned is the current estimate of the FTE savings. The figure does not

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

include savings from corporate services reform because the business case for that initiative is still being finalised. I clarify the two answers provided prior to the dinner suspension.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to the first dot point under major initiatives on page 95 of the *Budget Statements*. What is the time frame for the implementation of the strategic plan for the Office of Science and Innovation?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The strategic plan contains the guiding vision for the Office of Science and Innovation, the goals to be executed, clear timetables and criteria for measuring success, an assessment of whether the existing program is capable of meeting those goals and explicit prioritisation. The management plan is being developed in conjunction with the Premier's Science Council, and involves a high level of consultation with the research community. The plan will be finalised and submitted for approval by the Premier by the end of June 2003.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Will the plan be made a public document? Will it be open for public consultation and scrutiny or will it be presented to the public as the deliberations of the Chief Scientist and the Science Council?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Consultation with the community on the document is already occurring, as indicated by the research community's involvement in the process of its creation. When the plan is finalised and submitted for approval by the Premier as a plan of action for the Office of Science and Innovation, I will have no difficulty communicating to the public what we plan to do.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: I explore further the consultation with the science community. Can I obtain some detail on exactly what form that consultation is taking? It is clearly not just consultation with the Science Council. I presume it is broad ranging. Are any calls being made for the science community to have input, or does it involve word of mouth, phone calls to different institutions and so on?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I ask Dr Hobbs to answer.

Dr HOBBS: We had a meeting with fewer than, but close to, 100 members of the scientific community and some of the industrial community in late March. Following that meeting, a week of one-on-one consultations took place - although sometimes a few more people were involved - with two consultants hired for the task. In all, in the order of 200 people were contacted directly. From that evolved the existing draft strategic plan. I called together several groups in the scientific community whom I rely on for advice; namely, the deputy vice-chancellors, research, of the universities, members of the marine community, members of the metals community and so forth. I had deep consultation with those people. That is how the plan has evolved to date.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Are the Premier and the Chief Scientist satisfied that they have covered the broad range of the science and innovation community in Western Australia through the consultation?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Obviously, Dr Hobbs will present me with the draft plan, and I will look at it. I must be satisfied with it before I sign off on it. I am not in a position to answer that question before I receive the report. With Dr Hobbs' background, he is in a good position to take the net as wide as he needs to go.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: When the strategy plan comes out, can it include a list of all the people consulted, including the roughly 100 people to whom Dr Hobbs referred?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We will make note of that request.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: The fifth dot point of major initiatives for 2003-04 on page 95 reads -

The Strategic Research Fund for the Marine Environment will allocate the remainder of the Collaborative Research funding . . .

Has there been any benefit from the research undertaken? Has there been a major find with, or improvement to, marine life technology?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The strategic research fund for the marine environment is an unincorporated joint venture between the State Government and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. Under a joint venture agreement, both parties have committed to provide \$10 million each over six years commencing in 2001 to deliver significant capability development in marine scientific research in Western Australia and strategic outcome research required by the State Government's marine resource management, industry development and conservation agencies. The marine environment research fund is meeting its objectives. CSIRO has already recruited close to its target of 20 marine scientists to create a centre of excellence in marine research that will enhance the State's existing research capabilities. So, nearly 20 scientists have relocated to Western Australia. A key component is the post-graduate scholarship program; that is, 15 part-funded scholarships and PhD research funds worth \$665 000 over three and a half years have been awarded to WA publicly funded universities in the disciplines of chemistry, oceanography, marine biology and ecology.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: To the Chief Scientist, I saw up at Shark Bay a research project relating to the growing of snapper. Is that what this project is all about?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That sounds like a Fisheries project. An issue in Shark Bay is the survival of the pink snapper. I suspect that the project to which the member refers deals with the restrictions placed on catching pink snapper.

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: The same marine technology operation is in place in Queensland. The CSIRO has some involvement there. It has looked at various species, not just marine species such as prawns, and their lifestyles and how they can be generated in a commercial environment. Will the research centre look at such matters as well?

Dr HOBBS: "Strategic" in its title means that the aim of the endeavour is to form a baseline for the whole marine ecosystem, not just individual species. It is an attempt to build up a background knowledge on which future exploitation of the resource can occur.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am interested in the part played by the Office of Science and Innovation in the successful bid for the \$23.5 million grant for the international Square Kilometre Array radio telescope project. Can the Premier provide some detail?

[7.10 pm]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The square kilometre array project, or SKA, is a \$1 billion project that is representative of a completely new generation of international radioastronomy instruments and, as such, represents the future of radioastronomical research. Western Australia is the only State Government that is a participating member in the successful \$23.5 million major national research facilities grant, and this places the State in a highly competitive position to be selected as the preferred Australian nominated position for SKA. The State now has a partnership relationship with two divisions of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, five universities and three companies under the SKA agreement. As part of the SKA MNRF agreement, the CSIRO Australian national telescope facility division is committed to undertake a \$200 000 a year research program in Western Australia for each of the next four years. It enhances the Government's strategy of having part of the mid west region declared as an international radio-quiet reserve. Such a status, which does not currently exist anywhere in the world, increases the probability of attracting other new generation radioastronomy facilities such as the low frequency array, or LOFAR, and future National Aeronautics and Space Administration and European Space Agency projects.

Radioastronomy provides numerous opportunities to enhance the scientific capability of the State and also provides opportunities to develop the state information communication technology industry capability, particularly in the fields of signal processing and large-scale computing. At the moment Western Australia is being looked upon by the world as a radio-quiet destination; therefore, telescope facilities are being attracted to our State. The SKA project is one such project. Feeding off the SKA project, we also hope that the interest that is being expressed in the low frequency array radioastronomy project, which comes from America and Europe, may also be attracted to our State.

This is an exciting new area and there is no doubt that it represents a real opportunity. We are very pleased that we are part of the SKA consortium. Recently Dr Hobbs and I met with the proponents of the LOFAR project and pressed the case for Western Australia. They are getting close to a decision and we have made representations to them about the strengths of the Western Australian bid.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The State has positioned itself very strategically.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: There are not many radio-quiet parts of the world. In the mid west region of Western Australia, there is very little radio frequency interference.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The time line is that the decision is imminent.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: No. There are two projects. There is the SKA project, for which we are part of the national bid, and there is the LOFAR project. The decision on LOFAR will probably be made midyear. We have met with representatives from Europe and America, including American defence departments and universities and European agencies.

I will give the member some details about the LOFAR project as well. The LOFAR international site selection committee visited Perth, Geraldton and the proposed site and rated it very highly on the grounds of the ability to conduct outstanding science, the level of cooperation, the support and enthusiasm for the project and the competency and professionalism of the proponents. We expect a decision will be made in July this year.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to the second dot point on page 99, under output 11. It relates to e-government and the networked neighbourhoods pilot project. As part of this project, is there some focus on the so-called digital divider addressing the lack of penetration of electronic applications in disadvantaged parts of the State?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The networked neighbourhoods project involves the piloting of a prototype technological environment called networked neighbourhoods which was designed by the department. The environment enables the Internet to be used to create communities of people with a common interest. The approach incorporates the ability to personalise the delivery of government services to citizens. Implementation commenced in April 2003 in Picton Waters, a suburb of Bunbury. I am sure the Chairman knows all about this project. I will go to Bunbury later this year to look at it. Strong partnerships have been developed with local industry, including land developers, telecommunications companies, and information and communications technology companies such as Microsoft, Beacon Technology and Unisys West. Murdoch University, Curtin University of Technology and Edith Cowan University are involved to measure the financial benefits of building social capital in communities, and the Department of Housing and Works, regional development commissions, the Department of Sport and Recreation, the Department of Education and Training and the Department of Health are also involved. Initial training sessions are being held with a group of identified community champions from the Picton area and the Picton Primary School on 20 and 21 May, as well as with the City of Bunbury staff and members of the south west online committee. I am sure the member will recall that during the election we announced a major commitment to south west online to take all the achievements of Bunbury 2000 into the twenty-first century, and this is one of the follow-up commitments from the policy that we set. It will be a very interesting project. Obviously, we will monitor the results closely with a view to seeing whether it can be spread to other areas.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: I refer to page 93 and the total cost of output in the table in the middle of the page. Why was the expenditure this current financial year \$13.2 million less than was budgeted?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The member was not present before when I explained that there were two projects which we thought would be up and running in this financial year but which will be up and running next financial year. They are the Premier's research fellowship program and the Premier's collaborative research program. We should be ready to announce the successful recipients of those grants early in the new financial year. The other main reason is the re-positioning of the grants program. We did not spend all the money that was allocated to the grants and they have been re-positioned in the 2003-04 financial year.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Can the Premier give me an indication of the total number of dollars for each of those three programs - that is, the research fellowship, the collaborative research grant and the amount of money that was not spent in the grants program - so that I can lead into my next question?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Premier's research fellowship program provides a four-year \$200 000 fellowship, the Premier's collaborative research grant provides a grant of up to \$600 000 for a three-year collaborative research activity and total grants of \$15.618 million have been re-positioned in 2003-04.

[7.20 pm]

Mr B.K. MASTERS: What number of research fellowships are expected to be allocated in a year?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: There will be two over the next two financial years.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: What number of collaborative research grants are expected to be allocated?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: One.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: In total that is only about \$16 million, which the Premier is saying will be carried over to next year. Does that mean that next year there will be a doubling up of the number of research fellowships and collaborative grants?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We need to put into the budget as well all the other programs funded by the Science Council, such as the centres of excellence etc.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Another of the output performance measures on page 93 is research capability and infrastructure grants administered, for which the numbers are 70, 107, 62 and 64. I take it that the reduction from 107 budgeted to 62 estimated for 2002-03 is the reduction that the Premier has just been talking about.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is only for the centres of excellence.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: If that is only for the centres of excellence and not subject to the three areas that the Premier has just said have not been funded this year, why is it that the budget estimate for last year was for 107 grants but only 62 have come about?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I think I gave the specific answer earlier. The general answer is that obviously the science portfolio is a new portfolio. We set up the Science Council in our first year in government. We have already made some initiatives, such as the scholarships programs, the Premier's science awards, and repositioning the centres of excellence and giving them more professionalism in the way that decisions are considered. Secondly,

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

it has taken us some time to appoint our new chief scientist, Dr Hobbs. It is just the result of the fact that it is a new portfolio, and the rolling out of the money is happening more slowly than we predicted.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Does the Premier still envisage that consistent with his pre-election promises \$50 million will be spent in the first term of his Government, or will some of that money be rolled over to the period after that?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: It is still planned to be spent in this four-year period, and obviously if that were to change it would have to be announced in next year's budget. We still expect to do that.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Still on page 93, two of the international science projects managed are SKA and LOFAR. What is the third one?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Indian Ocean climate initiative.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: The third dot point under major initiatives for 2003-04 at page 95 reads that opportunities will be explored to consolidate existing centres of excellence into larger facilities so as to minimise overhead costs and duplication of assets, and so on. Is that one of the new projects that the chief scientist will be undertaking? I thought we had only a relatively small number of centres of excellence in Western Australia at this time; therefore, it might be difficult to consolidate them.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The background is that in the last round of major grants from the Commonwealth, Western Australia fared reasonably well in overall money but did not fare well in the headquartering of major projects. I believe the reason is that Western Australia does not have the scale to attract these headquarters. I will ask Dr Hobbs to comment further on what this objective comes down to, but I think it is to try to bring about a better base upon which to attract national funding.

Dr HOBBS: Indeed. None of the centres of excellence across the State, with the exception of perhaps one, is of a scale that could attract the headquarters of a major national facility or a special research centre, or a cooperative research centre for that matter. Therefore, the aim is to launch into a strategy whereby over the next year any investment that is made is made specifically to attract that critical mass so that we can achieve those other centres from the other funding agencies.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: How many centres of excellence are there in Western Australia?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Forty centres of excellence have been funded.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Are they centred in Western Australia?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I will provide as supplementary information the list of Western Australian centres of excellence.

*[Supplementary Information No A27.]*

Mr J.B. D'ORAZIO: Mr Chairman, I point out that we were due to finish division 3 at 6.00 pm. However, we deferred in particular to the Leader of the Opposition, who said he had one question to ask after the dinner suspension, and we could then go on to division 4. We still have divisions 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to go, and we have spent two and a half hours on this division. I ask that we finish division 3.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr A.J. Dean): The member for Vasse assures me that he has only two more questions.

Mr B.K. MASTERS: Under major achievements for 2002-03 and major initiatives for 2003-04 at pages 94 and 95 there is a list of different actions being undertaken in the science portfolio. Will the Premier outline by way of supplementary information the amount of money that has been allocated to each of the different initiatives; for example, the Premier's science awards, the Premier's research fellowships, the HECS support scheme and so on? There are about a dozen, and I do not wish to take up time on them now.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I am happy to provide supplementary information about the major achievements and initiatives recorded on pages 94 and 95 and the various costings.

*[Supplementary Information No A28.]*

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I refer to output 3 at page 80, management of policy, particularly relating to the Office of Crime Prevention. Will the proposed Northbridge curfew be coordinated by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; and, if so, where in the budget papers is there an allocation of costs for the implementation of such a curfew?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The coordination of that project is being done by the social policy unit of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. As part of our agreement with the City of Perth, we are carrying out the



Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

recommendations of the report that we prepared in consultation with Dr Nattrass and the City of Perth. Mr Peter Frizzell, a well-known public servant, has been appointed to oversee the implementation of those recommendations. It is being overseen by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and Mr Frizzell is the government representative on that joint group with the City of Perth. They will coordinate the implementation of the policy.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: If it is being coordinated by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, where in the budget papers can I find an allocation of funding for the proposed curfew?

[7.30 pm]

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Which funds is the Leader of the Opposition talking about?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Any funds.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Mr Frizzell's salary is met by the Department of Education and Training and the Leader of the Opposition will find it in that budget. Total funding for the social policy unit was indicated to the Leader of the National Party earlier. That unit is conducting the policy development.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Is there, therefore, no funding for implementing a curfew?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: I have made it clear that there is Gordon inquiry funding that I outlined in some detail earlier to the member for Girrawheen. Part of the package is the Gordon inquiry funding that will assist in getting collaborative arrangements with indigenous communities to deal with some of these endemic social problems. I am talking about a policy proposal for a curfew, not an expenditure of money.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Does the Premier have any idea of the resources required to implement a curfew?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition appears to have lots of ideas about it. My view is that it can be done very efficiently and it will be done as part of a whole-of-government approach to Northbridge. We are the first Government to take a whole-of-government approach to Northbridge. Northbridge has been a major problem and we acknowledge that we cannot solve the problem without a partnership with the City of Perth. Dr Nattrass has been working with us through the City of Perth on that project and we have appointed Peter Frizzell to coordinate our activities. Some \$75 million of Gordon inquiry money has been allocated by the State to deal with those endemic social problems. We have already funded the Noongar Patrol System and non-government agencies that are working in that area.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not want a speech; I just want to know where the money is.

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We are quite confident that we can carry out our aims in that area within the budget.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not at all share the Premier's confidence.

I refer to output 6, management of the Constitutional Centre programs, which indicates an increase in funding from \$1.19 million in 2002-03 to \$2.26 million in 2003-04. That is about a \$1 million increase for special funding associated with the celebrations of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of European settlement of Western Australia. Is that in addition to the \$1.25 million referred to in the major policy decision?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: That is what it is.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is the same amount?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: Yes.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: A major initiative for 2003-04 at page 83 states that the department will assist in developing a comprehensive early years strategy across government. What is that strategy aimed to do and when is it likely to be implemented?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: The early years task force was established within government to examine a range of issues on early intervention strategies. Both the member for Girrawheen and I were privileged to attend the annual Harmony Day lecture delivered by Professor Fiona Stanley, who focused on that subject. The strategy represents a major challenge for government. We therefore set up an early years task force in 2001-02 chaired by the Director General of the Department for Community Development. The task force comprises the directors general from the Departments of Health, Local Government and Regional Development, Education and Training, Housing and Works, the Disability Services Commission and representatives from the policy division of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The task force will develop an early years strategy to maximise interagency collaboration and community engagement and is informed by research indicating the importance of early years childhood development. The task force will also design and implement changes to the ways in which agencies interrelate, which will in turn provide more seamless, coordinated and responsive client services. Local

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr John Hyde; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr John D'Orazio; Mr David Templeman; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Bernie Masters

---

government will be invited to join in these efforts to improve services for young children and their parents. Eleven local governments have been identified to participate in the development of a strategy, including Gosnells, Mandurah, Halls Creek, Kalgoorlie and Swan and the Department for Community Development will provide support for the task force. A great deal of work in this area has been done in Mandurah through its regional development commission and local government. This represents a major challenge for government. We still have the silo approach, but if we are to deal with the major social issues that are presented to us, we must get government cooperating to address the problem; that means cutting across departments and forming a partnership with the community rather than being on top of the community. This represents a major challenge to us and I would like to think that we could do more work in this area. However, we have a road safety program, the implementation of the Gordon inquiry recommendations, the early years strategy task force and the homelessness strategy. All of these initiatives are part and parcel of a new effort to bring about collaboration within government and a partnership with the community.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Further to that, does it include the appointment of a commissioner for children?

Dr G.I. GALLOP: We decided in the response to the Gordon inquiry that at this stage our funds could be better spent on direct service delivery. There is therefore no allocation for that in this year's budget.

**The appropriation was recommended.**