

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

**Division 3: Premier and Cabinet, \$107 281 000 -**

Ms Guise, Chairman.

Dr Gallop, Premier.

Mr M. Wauchope, Director General.

Dr R.A. Field, Acting Executive Director, Executive Policy Office.

Mr G. Hay, Assistant Director General, Public Sector Management.

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

Ms J.L. Sales, Assistant Director General, Corporate and Business Services.

The CHAIRMAN: Each output in the division will be dealt with separately. The question is that the appropriation for output 1, division 3 be recommended.

Mr BARNETT: I refer to page 76 of the *Budget Statements* and major policy decisions specific to the Government Media Office. What major policy decision increased the funding for the Government Media Office by \$605 000 and what will that money be used for?

Dr GALLOP: The amount of \$605 000 has been allocated to the Government Media Office over the next four years. The 2001-02 allocation to the GMO is approximately \$1.524 million

Mr BARNETT: It is an additional \$605 000 every year, not over four years.

Dr GALLOP: With the additional \$605 000 each year over the next four years, the allocation will increase to \$2.129 million. I will draw a comparison. In 2000-01, the last year of the previous Government, the GMO allocation was \$1.78 million, together with an allocation to the communications unit of \$1.083 million. The total expenditure at that time was \$2.863 million. That puts things in some perspective. The amount of \$605 000 includes, first, an allocation of \$355 000 to the community liaison unit fund, which includes the salaries for four staff and overheads. This unit has the role of assisting in coordinating regional and metropolitan cabinet and subcommittee visits, researching community and regional issues, disseminating government policy material throughout the State, particularly through regional areas, and supporting the Premier and ministers on regional visits. The Government has initiated a wide-ranging program of regional cabinet meetings and visits, and the community liaison unit will play a role in that. Secondly, an allocation of \$75 000 is provided for countrywide monitoring. A contract will be let for monitoring radio news and current events throughout the country regions. The new service will replace contracted services provided to the previous Government from country towns. Under the previous coalition Government, country monitoring was provided by two media contractors based in Geraldton and Bunbury at a cost of \$162 000 per annum. Thirdly, in 2002-03 the Government has allocated \$180 000 to community quantitative, or attitudinal, research. This will allow six-monthly feedback of community opinion in the metropolitan and country areas, reflecting the diversity and dynamics of life in Western Australia. Issues covered will include the general mood of Western Australians; perceptions of commonwealth support for WA; and people's views on health, education, police, crime and law, water, sources of information, women's issues, urban planning, ethnic affairs and the environment. The quantitative research will be tabled in Parliament.

Mr BARNETT: Could I seek, by way of further information if it is not available now, a listing of all officers employed within the Government Media Office, including media advisers attached to ministerial offices, and their designation, salary and additional wage and non-wage benefits?

Dr GALLOP: I will provide supplementary information on staff employed by the Government Media Office and the media advisers in the ministerial offices.

Mr BARNETT: In terms of their level, wage and additional wage or non-wage benefits.

Dr GALLOP: I will provide that information.

[*Supplementary Information No A46*]

[9.10 am]

Mr BARNETT: I refer also on page 76 to the additional operational funding for parliamentary electorate offices. Which electorate offices are due for upgrades in 2002-03?

Dr GALLOP: I will refer this matter to the director general. I thought the list was here, but I cannot find it.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Mr WAUCHOPE: Since the election, the Premier has approved that 27 electorate offices be relocated. From memory - we have the information here somewhere, and I will confirm this later if we can find it - of that 27, 22 have been rehoused, and between seven and nine are still being considered in one form or another.

Mr BARNETT: I seek, by way of supplementary information, a listing of those offices that have been either relocated or refurbished since the election and those due to be, and the estimated cost per electorate office.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Premier confirm that for the record?

Dr GALLOP: I confirm that we will provide that supplementary information.

Mr McRAE: Would the five breaches of the Occupational Safety and Health Act in my previous electorate office be included in the justification for the -

Dr GALLOP: I seek the committee's indulgence. I have found the list, so I will read it. I apologise for that. Following the election in February 2001, changes to electorate office accommodation were arranged for 22 new and sitting members of Parliament. The approximate cost of establishing an office is \$75 000. The figure will vary according to location, be it in the country or the city, the existing standard of the building and incentive contributions from the owner. Thirty-six new members were elected at the state election held in February 2001. Thirty-two of those members were accommodated in existing parliamentary electorate offices. Four members required new accommodation - members Cadby, Farina, Pratt and Woollard - and were temporarily housed in Dumas House or their former campaign office. However, since the election, 36 relocation requests have been received from both new and sitting members. As at 22 March 2002, 27 requests to move had been approved, 22 members had been rehoused, four requests were under negotiation, nine requests had been deferred or rejected, and one request was being considered.

I will go through the requests. Madam Chairman, is it okay to mention the surname of the member? We normally address members by their seat. On this occasion I suspect it will be impractical to do that, so can I mention the surname? It is a slight breach of standing orders, but I think the Chairman will allow me to do it.

The CHAIRMAN: In the context of this item, I will allow that to happen.

Dr GALLOP: Ainsworth has been approved but negotiations are continuing with the owners; Andrews approved and accommodated; Birney approved and accommodated; Bowler approved and negotiations are continuing; Cadby approved and accommodated; Chappell approved and accommodated; Dean approved and accommodated; D'Orazio approved and negotiations continuing; Doust approved but deferred because she is seeking new premises; Ellery approved and accommodated; Farina approved and negotiations are continuing; Fischer approved and accommodated; Foss rejected; Giffard approved and accommodated; twice Griffiths approved and accommodated; Hill approved and accommodated; Hough approved and accommodated; House approved and accommodated; Hyde approved and accommodated; Kucera approved and accommodated; Margetts approved and accommodated; Martin approved and accommodated; McGowan deferred and remains in existing accommodation; McRae approved and accommodated; O'Gorman under consideration; Pratt approved and accommodated; Quigley approved and accommodated; Quirk approved and accommodated; Radisich deferred and remains in existing accommodation; Stephens rejected; Stretch deferred and remains in existing accommodation; Tomlinson deferred and remains in existing accommodation; Walker rejected; Whitely deferred and remains in existing accommodation; and Woollard approved and accommodated.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer to the supplementary information requested by the Leader of the Opposition. Does the Leader of the Opposition still -

Mr BARNETT: That is adequate.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the member for Riverton like to repeat his question?

Mr McRAE: I was going to ask whether, in the provision of that supplementary information, the Premier would indicate that in my case - I understand the situation is similar in a number of other cases - five breaches of the Occupational Safety and Health Act necessitated the move. The Premier's answer seems to have dealt with most of the Leader of the Opposition's questions and probably mine.

Dr GALLOP: For the purposes of information, I also indicate to the committee that in May-June 2002, 18 photocopiers were to be replaced at a cost of \$200 000; and 19 facsimile machines were to be replaced at a cost of \$23 000. All offices are fitted with standard security measures as they are relocated or refurbished. Currently, 80 offices have security features installed. Of the remainder, one is being assessed, three will be assessed during proposed relocation and refurbishment work, and seven members have either rejected the proposal or are awaiting assessment.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Ms QUIRK: I refer the Premier to output 2 on page 80, which is management of matters of state. Will the Premier provide an update on any work being done on the Commission on Government's recommendation for a register of cabinet decisions?

Dr GALLOP: That was a recommendation of the Commission on Government, and we promised to review all COG recommendations with a view to implementing them. We have asked the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to advise how we might implement that recommendation. We are considering this issue. The department has said that it thinks it will be much harder to implement this recommendation than we first expected. In fact, it has advised me against pursuing this reform. It has said that on the grounds of confidentiality, collective responsibility and solidarity within a Cabinet, it is not a desirable policy initiative. We have advice that this is impractical and has issues of principle associated with it. Drawing a line between what should be placed on the register and what would not be in the interests of the State to have on the register is a difficult issue. We are still considering the matter. We have advice that it would not be a practical reform to pursue. Basically, we are still considering whether that aspiration can be achieved.

[9.20 am]

Mr BARNETT: The strategic management unit is referred to on page 76 under major policy decisions and is listed as receiving \$200 000 by way of additional expenditure. What is the role of the strategic management unit; what is the \$200 000 to be used for; who is employed within that unit, and do their salaries come out of that amount or are they seconded?

Dr GALLOP: The strategic management unit has an allocation of \$200 000 per annum for the next four years. It has been created to ensure the implementation of key government strategic directions. Staffing costs are as follows: a class 1, including salary on-costs and motor vehicle, \$150 000; and a level 2, including salary on-costs, \$50 000. They are the bare bones. The strategic management office has been created in my office and is headed by David Hatt, who is well known to members of Parliament. At the moment the main task of the strategic management unit is to coordinate the Government's response to the water crisis, and to make sure all the different government agencies are working together to achieve a solution to that issue. We will soon be making some significant announcements about the forums we propose to have throughout the community and the symposium later this year. As members will be aware, within government major issues come along that need strategic coordination, and water supply is a clear example. The aim of this exercise is to make sure that major issues that require strategic coordination are addressed properly within government.

Mr O'GORMAN: The second dot point on page 82 under major initiatives for 2002-03 refers to a planned visit to Sarawak. Will the Premier tell us the purpose of that visit and what he hopes to achieve by visiting Sarawak?

Dr GALLOP: The department will coordinate arrangements for my proposed visit to Sarawak in September 2002. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will be interested in this matter. I am scheduled to visit Malaysia from 23 to 27 September 2002. I have been invited by the Vice-Chancellor of the Curtin University of Technology to visit Sarawak for the official opening of the Curtin-Sarawak campus. The visit will also provide the opportunity for the Government to strengthen its relationship with Malaysia. The draft itinerary for the visit at the moment includes a meeting to foster business relationships between Western Australia and Malaysia in the halal food sector, speeches to be delivered at a dinner hosted by the Sarawak Government, and a lunch hosted by the Sarawak Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I will also seek to be briefed by the Australian High Commissioner to Malaysia on the political, economic and bilateral relationships between Malaysia and Australia. The initiative of Curtin University to establish this campus represents a major step forward in Western Australia's provision of educational services to South East Asia. It further confirms the excellent relationship we have with Malaysia, and with Sarawak. I met with the chief minister of Sarawak in Perth last year; he is a graduate of Adelaide University and a great supporter of Australian-Malaysian relations. This visit is very important for Western Australia to reciprocate the support that the State of Sarawak and the nation of Malaysia have given to our State by opening that campus.

Mr BARNETT: I am sure the Premier will be delighted to know that I performed the groundbreaking ceremony.

Dr GALLOP: As I said, I was sure the Leader of the Opposition would be very interested in this matter.

Mr BARNETT: I refer to overseas agencies listed on page 78. Has the Government undervalued the importance of Korea to Western Australia by closing the Korean office, bearing in mind that Korea is a major purchaser of iron ore and has in the past been a purchaser of liquefied natural gas from Western Australia, and is an important prospective buyer of LNG in particular?

Dr GALLOP: As the Leader of the Opposition will be aware, Mr Y.W. Park, a Korean national, provided various services to the Government of Western Australia, relating to the representation of our interests in Korea. That arrangement was formalised initially following a cabinet decision way back in April 1991, specifying a

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

period of approximately three years. Consecutive three-year agreements were formalised in 1991, 1994 and 1997. The final agreement in 1997, which was valued at \$280 000 per annum, expired on 31 December 2001 and no further extensions were considered. We have reviewed all our overseas offices. That review was conducted by Mr Bob Fisher, who is now our Agent General in London. His advice was that we could adequately achieve our objectives in Korea without that office, and the Government accepted that advice.

Mr BARNETT: It has now been some time since the Western Australian Government's official representative left the North Asia Office in Japan and joined the private sector. Will the Premier advise whether he is intending to close this office, or is a replacement representative about to be appointed?

Dr GALLOP: Members will be aware that Mr Michael Walker held the position of official representative in the North Asia Office for some 10 years and he resigned on 13 July 2001. Mr Walker did a magnificent job for Western Australia. I visited Japan three times, and I am sure other members have been to Japan. We thank Mr Walker for the work he did. He received a very good offer, still working on Australian-Japanese relations in Japan, and he had served the State with distinction for 10 years. From mid July 2001 until the end of January 2002 the position was occupied on a temporary basis by Dr Bernard Key. The Leader of the Opposition may remember, he was formerly professor of Japanese studies at the University of Western Australia, now based in Japan. In August 2001 the position of official representative was advertised in Western Australia, nationally and in Japan on the basis of a fixed-term contract for three years. Following a review application being lodged, the selection process was finalised in April this year and Mr Craig Peacock commenced as the official representative on 1 May 2002. Mr Peacock was already domiciled in Japan at the time of his appointment, and that of course has made it a much more cost-effective solution for the State. He was previously in the New South Wales trade office in Japan. We are pleased to announce that an experienced officer has taken up the Western Australian position. The North Asia Office will continue to play a crucial role in servicing not only Japan, but also north Asia generally.

Mr McRAE: The second dot point on page 79 under major achievements for 2001-02 makes reference to the Gordon inquiry, established in January this year, into the response by government agencies to complaints of family violence and child abuse in Aboriginal communities. I note that that major achievement is that the inquiry is due to be completed by 31 July 2002. In the context of the broader relationship with Aboriginal communities and families, as evidenced by Martin Luther King III's comment last night to an assembled reconciliation of WA gathering that reconciliation starts firstly with "sorry", is the Gordon inquiry likely to report on time?

Dr GALLOP: As the member knows, the inquiry was appointed to examine issues raised by the coroner's inquiry into the death of Susan Taylor and the way in which state government agencies respond to evidence of family violence and child abuse in Aboriginal communities generally. It is chaired by Mrs C. Gordon, AM, who is a Children's Court magistrate, Hon Kay Hallahan, a former Minister for Community Development, and Mr Darrell Henry, a psychologist. Cabinet has approved funding of \$1.25 million for the inquiry. The inquiry provided an interim report on 26 April 2002, which report provided a summary of the methods and processes undertaken by the inquiry to date and the key issues it has identified for closer examination during the remainder of its operations. We expect that they will provide the final report within the time line laid down.

[9.30 am]

Mr BARNETT: I refer to output 2 on page 80. What was the final cost of operating ministerial offices in 2001-02? What is the budget for each ministerial office for 2002-03? I ask that those figures be provided showing the total budget actual for 2001-02, the projected budget for 2002-03, not only classified by ministerial office, including the Premier's office, but also designating the total budget, the office rental component and, therefore, the net cash budget.

Dr GALLOP: I will take that as a supplementary question given the detail required. The 2001-02 budget for ministers' offices and, of course, the Leader of the Opposition's office, was \$24.435 million; the budget for 2001-02 was \$23.210 million; the estimated actual is \$23.364 million; the budget for 2002-03 is \$23.054 million. I am happy to provide a breakdown of the budget allocation for each ministerial office and the Leader of the Opposition's office, its achievement this year and the allocation for next year. Does the leader want that on a cash or an accrual basis?

Mr BARNETT: Cash net of rent.

[*Supplementary Information No A48*]

Mr BARNETT: I refer specifically to the budget for the office of the Leader of the Opposition, in which I have a direct interest. Last year's budget was \$623 000. What is the proposed budget for 2002-03?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Dr GALLOP: On a cash basis, the Leader of the Opposition was allocated \$623 000 last year. On current estimates, this year he will spend \$670 000. He is over budget at the moment, but I do not know why. Next year's allocation is \$652 000.

Mr BARNETT: Why is that allocation of \$652 000 still well short of the \$954 000 allocated in 2000-01? The allocation for next financial year is barely two-thirds of the allocation in 2000-01, when the Premier was the Leader of the Opposition.

Dr GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition could discuss this matter with the person sitting next to him representing the National Party. As he knows, we applied exactly the same regime for the Opposition as that applied when the Labor Party was in opposition. We have a first party in opposition - the Liberal Party - and a second party - the National Party. It is a different scenario from that which existed when the Labor Party was the single party in opposition. The resources have been allocated using the same formula that was applied and agreed to by the previous Government.

Mr BARNETT: Was the Premier advised, presumably, by the Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet? Was written advice provided to the Premier on the allocation of resources to the Opposition? If so, will he make that available?

Dr GALLOP: Advice was provided on that matter. I answered questions in Parliament about it because the Leader of the Opposition pursued the matter. We have outlined the Government's accountability on that issue in Parliament.

Mr BARNETT: I have checked the record and no parliamentary arrangement or formula has been adopted. I have also checked Liberal Party records, and there is no record of any agreement reached at any stage. Will the Premier produce evidence of any arrangement, either parliamentary or executive, about the allocation of resources to the Opposition?

Dr GALLOP: We applied exactly the same formula.

Mr BARNETT: I am asking for the formula.

Dr GALLOP: The formula was agreed because it was applied.

Mr BARNETT: Who agreed to it?

Dr GALLOP: The various players in the parliamentary process.

Mr BARNETT: Specifically?

Dr GALLOP: I do not have that material with me.

Mr BARNETT: Is it true that any agreement on opposition funding determined in the mid 1980s did not involve any discussion with the Liberal Party of the day?

Dr GALLOP: I am not aware of that.

Mr BARNETT: Is it true that the decision about the allocation for the Leader of the Opposition was made by the Premier, as the executive officer of the Parliament, and was not based on any agreement, correspondence or formulated arrangement at a parliamentary or administrative level?

Dr GALLOP: It certainly was not based on an agreement with this Leader of the Opposition, because he has opposed it. I have a responsibility to allocate money to parliamentary offices, ministerial offices and the Leader of the Opposition's office. The National Party is an opposition party and it deserves to be given fair and reasonable treatment.

Mr BARNETT: I do not have an argument with that. However, I want to place on the record that the Premier has not been able to provide documentary evidence of any advice he received from the director general or of any agreement between the major parties.

Dr GALLOP: The director general did advise me on this subject.

Mr BARNETT: Please table the documentary evidence.

Dr GALLOP: It may not have been in writing.

Mr BARNETT: Is it true that the Premier made a political decision - as did Brian Burke in the 1980s - to change arbitrarily the allocation of resources for the Opposition?

Dr GALLOP: That is not true. I used exactly the same formula that was applied previously.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Mr BARNETT: Is it true that the 1980s arrangement was reached, presumably informally, between the then Premier, Brian Burke, and the Leader of the National Party and that it did not involve the Leader of the Liberal Party?

Dr GALLOP: I have no idea and I have no interest in what went on in the 1980s. I am interested in a fair and reasonable allocation of money today given that the National Party is the second party in opposition. It is a totally different situation from that which applied when the Labor Party was in opposition.

Mr BARNETT: The 2002-03 target average cost of operating a ministerial office, including the offices of the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, is \$1 386 995. Is it democratically correct that the Leader of the Opposition's budget is set at \$652 000, which is less than half the average cost of operating a ministerial office?

Dr GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition is simply not drawing an analogy. There are two opposition parties in this Parliament. The leader cannot talk about his office without talking about the Leader of the National Party's office.

Mr BARNETT: I am happy to talk about the Leader of the National Party's office.

[9.40 am]

Mr WAUCHOPE: We are not talking about comparable figures. The figure for the Leader of the Opposition's budget, as we indicated earlier, is a cash figure. The figure he referred to in his most recent question is based on accrual data, as all performance measures are, so we are not comparing apples with apples.

Dr GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition has raised the question of ministerial offices under the current Government. I will make some comparisons. Currently, the ministerial offices of the Government have 171 staff who have 74 Visa cards, 55 American Express cards, 106 mobile phones and one satellite phone. Under the Court Government, 210 people were employed in ministerial offices; under my Government 171 people are employed in ministerial offices. That is a significant difference.

The Government is very proud of these achievements: in establishing our Government, we reduced the number of ministers from 17 to 14, which has saved taxpayers \$3.5 million a year. The Government has also managed to reduce the number of staff employed in ministerial offices by 39 from 210 people to 171 people. The number of office vehicles has been cut from 109 to 68. I am quite happy at this point to talk about the reduction in the number of senior executive office holders in the Government, but given that was not the question, I will leave that to a later stage. The Government is very pleased with its record because without doubt it has contributed to a leaner, meaner government in Western Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a number of members who are waiting to ask questions. The Leader of the Opposition's questions were interposed, so, if he does not mind, I will give the call -

Mr BARNETT: I was pursuing the issue of the Leader of the Opposition's office.

The CHAIRMAN: In fairness to other committee members, I will give the member for Merredin the call, and we will come back to that.

Mr GRYLLS: On page 76 one of the major policy decisions is that \$820 000 has been identified for ministerial policy and regional officers. What is the role of those officers, how many are there and to whom do they report?

Dr GALLOP: The increase provides for the creation of five additional policy officer level 7 positions at \$450 000 and four regional liaison officer level 6 positions at \$370 000.

Mr MASTERS: Where will the regional offices be based?

Dr GALLOP: We have not finally decided where they will be based. Obviously we are taking our regional responsibilities very seriously. We have regional cabinet meetings and a regional subcommittee of the Cabinet that travels around the State. Those positions will be filled in major regional centres in Western Australia.

Mr GRYLLS: Given that on page 84 the fourth output on management of policy states that the department provides coordination for key policy matters including regional policy and the work of the cabinet standing committees, what is the justification for this \$820 000?

Dr GALLOP: The regional cabinet subcommittee deals with future government policies for regional Western Australia. The additional policy officer positions will be in the regions. We want more grunt from the regional development commissions' advice on how we can facilitate development in the regions. They will obviously be contributing to the policy discussion, but the cabinet committee has staff attached to the policy office at the centre. The policy officers will be in the regions working on regional issues. Under the previous Government there were seven regional ministerial staff. Hon Hendy Cowan had three, based in Bunbury, Dowerin and Esperance; the member for Stirling had one in Mt Barker; Hon Norman Moore had two in Kalgoorlie; the

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

member for Blackwood had one; and the former member for Albany, Hon Kevin Prince, the former Minister for Police, had one in Albany.

Mr GRYLLS: Would the Premier be able to provide supplementary information on where those officers will be located?

Dr GALLOP: The final decision has not yet been made. If the member puts the question on notice, I will certainly answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is about division 3 inclusive of outputs, it does not deal with each output separately, which was the advice I had earlier. The question is that the appropriation for division 3 be recommended.

Mr BARNETT: I refer to page 80 and to output 2. I refer the Premier to the position occupied by his current chief of staff, Mr Sean Walsh. Is it the case that he was also chief of staff for the then Leader of the Opposition prior to the election? What level did he occupy as chief of staff? What level is Mr Walsh on?

Mr WAUCHOPE: Mr Sean Walsh occupies a position with the classification of S3, which is the same classification as the chief of staff for the former Premier. His classification immediately prior to becoming chief of staff to the Premier was level 8.

Mr BARNETT: Given that Mr Walsh, who is a long-term respected public servant, was at level 8 when chief of staff for the then Leader of the Opposition, how does the Premier explain that the now Leader of the Opposition does not even have a chief of staff?

Dr GALLOP: I cannot answer that question. I could refer it to the director general.

Mr BARNETT: Is it not the case that all ministers have a chief of staff? The position of Leader of the Opposition is meant to be a ministerial office. Is it not the case that the only ministerial office that does not have a chief of staff is the Leader of the Opposition's office?

Dr GALLOP: I have no idea. I will refer to the director general.

Mr BARNETT: Perhaps the director general could clarify whether there is a chief of staff in the Leader of the Opposition's office?

Mr WAUCHOPE: The Leader of the Opposition is entitled to a chief of staff. As I understand it he has made decisions not to fill the position.

Mr BARNETT: What are the levels of chiefs of staff in the ministerial offices?

Mr WAUCHOPE: The chiefs of staff in ministerial offices range from level 8 through to level 9.

Mr BARNETT: Is it not the case that under the allocation of resources to the Leader of the Opposition it is not possible to appoint a level 8 position and, therefore, it is not possible for that ministerial office to have a chief of staff, unlike all 14 other government ministerial offices?

Dr GALLOP: May I very gently indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that running a Leader of the Opposition's office is not easy? When I was in the position we tried to maximise the use of the limited resources that we had. When I was Deputy Leader of the Opposition, one institution was that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had a motorcar driver. I sacrificed that driver in order to create more resources for the use of the office generally.

[9.50 am]

When I was the Leader of the Opposition, I always took the opportunity to travel by economy class, which meant that more revenue could be used elsewhere in the office of the Leader of the Opposition. In order to more productively organise his office, I advise the Leader of the Opposition to more carefully examine the way he spends his money. I cannot give him any more advice on the matter.

Mr BARNETT: Pursuant to that issue, I note for the record that for the first time in the State's history the office of the Leader of the Opposition does not have a chief of staff.

Dr GALLOP: That is the Leader of the Opposition's decision.

Mr BARNETT: It is not my decision. I do not have the capacity to pay for a level 8 officer. Prior to the last election, what staffing resources were available to the then Leader of the Opposition in the upper House? When in opposition did Hon Tom Stephens, as the Leader of the Opposition in the upper House, have four staff compared with the two staff now available to Hon Norman Moore even though the number of then Labor and now Liberal opposition members are comparable?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Dr GALLOP: If the Leader of the Opposition wants to discuss these matters, he should discuss them with the Leader of the National Party.

Mr BARNETT: I will come back to this matter at a later stage when we discuss salaries and allowances. My question is not on this topic, but it does relate to the Leader of the Opposition's office. Will the Premier allow the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal to conduct an independent inquiry into the appropriate amount of resources for the office of the Leader of the Opposition in the lower House and in the upper House, and the resources available for the minor parties and Independents? Will the Premier commit to abide by that decision, as I do?

Mr WAUCHOPE: The salaries -

Mr BARNETT: Excuse me, Chairman, I am asking questions of the Premier; I would prefer him to answer the questions. If he wishes to refer to the director general, the director general may answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the Premier was in the process of answering the question. Members, interjections across the Chamber are considered unparliamentary.

Dr GALLOP: I am not willing to agree to that for the simple reason that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal works under the Salaries and Allowances Act. I would be surprised if it had the power to undertake such an inquiry.

Mr BARNETT: It can ask the question. Some other body could do it if the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal cannot do it. It seems to me to be the appropriate body for these matters.

Dr GALLOP: Opposition and government resources have always been the responsibility of the Executive arm of Government.

Mr BARNETT: It has never before been politicised.

Dr GALLOP: We had to work within the constraints of the available resources.

Mr BARNETT: The then Opposition had a full budget.

Dr GALLOP: There are two major parties in Opposition.

Mr BARNETT: The National Party is an independent party and deserves to be funded on its own merit. The previous Leader of the Opposition was given a full budget, yet I have been given half a ministerial budget; that is why I do not have a chief of staff, a full level press secretary or officers for staff in the upper House.

Mr McRAE: You are still overspending and you always have.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier has the call.

Mr BARNETT: Madam Chair, I am starting to get a little irritated by the interjections from a non-participatory member.

Mr McRAE: I beg your pardon!

The CHAIRMAN: Order, members! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Dr GALLOP: I repeat, the current Government reduced the size of Cabinet, the number of ministerial officers and the number of motor vehicles associated with ministerial offices. We are playing our role in providing a lean and mean Government for the people of Western Australia. I expect the Leaders of the Opposition and the National Party to do exactly the same.

Mr BARNETT: I ask the Premier whether it is reasonable that no matter who might be in Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition's office should receive resources comparable to a typical or average ministerial office?

Dr GALLOP: There are two opposition parties in Western Australia and when their resources are combined, they do.

The CHAIRMAN: I will move on. The Premier has answered that question. If the Leader of the Opposition has a further question for a similar line, he can ask it before I move on to the member for Girrawheen, who has been patiently waiting for sometime.

Mr McRAE: Point of order. I want the Chairman's ruling on the fact that there are six voting members on this committee and other members who can join those members but as non-voting members. Any member of the Assembly can be a member of the committee. Would the Chairman confirm that so that the Leader of the Opposition understands that.

Mr BARNETT: I understand that, sunshine.

Mr McRAE: There is no need for the Leader of the Opposition to use smarmy expressions like sunshine.



Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Riverton has made his point.

Mr McRAE: Am I right?

The CHAIRMAN: The member is quite right. The committee is made up of six members, but other members have a right to participate and to ask questions. The Leader of the Opposition has a further question.

Mr BARNETT: I refer to travel entitlements under output 2 on page 80 of the *Budget Statements*. When I became Leader of the Opposition, the Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet gave me a document on the guidelines for airline travel. That document, dated February 2001, stated that the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly is entitled to unlimited business class travel on scheduled air services for official purposes within Australia. Why has the Leader of the Opposition not been offered unlimited air travel? I do not care whether it is by business or economy class. Why has the Leader of the Opposition not been allocated funds for air travel? The Premier of Western Australia can fly anywhere in Western Australia at any time. However, for the first time in the history of this State, the Leader of the Opposition cannot do the same.

Dr GALLOP: All offices in Western Australia work within a budget, whether it is the opposition office I held when in opposition or the Premier's office that I now hold. We cannot just have unlimited travel. The concept that there is no such thing as a budget is ridiculous.

Mr BARNETT: This Government provided that entitlement to me as the Leader of the Opposition and it was laid down by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal.

Dr GALLOP: Is the Leader of the Opposition saying that he can spend whatever amount of money he likes?

Mr BARNETT: It is laid down in the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal entitlements. I did not create this entitlement. I repeat, the document provided to me by the Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet states that the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly is entitled to unlimited business class travel on scheduled air services for official purposes within Australia. Why has that entitlement not been made available to me?

Dr GALLOP: It is understood that that entitlement is to be interpreted within the budget provided by the Parliament of Western Australia each year. Money cannot be spent without proper appropriation. I have never before heard such a ridiculous interpretation of the entitlements than what I have just heard from the Leader of the Opposition. It is embarrassing to the taxpayers of Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, members! This is not a free-ranging debate across the Chamber. Comments can be directed through the Chair and questions can be asked in an appropriate manner. If they are not, I will move on.

Mr BARNETT: That entitlement has been independently laid down through the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal process. The Premier implied that I would use that entitlement irresponsibly. In the 15 months since I have been Leader of the Opposition, I have travelled by air in this State on one occasion. It is unlikely that the Leader of the Opposition would travel around the State for the thrill of flying. I do not enjoy flying for a start. The Premier can travel around the State. The Leader of the Opposition also has a responsibility to meet and serve the wider community, yet the Premier is not honouring -

The CHAIRMAN: Would the Leader of the Opposition ask his further question.

Mr BARNETT: Why is the Premier not honouring that determination of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, which serves a democratic purpose to ensure that the Premier and his counterpart in opposition can travel to meet people to talk about issues anywhere in Western Australia at any time if they so chose? Why has that commitment not been honoured in the budget?

Dr GALLOP: I am subject to the same discipline and must work within the budget provided to me; it is as simple as that.

Mr BARNETT: The Premier has an unlimited role.

Dr GALLOP: I have a budget that I have to work within, as does the Leader of the Opposition and everyone else.

Mr BARNETT: I do not have the capacity to buy an air ticket.

Dr GALLOP: I find the Leader of the Opposition's concept of a budget unbelievable.

Mr BARNETT: Why does the Leader of the Opposition not have the capacity to buy an airline ticket to fly within the State? Why has that happened against the ruling of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Dr GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition and I work within the budget. If the Leader of the Opposition is not willing to work within that budget, he has a problem.

Mr BARNETT: The Premier knows that that is unacceptable.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, members! I will move on. That question has been answered.

Dr GALLOP: I worked within those constraints when I was in opposition and I expect the Leader of the Opposition to do likewise.

Mr BARNETT: How many flights has the Premier taken in Western Australia since forming Government?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is enough.

[10.00 am]

Ms QUIRK: I refer to the second line item on page 81. Will the Premier inform the committee of the cost of fitting out the office of the Leader of the National Party, the second party in opposition?

Dr GALLOP: It was \$79 668.

Ms QUIRK: What is the budget allocation of the National Party?

Dr GALLOP: The second party in opposition, as it is known -

Mr MASTERS: It is not to be confused with the third party in opposition, which is the Greens (WA).

Dr GALLOP: The budget allocation of the National Party is \$332 000, the estimated actual for this year is \$355 000 and the allocation for 2002-03 is \$312 000.

Ms QUIRK: Does the Premier know whether the National Party has stuck within its budget?

Dr GALLOP: The estimated actual is more than the budgeted amount but I do not have an explanation for that.

Mr MASTERS: I ask the Premier to provide by way of supplementary information an indication of his budget for air travel within Australia in 2001-02 and the current year?

Dr GALLOP: An overall office allocation is made to the Premier's office, as it is to the Leader of the Opposition's office. We have to work within that allocation and travel is part of it. There is no special item for travel; there is an overall allocation.

Mr MASTERS: Will the Premier give an indication of roughly how many trips he has made this year in Western Australia?

Dr GALLOP: I would be happy to provide that information.

Mr MASTERS: Will the Premier provide that information now rather than as supplementary information? Is it five, 10 or 100?

Dr GALLOP: I cannot answer that question now. I could try to, but it would be better for the member to get supplementary information.

Mr MASTERS: Supplementary information would be appreciated.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr Edwards): Does the Premier agree to provide supplementary information; and, if so, would he state exactly what information he will provide?

Dr GALLOP: Supplementary information will be provided on air travel that I have taken within the State of Western Australia in the past 12 months.

*[Supplementary Information No A49]*

Mr McRAE: I refer to the third heading on page 83 and to the Government's election commitment to reduce the number of senior executives from a peak of 422. How is that reduction progressing?

Dr GALLOP: When we came to power we set a target of 362 senior executive service positions by 2004 from the base figure of 422. That would have achieved our target at the election of reducing the number of senior executives by 60, or 14 per cent. I report to the committee today that as at 21 May 2002 the number of substantive SES positions in Western Australia is 372, a reduction of 50 executives. In this Government today there is a real effort to ensure that the Government is lean and mean. We have reduced the Cabinet from 17 to 14 since the election, saving taxpayers \$3.5 million a year. We have reduced the number of senior executive service personnel by 50, saving taxpayers \$4.6 million a year. As reported earlier, we have slashed the number of staff employed in ministerial offices from 210 to 171, a reduction of 39. The number of ministerial office vehicles has been reduced from 109 to 68. We are very keen to ensure that government in Western Australia serves the people. We do only what we have to do as a Government. We provide the level of resources that is

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

necessary to ministerial offices, both in executive support and direct funding to those offices. We are saving money and that money is going into health, education and police. We are, therefore, delivering on what we promised we would do for the people of Western Australia.

Mr McRAE: I refer to the average cost per senior executive service member, including chief executive officers, under the cost efficiency heading in the table on page 83. The Premier said that there are now 50 fewer SES officers. Is that the full reduction? I understood that the peak of SES officers was 422. I presume that is indicated in the 2001-02 budget as an average cost. Footnote (b) underneath the table on page 83 states that it includes all SES members and CEO positions.

Dr GALLOP: The point is that as the number of CEO and SES positions falls, the amount of resources needed in the central arm of government for support goes down with it.

Mr McRAE: That is the point I was trying to get at: there is also, therefore, a reduction in support costs.

Dr GALLOP: Of course, because there are fewer positions to support.

Mrs EDWARDES: In the restructuring that occurred in all departments, which allowed a reduction in CEO and SES positions, a number of departments were created or amalgamated. Will the Premier tell the committee which director general positions in the new departments are still vacant; which positions have been advertised; when those positions are likely to be filled; and when the positions that have not been advertised are likely to be advertised?

Dr GALLOP: What page is this in the *Budget Statements*?

Mrs EDWARDES: Pages 82 and 83. I am happy if the Premier wants to provide it by way of supplementary information.

Dr GALLOP: No, I have the information with me. I will, first, outline the eight chief executive officer appointments and reappointments that were finalised between 1 July 2001 and 22 May this year. They are: John Stewart, Lotteries Commission, appointed 21 August 2001; George Etrelezis, Small Business Development Corporation, reappointed 4 September 2001; Michael Daube, Department of Health, appointed 12 November 2001; David Singe, Wheatbelt Development Commission, reappointed 13 November 2001; Richard Muirhead, Western Australian Tourism Commission, appointed by way of transfer on 11 December 2001; Paul Albert, Department of Education, appointed 12 December 2001; Jeff Gooding, Kimberley Development Commission, reappointed 24 December 2001; and Alan Dodge, Art Gallery of WA, reappointed 23 January 2002. In fact, if the member has seen today's paper, I also point out that Cheryl Gwilliam was appointed to the Department of Local Government and Regional Development on 28 May 2002. There are a lot of acting CEOs and I will read them. I will read the agency rather than the name, or does the member want the name and the agency?

Mrs EDWARDES: No, agency is fine.

[10.10 am]

Dr GALLOP: The following agencies have acting CEO positions: C.Y. O'Connor College of TAFE, Department for Community Development, Department of Conservation and Land Management, Department of Consumer and Employment Protection, Country High School Hostels Authority, Curriculum Council, Department of Education Services, Office of Energy, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Indigenous Affairs, Department of Industry and Technology, Department of Land Administration and Library and Information Service of Western Australia. Actually, local government has been completed, so it is a total of 25. I apologise for that. I continue: MetroBus, Western Australian Museum, Next Step Alcohol and Drug Services, Peel Development Commission, Perth Theatre Trust, Pilbara Development Commission, Department for Planning and Infrastructure, South West Regional College of TAFE, State Supply Commission, Subiaco Redevelopment Authority, Department of Transport and Westrail.

Mrs EDWARDES: Which positions have been advertised?

Dr GALLOP: The positions anticipated to be finalised by the end of the financial year include the Department of Indigenous Affairs, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and the Department of Industry and Technology. The finalisation of the positions is in the final stages. As I know the member is interested in this area, she should know that on 12 May 2001 the Cabinet approved the use of section 46 of the Public Sector Management Act to reappoint chief executive officers at the expiry of the term of their appointment after consulting with the relevant responsible authorities, and to discontinue the previous Government's policy of automatically advertising every chief executive officer position when a term of appointment expired. The Cabinet can make a decision to go either way, but it made the decision that compulsory advertising was costing a lot of money and, if there was a case for reappointment, the Cabinet would use that power under the Act.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Mrs EDWARDES: Excluding the positions finalised prior to 30 June, when will the remaining vacant positions be advertised or have appointments been made?

Dr GALLOP: One issue is the finalisation of machinery of government legislation, some of which is still going through the Parliament and some of which is yet to be introduced. It is difficult to give precise timing. Obviously, departments such as transport, which is under the Department for Planning and Infrastructure, will be affected by the legislation about to go through the Legislative Council. We are yet to bring in legislation affecting the environmental authorities.

Mrs EDWARDES: The Department of Conservation and Land Management position has already been advertised.

Dr GALLOP: We have kept on the CEO in an acting basis.

Mrs EDWARDES: Reappointed?

Dr GALLOP: Yes. There will be more legislation in that area to create a new department called the Department of Environment, Water and Catchment Protection. The member understands that, until that legislation is passed, it would not be appropriate to reappoint people to those positions.

Ms QUIRK: I refer to the fourth dot point at page 79 of the *Budget Statements*. In March this year the Premier tabled a draft code of conduct for members of Parliament. When does the Premier expect the code of conduct will be adopted? Is there any opportunity for input by members?

Dr GALLOP: That is not a matter for me; it is a matter for the Parliament. I put forward a suggested framework for discussion. It has gone before the Parliament and it is a matter for the Parliament.

Mr BARNETT: I refer to the sixth output on pages 88 and 89 of the *Budget Statements*, which refers to the Constitutional Centre. Under the major initiatives for 2002-03, there is reference to the forthcoming Foundation Day and the format for Western Australia Week.

There is a proposal to release publicly 30-year-old cabinet documents. Have the cabinet documents and decisions been released to the Premier or any member of the Premier's staff?

Dr GALLOP: We will hold a major event on Monday. In preparation for that event we have looked at the documents. Professor Geoffrey Bolton, who is well-known to all members, has been asked to give a talk on the historical significance. In order to prepare for the event, staff have looked at the documents, because they are providing a full exhibition at the Constitutional Centre.

Mr BARNETT: Is it not the case that although I, as Leader of the Opposition - and also a custodian of some of those records - have agreed in principle, I have not formally agreed to the release of those documents? How can those documents be in the possession of the Premier's staff?

Dr GALLOP: We have to be in a position to prepare for the event. This happens every year at the commonwealth level. The official historian scrutinises documents before they are released publicly so a framework for discussion can be established.

Mr BARNETT: Is it not the case that I, as the Leader of the Liberal Party, and the Premier as the Leader of the Labor Party, have clear custodial roles of the cabinet records relating to previous Administrations of our respective parties? Is it not the case that I gave in-principle approval, but have not yet given approval for the release of documents relating to a previous Liberal coalition Government?

Dr GALLOP: The director general informs me that a volunteer, Mr Jeremy Buxton, was invited to look at the documents. He expressed no problem with them being released.

Mr BARNETT: I am sorry, but only one person can release the documents - either the Premier in respect of a Labor Government or me in respect of a Liberal Government.

Dr GALLOP: I thought the Leader of the Opposition was fully consulted about this. I was unaware that there was any difficulty.

Mr BARNETT: I wrote to the Premier outlining suggested procedures and conditions for the release of the documents. I have not received a reply.

The CHAIRMAN: This is turning into a discussion across the Chamber. We must keep the format to questions and answers.

Mr BARNETT: I raise this issue because the Premier intends to release records of a previous Liberal Government. He has already accessed those records without the authority of the current Liberal leader.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Dr GALLOP: The director general has just informed me that under archive provisions they would be released anyway. As a result of the suggestion that has come through the processes of government, we are trying to make it more of an event this year. We want to do that to provide more interest in the Western Australian Parliament and the Government.

Mr BARNETT: I do not disagree with that at all.

Dr GALLOP: I cannot see what is the problem of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BARNETT: The problem is that the Premier wrote to me, quite correctly, seeking my approval. I gave approval in principle subject to a few quite reasonable conditions. I have not received a reply, yet the Premier has already accessed the cabinet records.

Dr GALLOP: I am sorry, but I was not aware there was a problem. Jeremy Buxton has inspected the documents.

Mr BARNETT: With due respect to Jeremy Buxton, he is not the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier cannot make assumptions about cabinet records. It is a matter of protocol and propriety.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the committee should move on. The point has been made. We are coming to an impasse.

Mr GRYLLS: I refer to the major achievements for 2001-02 at page 81 of the *Budget Statements*. My question follows up the member for Girrawheen's question. Will the Premier outline what was the second party in opposition's budget for its office last year and what it will be this year?

Dr GALLOP: The budget last year was \$332 000 and it will be \$312 000 this year.

Mr GRYLLS: What is the rationale for that reduction?

Dr GALLOP: Certain costs were involved in setting up the new office and those costs have now been built into the system. The budget last year was higher because of setting-up costs.

Mr GRYLLS: The Premier told the member for Girrawheen that \$79 000 was the cost of establishing the office.

Mr WAUCHOPE: On top of fit-out costs of \$79 000, there were also one-off equipment costs that were reflected in the expenditure and budget for the current financial year. The money is not there for the next financial year.

Mr MASTERS: The committee referred earlier to major policy decisions at page 76 of the *Budget Statements*. The Premier suggested that the typical cost of relocating an electorate office was about \$75 000. What is the typical cost of running an electorate office?

[10.20 am]

Dr GALLOP: I will provide that as supplementary information.

Mr MASTERS: My back of the envelope figures come to about \$300 000 a year. However, should the one vote, one value reform proceed, which has just been passed through both Houses of Parliament, there will need to be significant forward estimates. In 2004-05 or 2005-06, money will need to be available for the relocation of eight offices from the country to the city and for the creation of two new upper House offices.

Dr GALLOP: That would not be incorporated into the budget until the redistribution went through. It would not be appropriate to do it now because the case has not yet been finalised. However, once it has been finalised and the redistribution is done, we will have to budget for that.

Mr MASTERS: So next year's budget would see a figure - on my estimate - of about \$1.3 million.

Dr GALLOP: I will not comment on the member's estimate. We would have to consider that matter.

Ms QUIRK: I refer to page 85 of the *Budget Statements* and output 4. What is the Government doing to reduce premiums and ensure accessibility for community groups to public liability insurance cover?

Dr GALLOP: I outlined the Government's position on this matter in a recent parliamentary debate. Yesterday, a meeting between all the ministers and the Commonwealth was held and there has been an agreement between the Commonwealth and the States on a range of measures that will need to be applied at both levels of government. The Commonwealth will have to introduce measures that ensure that the insurance companies pass on the savings that will be put in place as a result of other legislative initiatives. I have not had a full briefing on the meeting. I have the notes with me but rather than go through those notes today, I am happy to go through them with the member at another time. The Government of Western Australia is also considering - this will also be considered by the Insurance Commission of Western Australia - whether it would be appropriate for the

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Government to provide insurance for some organisations that play a crucial role in the community. The obvious organisation is the police and citizens youth clubs because it is crucial to the community. The fact that it is being threatened by spiralling premiums is something with which we must deal. The insurance commission is currently discussing this matter to determine whether it would be appropriate to offer insurance arrangements for groups like that.

Mrs EDWARDES: I refer to page 81, output 2, and the second dot point under major achievements for 2001-02. It refers to the significantly greater number of inquiries that ministerial offices received this year by comparison with the previous year that were generated by public responses to the new Government's legislative program. Of the 26 400 inquiries generated, how many related to the Labour Relations Reform Bill 2002 and other industrial relations matters?

Dr GALLOP: The Department of the Premier and Cabinet has responded to a greater number of inquiries, as the member said. The estimated number of matters requiring response was 26 400 compared with the budget estimate of 15 400. The inquiries were about the Government's gay and lesbian legislation, the premium property tax, Ningaloo Reef - a big issue at the moment - and the industrial relations legislation.

Mrs EDWARDES: Could I have an indication, by way of supplementary information, of the numbers relating to the industrial relations legislation?

Dr GALLOP: The member is seeking supplementary information on the community access line and the correspondence received by the department and the break up of the issues raised by members of the public.

*[Supplementary Information No A50]*

Mr McGOWAN: I refer to page 79 in the *Budget Statements* and major achievements for 2001-02. It states that an agreement has been secured with Emirates airlines to fly non-stop from Dubai to Perth. What benefits will accrue to the State from this, particularly to our tourism and business industries, and what other opportunities does the Premier foresee being part of this relationship between Western Australia and Dubai?

Dr GALLOP: The member would be aware that we finalised our arrangements with Emirates airlines last year when I visited Dubai. The agreement will provide a boost to the State's tourism industry and we expect that nearly 1 000 visitors per week will arrive in Perth on the airline. In August this year, Emirates will start its four weekly services from Dubai to Perth. It is estimated that the impact of the new service on the Western Australian economy will be worth \$47 million per year in tourism-related activities. However, just as important are the opportunities for the export of fresh produce worth up to \$30 million a year. The oil and gas industries will also be able to directly access the Middle East rather than go through Singapore. The fresh produce issue is important because, from time to time, when produce goes via Singapore it might sit at the airport for a while and lose some of its freshness. To have it flown directly to Dubai offers real opportunities for our agricultural industry.

Mr McGOWAN: Does that include crayfish?

Dr GALLOP: I am not aware of whether that goes to Dubai. We will also set up a new trade and investment office in Dubai because of the potential benefits for Western Australia. Educational opportunities have expanded as a result of the 11 September attacks and the concerns of people within the region about sending their children to the United States. Generally speaking, there are broader issues of economic connection. Relationships between the Emirates, Australia and Western Australia have been very good and this will confirm that positive relationship. Western Australian's exports to Dubai grew from \$320 million in 1997 to \$563 million in 2001. It is a real growth market and we want to have someone in the position of promoting Western Australia and coordinating our efforts in that area. We are confident that we will get good feedback and results for the people of Western Australia.

Mrs EDWARDES: I refer the Premier to output 3 on pages 82 and 83 that deals with the support for the Premier as Minister for Public Sector Management. I have three questions on redeployment. Does the Premier have the list of how many people were on redeployment as of 10 February - when Labor took over Government - and 30 June 2001 and the numbers of people currently on the redeployment list?

Dr GALLOP: The closest figure we had on the number of registered employees at 30 June 2001 was 549. The number of registered employees on the redeployment list at 29 May this year was 332.

Mrs EDWARDES: The second table on page 82 refers to the cost efficiency and average cost of public sector management recruitment and redeployment services. The summary at the end of the table on the next page refers to changes to the redeployment process and states that it has been replaced by the number of clients provided with strategic services, as against the number of registered redeployees. What are these changes and what is taking place?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

[10.30 am]

Mr WAUCHOPE: In the past three to four years, primary redeployment responsibility has been devolved to the agencies. This occurred as a result of the recommendation of the Codd Report in 1997 and has been progressively implemented since then. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet still has responsibility for policy setting and for taking an active involvement in making sure the policies work. Agencies are now able to register redeployees online and source employment opportunities online. Therefore, the paperwork must not always necessarily come through us. However, there is still a framework and a process to ensure that it all takes place.

Mrs EDWARDES: I raised with the Deputy Premier the other day the \$20 million which was for the redundancies and which specifically targets redeployees, I understand. The Deputy Premier said that it was under the Premier's budget, not his. Will the Premier point us to that and tell us how it is going? Is there a figure to date for those redeployees?

Another issue related to the changes to be made. I highlighted to the Deputy Premier that redeployees are not targeted sufficiently. Many redeployees have skills, and a large number of jobs requiring those skills are still being advertised. A lot of work still needs to be done. I recognise that some redeployees do not want to take jobs, and some departments do not wish to take redeployees. I am not talking about clerks to nurses; I am talking about the same sorts of skills.

Dr GALLOP: I will give some figures that I think the member will be interested in. This process will go on until -

Mr WAUCHOPE: The enhanced severance scheme runs through to 30 June.

Dr GALLOP: The total number of severance requests received so far is 122. Seventy-four have been approved. Forty-six are awaiting approval. Of those approved, 60 have been funded out of the individual agencies, and five will be funded from Treasury. There is a special scheme in the health area. Treasury funded another nine. That is a total of 74.

Mrs EDWARDES: If they are funded by the individual agencies, those amounts will not come out of the \$20 million special package?

Dr GALLOP: No.

Mrs EDWARDES: Will only those funded by Treasury come out of the \$20 million special package?

Dr GALLOP: That is right.

Mrs EDWARDES: Will the Premier point me to where they are in the budget?

Dr GALLOP: They are funded by Treasury.

Mrs EDWARDES: Therefore, are they in the Treasury budget?

Dr GALLOP: My understanding is that they are funded through the Department of Treasury and Finance.

Mrs EDWARDES: The Deputy Premier sent me to the Premier.

Dr GALLOP: I think the Deputy Premier was referring to the fact - obviously, I was not here at the time - that my department is managing the process.

*Sitting suspended from 10.30 to 10.45 am*

Mr MASTERS: I refer to output 9 on page 93, which relates to science and innovation. I hope the Premier will not be offended if I say that for the past 12 months he has been a Clayton's Minister for Science -

Dr GALLOP: I am offended, but there we go.

Mr MASTERS: - because most of the work involved in science and innovation has come through the Minister for State Development, I understand. The budget now has allocations.

Dr GALLOP: I should point out that for the past year the offices that deal with science were in the Department of Industry and Technology. They are now transferring to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. There is an institutional reason for what the member said.

Mr MASTERS: That is why I did not make my Clayton's comment with any malice. Because of the changes from the last budget to this budget and the swapping between two different government agencies or areas, it has been difficult for me to determine exactly how much money is being spent.

Dr GALLOP: Could I read a statement on this, because I think the member will find it interesting?

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY - Friday, 31 May 2002]  
p444a-467a

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

Mr MASTERS: Yes, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Vasse has not yet asked a question. Does he agree to the Premier reading that statement?

Mr MASTERS: I am building up to a question, but the Premier might be able to help.

Dr GALLOP: An office of science is being set up in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It is somewhat difficult to analyse the budget because of the intermixing of different programs and items that have now come across. Therefore, if I read a statement about output 9, I think it will help the committee.

The office of science and innovation will be established on 1 July 2002. The office was created through a transfer of resources from the Department of Industry and Technology, and no additional cost was incurred for the creation of the office. The functions transferred are substantially those of the division of science and research. The Department of Industry and Technology has retained the WA innovation support scheme and transferred the square kilometre array project, which was previously part of the infrastructure division. As there were no comparable output costs and measures for 2000-01 actual, 2001-02 budget and 2001-02 estimated actual, Treasury requested that comparable costs be calculated to provide a basis for comparison. The data used for this purpose was partially provided by the Department of Industry and Technology project staff and partially by deriving comparative costs using Department of the Premier and Cabinet overhead and corporate expenses for similar periods. Therefore, the total cost of output as reported in a table for those periods is a derived rather than actual value. Can I go through each one of them?

Mr MASTERS: Does the Premier have a huge range of numbers?

[10.50 am]

Dr GALLOP: It is not a huge range. I am sorry, those items are listed on page 93.

To simply illustrate variants between the four periods, a table has been prepared to show the individual elements of the output costs and carryover figures for each year. I will table this page showing the centres of excellence program, Innovate WA, the strategic fund for the marine environment, the Neville Stanley studentships, Scitech support, the Indian Ocean climate study and carryover. This is a good document to incorporate in the estimates record so that members can have a look at it; it shows where the money has gone.

Mr MASTERS: I am happy for the Premier to table that document, because some of the comments he has made go to the nub of the question I intended to ask.

Dr GALLOP: Can that document be incorporated in *Hansard*?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I am prepared to have that document tabled and incorporated in *Hansard*.

	2000-01 Actual	2001-02 Budget	2001-02 Estimated Actual	2002-03 Budget Estimate
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
<b>COST OF OUTPUT</b>	<b>8,757</b>	<b>21,125</b>	<b>17,120</b>	<b>28,904</b>
<b>Operational costs</b> (salary and contingencies)	1,244	740	735	1,093
<b>Grants Programs</b>				
Centres of Excellence	4,212	8,401	4,101	14,300
Innovate WA		<sup>(a)</sup> 6,530	70	6,660
Strategic Fund for the Marine Environment	278	2,722	718	4,004
Neville Stanley Studentships	66	66		134
Scitech Support	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,700
Indian Ocean Climate Study	112	112	112	
Carryover	245		<sup>(b)</sup> 8,830	
<b>COST OF OUTPUT</b>	<b>8,757</b>	<b>21,171</b>	<b>17,166</b>	<b>28,891</b>



**Extract from Hansard**  
[ASSEMBLY - Friday, 31 May 2002]  
p444a-467a

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Plus Administered	5,000
(a)	\$4,000,000 deferred in Cabinet expenditure cuts in October 2001. 2001-02 was a period of groundwork to determine strategy and develop new programs.
(b)	Estimated carryover for 2001-02 to be transferred from DoIT to DPC by way of Section 15 transfer. The carryover figure comprises:
	Centres of Excellence \$4,300,000
	Innovate WA \$2,460,000
	Strategic Research Fund for the Marine Environment \$2,004,000
	Neville Stanley Studentships <u>\$66,000</u>
	TOTAL \$8,830,000

---

Mr MASTERS: My first question is an attempt to compare last year's total funding in the science and innovation area with this year's funding. In last year's budget papers \$41.756 million was allocated for innovation and technology, with no allocation for science. That is not a criticism; obviously the Government had to crawl before it could walk. This year, the two output areas of innovation and technology and science and innovation - the second, science and innovation, is listed under the Premier's portfolio on page 93 - have a total of \$35.231 million, some \$6.5 million less than the amount budgeted for innovation and technology last year.

Dr GALLOP: The member is now talking about the Department of Industry and Technology. That is not in this budget. All I can talk about is the science budget, and the cost of the output in 2001-02 is \$17.120 million, and the budget estimate for this year is \$28.904 million.

Mr MASTERS: Will the Premier explain how I find an answer -

Dr GALLOP: The document I have tabled outlines the budget.

Mr MASTERS: I mean how can I get an answer to the question about comparing last year's figures with this year's figures, remembering that last year there was another portfolio and this year that amount is split between two portfolios? If I go to the minister responsible for industry and technology, his reply will be that he cannot make any comment about science and innovation because that is the Premier's portfolio. How are Opposition members supposed to ask questions to allow us to understand exactly what is happening from one year to the next?

Dr GALLOP: I have told the member the amounts we have taken across into the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I have tabled the document showing the programs that are associated with those costs: centres of excellence, Innovate WA, strategic fund for the marine environment, Neville Stanley studentships, Scitech support and the Indian Ocean climate study. Those programs have come across.

Mr MASTERS: I appreciate that, and I also appreciate that the budget estimate is \$28.904 million. I do not know how to prove one way or the other whether I am right or wrong, but when I compare last year's figures with this year's figures there is a \$6.5 million reduction.

Dr GALLOP: No. In the science budget -

Mr MASTERS: No, science and innovation. That is what it was last year.

Dr GALLOP: I am the minister responsible for science. I am responsible for these programs and I am telling the member that the centres of excellence programs have gone from \$4 million this year to \$14 million next year, Innovate WA has gone up to \$6.5 million, the strategic fund for the marine environment has gone from \$718 000 to \$4 million, the Neville Stanley studentships will continue, and Scitech support has been confirmed. There is an increase in science funding.

Mr MASTERS: On the same theme, I refer the Premier to budget paper No 3 at page 48 -

Dr GALLOP: That is not this budget paper.

Mr MASTERS: I will quote from that page and then I will come back to the current document.

Dr GALLOP: The member cannot quote from another budget paper.

The CHAIRMAN: Member, is this relevant?

Mr MASTERS: On page 93, appropriation for purchase of output 9 shows four amounts: \$10 million, \$19 million, \$15 million and \$20 million. There are no forward estimates for output 9, science and innovation, yet in the document I am not permitted to refer to, there is a claim that \$100 million -

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Dr GALLOP: Yes, and I am happy to talk about that.

Mr MASTERS: Okay. It is claimed that over the next four years \$100 million will be earmarked for science and innovation. So far the track record of this Government is that it is spending between \$15 million and \$20 million per annum. If that is multiplied by four years, we get between \$60 million and \$80 million. Where does the \$100 million come from?

Dr GALLOP: I am happy to go through the figures. The total spending on science and innovation over the forward estimates is approximately \$100 million, excluding operating costs, and a lot of these are grant programs: in 2002-03, \$18.800 million; 2003-04, \$16.570 million; 2004-05, \$16.570 million; 2005-06, \$18.440 million; for a total of \$70.380 million. In the transfer across from the Department of Industry and Technology this year, there is funding to the tune of \$8.830 million. That amount of \$8.830 million continues over the four years. We are primarily looking to upgrade some of the facilities for science education. In the administered area we have allocated the following amounts: \$5 million in 2002-03, \$5 million in 2003-04, \$10 million in 2004-05, for a total of \$20 million. If we add \$70.380 million, \$8.830 million and \$20 million, we get \$99.210 million.

Mr MASTERS: In last year's budget statements, which show the final full year of the previous Government's commitments to science and innovation, that would have been equivalent to \$25 million a year, or \$100 million over the four-year life of this Parliament.

Dr GALLOP: No. The problem with the previous Government -

Mr MASTERS: I am talking about actual expenditure in the last full year of the previous Government.

Dr GALLOP: I am sorry. The member has to look at what is in the budget.

Mr MASTERS: Is the Premier increasing the amount of money for science and innovation over and above what was the historical average for the previous Government?

Dr GALLOP: I will supply that as supplementary information, for a very good reason. The previous Government was very good at saying it was spending a certain amount of money on something but then not planning for the future. For example, the centres of excellence program was not projected into the future; it was one of those unfunded programs. We have now put the money in. I caution members when they start to play with figures like this.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the member for Vasse seeking supplementary information?

Mr MASTERS: I am looking at Dr Field passing information to the Premier.

Dr GALLOP: He is referring me to the economic and fiscal outlook, which shows the \$50 million we have allocated to the Innovate WA policy, which is funding these sorts of programs.

Mr MASTERS: That was a previous budget document.

Dr GALLOP: No, that was our commitment in the election, which has now been fulfilled through these budget items.

Mr MASTERS: I express my doubt about whether there is any increase in spending.

Dr GALLOP: The member did such a poor job on the tourism budget, I am very suspicious of anything he says about budget figures.

The CHAIRMAN: Members, if we have finally finished with this question, which I think we have, I will move on.

Mr MASTERS: I have one small follow-up question.

The CHAIRMAN: I was asking the member for Vasse if he wanted further supplementary information. If that is the case, he can seek it.

Mr MASTERS: I believe the Premier was going to supply that extra information.

Dr GALLOP: The comparison must be with what is in the budget and what is planned, rather than what was spent in the past, because the previous Government did not include any money for the centres of excellence program in future years. We had to address that major problem.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case, will the Premier agree to provide supplementary information and will he state exactly what information he will provide?

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Dr GALLOP: It will be difficult. The member is asking me to compare the science and innovation budget allocations of the previous Government with the allocations of the current Government. I will do my best.

*[Supplementary Information No A51]*

Mr MASTERS: I also ask for a comparison with last year's budget, which was the Premier's first budget.

Dr GALLOP: That has been done. We will do our best.

[11.00 am]

Ms QUIRK: I refer to the fourth dot point on page 85 and federal and constitutional affairs. What are the implications for this State of the recent leaders' summit on transnational crime and terrorism?

Dr GALLOP: The member is aware that I attended the Commonwealth-State Summit on Transnational Crime and Terrorism on 5 April. The department provided policy and secretarial support for that attendance. The Government's negotiating position was developed in consultation with the Attorney General and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, with input from a state working group of officials from relevant line agencies. The Prime Minister and state and territory leaders agreed to a national framework to combat terrorism and multi-jurisdictional crime. It was agreed that the National Crime Authority would be replaced by an Australian crime commission, which would deliver a more effective national law enforcement operation.

The State Government was very concerned to press two issues at that meeting. The first issue was not necessarily impacted upon by the formal decision, but what emerges from it could affect the resources provided to Western Australia, currently through the NCA and, in the future, the Australian crime commission. I discussed that matter with the relevant minister, Senator Ellison, who is from Western Australia. He assured me that, as a Western Australian minister, he will ensure that Western Australia is well looked after in that process because of its long coastline and the organised crime problems that have been exposed here. As the member knows, that matter is not necessarily impacted upon by the formal change from the NCA to the Australian crime commission. However, we could lose resources in that process. We are concerned about that and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services has made public comments about the issue. I urge members of the opposition parties to encourage their colleagues in the Howard Government to ensure Western Australia is protected in that process.

Concern has also been expressed that the investigatory functions of the new Australian crime commission will not be given the strength that they have had under the NCA framework, and that task forces will be set up to look at particular issues. That poses a risk to Western Australia, in that we might not have the same resource base to deal with organised crime that we have had in the past.

All States and Territories strongly supported changing the system. However, as with all these things, there are inherent risks. It is important that Western Australia be involved in the national approach, but we must press our position to ensure we do not lose out.

The second issue of concern was the constitutional position of the State of Western Australia. We have agreed with the Commonwealth Government that the powers ceded to the Commonwealth Parliament under the legislation currently being debated will be confirmed by the States. Obviously, that is a risk to the State's sovereignty. As the Commonwealth Government gets new powers, it extends its range of activity. It wanted to be able to change that law in the future. I made it very clear that any change to that law must be referred back to the States. We will not give the Commonwealth Government a blank cheque to increase its powers repeatedly at the expense of state sovereignty. There must be a referral back on the issue; the States must agree to any further extension of that power. I raised those two issues and the Prime Minister provided me with satisfactory guarantees.

Ms QUIRK: I understand discussions are ongoing at an official level. I seek the Premier's assurance that any attempt at cost shifting on the Commonwealth Government's part will be vigorously resisted.

Dr GALLOP: Obviously we are very concerned that this may be a shortcut for what the member correctly described as cost shifting. We will be very vigilant to ensure that does not happen.

Mr McGOWAN: I refer to page 76. An additional \$1 million has been included in this year's budget and each of the three out years for community crime prevention. On what will that money be spent to meet community security needs?

Dr GALLOP: This was another item that was not in the forward estimates when we took office. I am very pleased to announce that the Government of Western Australia has committed \$1 million a year for the next four

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

years for community crime prevention. Members can tell their constituents that the Labor Government is fulfilling an election commitment.

The Safer WA community security program was established in 1998-99 to support local government crime prevention initiatives, and the 2001-02 budget allocated \$4 million over four years. The fund has enabled more than 75 local government community security audits to be undertaken and supported a range of crime prevention activities. Initially, a maximum of \$10 000 was provided for audits and up to \$25 000 was provided for crime prevention initiatives. Funds were also provided to subsidise community security patrols. In 2001-02, the focus of funding was moved from supporting security patrols to supporting a broader range of crime prevention initiatives, including those with an indigenous focus, and the grant maximum was increased to \$40 000. The program of community safety audits and implementation of the community safety initiatives will be continued and administered by the new Office of Crime Prevention, which was established by the Government on 1 October 2001.

Mr GRYLLS: I refer to page 95 and the computer hardware and software upgrade program for 2002-03 costing \$550 000. What will this involve and what is the time frame?

Dr GALLOP: This is the continuation of a program for the consistent and orderly replacement of computing equipment in departmental and electorate offices. The capital allocation of \$586 000 includes a further \$17 000 to be spent in 2002-03 to complete the 2001-02 replacement program.

Mr GRYLLS: Is there a time frame?

Mr WAUCHOPE: The capital works program is split into three categories: works in progress, completed works and new works. The new works consist of a replacement program for computer hardware and software and electorate office equipment upgrades. That will be done progressively over 2002-03. The program will be undertaken in an orderly way in consultation with members to avoid any inconvenience.

Mrs EDWARDES: I wrote to the Premier about upgrading computer hardware and raised concerns about outside agencies being able to access our computer system without our being able to put in a security code. That is an issue for all members of Parliament.

Dr GALLOP: I think I responded to that letter.

Mrs EDWARDES: I have not received that response.

Dr GALLOP: I have signed a response.

Mrs EDWARDES: That is a major concern.

[11.10 am]

Mr WAUCHOPE: The member for Kingsley will hopefully be assured, when she gets the letter from the Premier, that adequate security arrangements are in place. I will be happy to talk to her once she has the letter.

Mr McRAE: As the Premier reviews the program and the efficiency review implementation, could he also look at the efficiency of having the Parliament and his office providing hardware and software to electorate offices, and the need for negotiation between the two on the capability of the systems?

Dr GALLOP: I will take that on board.

Mr MASTERS: I refer the Premier to output 9 on page 94, science and innovation, and the second dot point of major initiatives for 2002-03, which states that a number of new programs, funded from the Innovate Western Australia budget, will be introduced. The Premier mentioned in an earlier answer the Scitech organisation, which I hold in the very highest regard because it does wonderful work. Is money for the relocation of Scitech to the East Perth power station in the budget and what is the future of Scitech? What is meant by "a number of new programs"?

Dr GALLOP: Like the member, I am a strong supporter of Scitech. I took an interest in it when it was set up way back in 1988 or 1989. It is a very good organisation and leads the way in science education, in not only Australia but also the region. It is held in very high esteem. We are keen to work with the Scitech board to make sure it has the space available to do the job properly. We are currently discussing the matter with the board. A number of issues are involved. Obviously Scitech needs an adequate level of floor space and a location that suits its needs for the metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. We have confirmed our support to Scitech, which the Government gives each year. We have allocated \$2.7 million for 2002-03. Discussions about the future location of Scitech are ongoing. Many issues are involved, which we are continuing to discuss. The member will recall that when I outlined the science budget, I gave a figure of \$20 million as being allocated for support for new science infrastructure. Within the framework of that allocation we will be able to find money to assist Scitech with its future capital needs. How much of that allocation goes to meet those needs will remain a

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

matter of negotiation. We are committed to Scitech and have had a lot of discussions with its board. The member will know that there has been some discussion about the potentiality of the East Perth power station. A submission within government is coming up on that subject. Whether it will meet Scitech's requirements I cannot say at this stage because I have not looked at the submission. Different options are being considered, but I can assure the member that we are very keen to assist Scitech to make sure that it can continue to play its role with the space that it needs to do it.

We have included three initiatives in the budget. They include the science education initiative to pay higher education contribution fees for people who complete a diploma of education and take up jobs as science teachers.

Mr MASTERS: Is there a rough figure for that?

Dr GALLOP: I will give the member the three programs and then come back to that. Science capability involves the Western Australian Premier's fellowships to attract good researchers from overseas and interstate to come here. For research in State Government, the Premier's cooperative science grants will go to stimulate cross-agency research collaboration in areas of strategic priority for Western Australia. We are currently working on the detail of these programs. One of the issues that is very important, which I have already raised with the Science Council, is that the Premier's fellowships and the collaborative cross-agency grants will need a selection process. A lot of our science money has not required that. If the commonwealth cooperative research centres are chosen through a proper process of peer review, we can guarantee that they are good programs and we can support them. We then do not have to assess them. When we start doing it ourselves, we will have to have a process in place. I saw Professor Constable of the Science Council last Monday. I said that we wanted to know how we would get the accountability and probity requirements for a good selection process. I should have with me the allocation for those three programs, but I have not. I will supply through supplementary information the amount allocated to science education, science capability and research in State Government under the science budget.

[*Supplementary Information A52*]

Mrs EDWARDES: I refer the Premier to output 8 on page 91, native title.

Dr GALLOP: That matter was dealt with by the Deputy Premier, who has responsibility for native title.

Mrs EDWARDES: It is in the Premier's budget.

Dr GALLOP: The Deputy Premier has responsibility for the allocation, and I believe he responded to questions on that. Ask the question anyway.

Mrs EDWARDES: It is not a difficult question. The number of full-time equivalents was 10 at 30 June and is expected to be 19 in the forthcoming year. Is the increase in the budget allocation due mainly to the increase in FTEs? Why has the Government increased the number of FTEs to that extent? Who will be or has already been recruited into the agency and what are their skills?

Mr WAUCHOPE: Funding has been increased for native title. I do not have all the detail with me. The funding provides for an increase of eight FTEs in the unit. They are principally involved in mediation work. As far as I know, at this stage those people have not been recruited; that is something that will occur during the course of the next few months.

Mrs EDWARDES: Because those FTEs will be mediators, will they generally be of Aboriginal descent?

Mr WAUCHOPE: I cannot say at this stage. They will obviously be suitable people for the job.

Dr GALLOP: Does the member want some more information on that?

Mrs EDWARDES: I am prepared to go back and check Tuesday's *Hansard*.

Dr GALLOP: I will provide supplementary information on the native title allocation and the increased money for mediation.

Mrs EDWARDES: I am really interested in the FTE public sector management component.

[*Supplementary Information No A53*]

Ms QUIRK: The third dot point of major initiatives for 2002-03 refers to an increased emphasis being placed on community education and awareness raising about antiracism. What form will the increased emphasis take? Did any specific strategies have to be introduced as a result of some of the issues that arose post-11 September?

[11.20 am]

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Dr GALLOP: I will answer this question in some detail. I will look at what we have done this year and then what we are planning to do next year for the antiracism strategy. I thank the Office of Multicultural Interests for providing support for this work. The vision is to create an inclusive and harmonious Western Australia, in which everyone, no matter what their racial background, can go about their business free of intimidation and harassment, so they can achieve their full potential. That aspiration will have many implications. We need to form strategic and community partnerships with other bodies in the field of antiracism. We need to increase public awareness of it and empower groups that are the target of racism through advocacy, public education and the provision of credible and persuasive information. We need to carry out public consultation on legislation that may be required to eliminate racism. We need to address issues as they arise in the short term and develop and implement longer-term strategies to target specific structures and behaviours. We need to encourage and acknowledge positive initiatives in the elimination of racism and the promotion of harmonious relations in the community.

The Government has done a lot this year. Three workshops were conducted in 2000-01, some of which occurred after the change of Government, to initiate ideas and directions. In 2001, the Government undertook a case study of a Perth community alleging race-related vilification. The member for Girrawheen knows about that case study because she was involved in some of the work, and I thank her for her assistance.

We have established the Anti Racism Steering Committee, of which I am the chairman. It includes representatives from Government, ethnic and community groups to oversee the development of its antiracism strategy. That committee has formed subcommittees in the areas of research, structural issues and community consultation and education. A model for community consultation and education in the area of racism has been developed and endorsed by the committee. The ensuing community consultation process is anticipated to cost approximately \$20 000.

We are very keen to develop more sophisticated processes of consultation. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet has developed a model document about how we should consult with the community that I think all members of Parliament should read. That has formed the intellectual basis for this project. The Premier's multicultural award was launched to raise the profile of multiculturalism. A number of members attended that tremendous evening at Curtin University of Technology. Service providers in our community have held information sessions on minority religions. Those sessions dealt with Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism and Sikhism. The sessions were aimed at providing people with a better understanding about those religions and the requirements they have of which service providers must be aware. We have evaluated antiracism strategies from other similar jurisdictions.

Two research reports on the issues impacting on the development of the antiracism strategy cost \$30 000. Seminars on racism and cultural and religious diversity were also held. Of course, Harmony Day was held this year. The Office of Multicultural Interests has liaised with the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Murdoch University about conducting a survey to assist with the benchmarking of attitudes to diversity and service provision. The Office of Multicultural Interests is attempting to determine whether a more cost-effective method can be adopted to obtain the same information.

As I have said, we have formed the Anti Racism Steering Committee, which has formed subcommittees, and we are conducting research and consulting with the community as we develop our strategy. This year we want to progress that work under the Office of Multicultural Interests because it is one of its main objectives of its strategic plan for the next three years. We have endorsed the overall framework of the strategy. The Anti Racism Strategy Steering Committee consists of a very broad range of community representatives. Throughout this year we will consider all the issues it raises.

Community education and awareness-raising initiatives will address two issues: fears and misconceptions groups have of each other as a result of the lack of or poor levels of trust between them about their motives, desires and status; and public awareness of issues of justice, rights and equity. This approach concentrates on informing people of their rights and the legal remedies we currently have in our society. The department has undertaken consultations with a variety of groups, including focus groups within key sectors, and it has held community meetings, online forums and conducted surveys. I have taken some time on this matter but if members want more detail, I can provide it.

Ms QUIRK: I asked whether any strategies needed to be embraced following some of the community's expectations post-11 September.

Dr GALLOP: The committee is considering specific issues that have emerged as a result of that event.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Mr BARNETT: I have some factual questions and I am happy for this information to be supplied by way of supplementary information. I request a list of all staff members and their level within the public sector for each ministerial office, including the Premier's office and mine.

Dr GALLOP: The Leader of the Opposition will find that that information will be provided as a result of a question from the member for Kingsley.

Mr BARNETT: I have not finished the question. I would like a list of all ministerial officers and their designated level. In addition, I want a list of officers who are attached or seconded in some way to those ministerial offices. I would also like a summary of the total numbers of full-time equivalents within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, designated by their area of function or responsibility.

Dr GALLOP: I will provide as supplementary information a list of ministerial officers and staff, including their levels and secondments and information about the FTE allocation within the department for the different programs.

[*Supplementary Information No A54*]

Mrs EDWARDES: I note on page 97 of the *Budget Statements* that the FTE allocation has started to increase. That might be because of, for example, the native title, science and crime prevention programs. Perhaps the Premier could identify those new or transferred positions with that supplementary information.

Dr GALLOP: Okay.

Mr MCGOWAN: I refer to the first dot point on page 91 of the *Budget Statements* and the Online WA Multicultural Communities' web site. How many sites are now part of that program and how successful has it been to ensure that Western Australia's multicultural communities have contact with and get their messages to the wider community? I am interested in the Premier's assessment of Harmony Day's success this year and what he thinks its future is.

Dr GALLOP: Online WA Multicultural Communities is an initiative involving the Office of Multicultural Interests and the Ethnic Communities Council of WA. The purpose of the project is to provide assistance to multicultural communities and service organisations to get online. The project is designed to provide a multicultural network on the Internet, to facilitate the statewide involvement of ethnic communities and community service organisations into the gateway and to enable multicultural groups to access a new range of communications facilities and information services.

Incorporated ethnic communities and not-for-profit community-based organisations are eligible to apply for a site. Phase 1 had already taken place with 50 communities being allocated a web site. Phase 2 of the project was completed this year and 400 additional sites were made available. To date, 60 new associations and organisations have been trained and have started creating their web sites. Creating their own web sites will enable ethnic groups and not-for-profit community organisations to promote their services and achievements to the wider community as well as providing a social support system within the group or community by providing chat rooms and bulletin board facilities. It will also link ethnic groups to relevant service providers and enable access to online services. Media training for community groups and cross-cultural training for staff was also provided. It is a very successful initiative that we inherited from the previous Government and have continued to fund.

Harmony Day has two elements to it: firstly, to celebrate the diversity of our State and, secondly, to work against racism in the community. This year's Harmony Day was different from previous Harmony Days. In the past, Harmony Day has focused on celebrating cultural diversity, which manifested in song, dance, food, festivals, activities and whatever.

[11.30 am]

This year's Harmony Day included a stronger anti-racism message following feedback from key stakeholder groups, including the Ethnic Communities Council of WA, that they wanted a more cutting-edge Harmony Day than we have had in the past. They felt that the messages were not strong enough. They agreed with the celebration of diversity but they also wanted a more specific anti-racism message. We therefore took their advice.

Harmony Day promotional material, events, activities and information were redesigned to deliver stronger messages to the community about issues related to race and culture. For example, the advertising on radio station Mix 94.5FM, part of the Harmony Day program, cited specific acts of racism against minority groups and sought to debunk some of the myths surrounding religious and cultural groups. In addition, Western Australia moved away from the national slogan, which was "You, me, Australian" and developed its own slogan, "Embrace diversity, eliminate racism". A walk was organised through the streets of Northbridge with more than

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

1 500 people participating, showing strong support for the need to stamp out racism. At the Harmony Day launch, I initiated the State Government's vision and purpose as part of its anti-racism strategy. We also again incorporated the vice-chancellor's Harmony Day oration, delivered by Aboriginal leader Pat Dodson at Curtin University of Technology.

In answer to the question, Harmony Day has kept up its celebratory focus but added to that a focus on the elimination of racism. I believe it works a lot better with those two elements working together. We are constantly reviewing its performance in the community to ensure that it is delivering a result from the Government's view of its objectives. We administered more than 60 grants to community groups to undertake their own Harmony Day activities. I urge all members to look at those activities next year. Those grants are available to local communities and have been very successful. Harmony Day this year was the best we have had. The march that was organised in Northbridge was initiated by the Meerilinga Young Children's Foundation. The Leader of the Opposition was there and we marched up to the Northbridge arts precinct where I and others delivered speeches, presented awards to youngsters and so on. It was a very good Harmony Day. However, in answer to the member's question, we have added that element of combating racism to the celebration of diversity, and that is a change that has occurred under our Government.

Mr MASTERS: I refer to output 4, management of policy, which commences on page 84. On page 85 under major achievements for 2001-02 are two references to the State's sustainability strategy. Is that a reference to the strategy group headed by Professor Peter Newman?

Dr GALLOP: That is the one.

Mr MASTERS: Will the Premier indicate the cost to the taxpayer of that unit within his department for the preparation of matters relating to sustainability? Secondly, the greenhouse issue is clearly one of the major sustainability issues affecting WA because of the gas projects in the North West Shelf, the Burrup Peninsula and so on. How will the issue of greenhouse gas be addressed under this strategy?

Dr GALLOP: I will provide the figure on the amount of money allocated to the sustainability strategy as supplementary information?

Mr MASTERS: And the full-time equivalents?

Dr GALLOP: There is an allocation for that and I should have had that information with me. I apologise for not having it but I will provide that by way supplementary information.

*[Supplementary Information No A55]*

Dr GALLOP: I have been advised that three FTEs are allocated to that strategy group.

Mr MASTERS: Is Professor Newman employed full-time in that office?

Dr GALLOP: Yes. I will refer first to the sustainability strategy. The draft sustainability strategy will be prepared with input from public submissions, departmental submissions and research by the department; that is, the sustainability policy unit. The member will be interested to know that 207 public submissions had been received on our draft sustainability strategy as at 27 May. Dr Field might talk about that but I think the member would have received a copy of that draft strategy.

Mr MASTERS: Yes.

Dr GALLOP: The draft strategy will focus on priority sustainability issues for Western Australia with an emphasis on the positive opportunities that exist to simultaneously achieve social, environmental and economic outcomes. That draft release will be subject to cabinet approval but we expect the release to be available for public comment in July. The draft strategy will be widely circulated for public comment, including to industry associations and non-government organisations. A series of seminars and debates on key issues will be held to allow community and industry engagement. We hope to finalise the strategy towards the end of 2002, probably for release in October.

Work on reviewing our greenhouse strategy is being conducted by the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, and the parliamentary secretary, the member for Cockburn, is playing a lead role. I will provide supplementary information on what is being done on the greenhouse strategy. I apologise to the member that I am not as close to the strategy as is the Minister for the Environment, who is the lead person on that matter.

Mr MASTERS: Rather than have the Premier supply supplementary information, I ask what is being done to coordinate the minister and the office of sustainable management, or whatever the unit is called, to ensure that there is a consistency in approach.

Dr GALLOP: Professor Newman is on the greenhouse strategy group.



Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Mr MASTERS: Is he on both groups?

Dr GALLOP: Yes.

Mr McRAE: I refer to the management of matters of State, output 2 on page 80. The preamble to the tables on that page sets out the role of the department and refers to the services provided to the Premier and the Executive, the administration of entitlements for members of Parliament and the support for ministerial offices and the leaders of the opposition parties. I have participated in some of the surveys on whether the services of the department have been up to scratch. What are the levels of approval for services and is it true that the only return that stated "I can't get no satisfaction" was from the Leader of the Opposition?

Dr GALLOP: I cannot confirm that.

Mr McRAE: That was a light-hearted joke. I really refer to the satisfaction levels in the surveys. What changes to the service provision have resulted from those surveys?

Dr GALLOP: The Department of the Premier and Cabinet must report each year on the delivery of its services. The assessment of those services by its clients - that is, the members of Parliament - is part of that process. I as minister have responsibility to make sure they are delivered. The director general may also wish to comment.

Mr WAUCHOPE: The results of the survey, including output performance measures in gross terms, are published in the *Budget Statements*. There is, therefore, a measure for the satisfaction of members of Parliament on the quality of services provided. That can be found under quality in the output performance measures. The Premier indicated earlier that about 36 new members were returned after the last election, which, frankly, caught us by surprise.

Dr GALLOP: What; the election result caught you by surprise? Gee whiz, I am a bit worried about that!

Mr WAUCHOPE: We did not expect the numbers of changes to seats and perhaps we did not resource the changeover as well as we might have. However, the ratings in the surveys were not as bad as some members might have thought. We took on board the comments made by members in the returned questionnaires and we undertook a review of the area that provides those services. That review pointed to recommendations that we intend to implement. Hopefully, in the next 12 months members will see some of the matters raised being addressed.

Dr GALLOP: I appreciate that question because it is important that members get on with their work. I know that the department will look at all the feedback with a view to improving services.

[11.40 am]

Mr McRAE: I accept that there were some delays in the handover. It must be a record of some sort to have 36 new members.

Mrs EDWARDES: I refer to the statement of financial performance at page 97 of the *Budget Statements*. A line item refers to supplies and services. The estimated actual cost for 2001-02 is \$37.624 million and it has been reduced for the forthcoming budget to \$29.310 million. What are the reasons for the higher-than-normal increase for 2001-02 and the reduction for 2002-03? I would like a breakdown of both figures by way of supplementary information.

Mr WAUCHOPE: The supplies and services item comprises a number of professional services. The figure for 2001-02 reflects a number of one-off events including the King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women inquiry. That required major professional services. It includes costs for the International Year of Volunteers and some machinery of government expenditure. That was a one-off expense because of the review undertaken. It also includes costs for the native title section 25 transfer from the Department of Justice, which was approximately \$1.7 million. In addition, it reflects expenditure for the Gordon inquiry. The inquiry will finish in July and the expenditure is effectively one-off. The item also reflects the cost of legal fees for the former Premier.

Mrs EDWARDES: May I have a breakdown of the figures by way of supplementary information?

Dr GALLOP: Yes. I believe the legal fees of the former Premier amounted to \$75 000.

[*Supplementary Information No A56*]

Ms QUIRK: I refer to the second output at page 82 of the *Budget Statements*. Under the major initiatives for 2002-03, there is reference to a welcome home parade for Western Australian members of the Commonwealth Games team. What arrangements have been made for the parade? Has a date been set for the ceremony?

Dr GALLOP: It will be in September or October. The estimated cost of the reception including the printing of invitations and certificates for presentation to team members is expected to be \$10 000. A specific date is still being negotiated.

Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Dr Geoff Gallop; Mr Tony McRae; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr  
Brendon Grylls; Mr Bernie Masters; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Ms QUIRK: Has the Premier been practising, "Aussie, Aussie, Aussie, oi, oi, oi" in the mirror?

Mr MASTERS: I refer to page 75 of the *Budget Statements*. The first dot point listed under significant issues and trends refers to the implementation of machinery of government reforms. I take it that the machinery of government report has been assessed and approved by the Cabinet?

Dr GALLOP: Yes.

Mr MASTERS: If Cabinet approves such a report, are the recommendations binding on ministers to implement in the fullness of time?

Dr GALLOP: There are two sorts of decisions. The first type relates to legislation. Obviously, the preparation of legislation is one thing and the successful passage of legislation through the Parliament is another, because the Government does not have the numbers in the Legislative Council. We cannot guarantee that everything we want to do will happen. Decisions may be made by the Cabinet, but the timing and implementation of administrative change is a matter for the Government.

Mr MASTERS: I refer to recommendation 30 of the machinery of government report, which calls for the integration of "at sea" service delivery. It refers to an amalgamation between certain sections of the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Transport for areas other than those affecting the Swan River. I have been asked by a group to try to find out what sort of expediency will be placed on such a recommendation.

Dr GALLOP: It is still being discussed within government. If the member requires a more comprehensive briefing, I am happy to provide one. No decisions have been made to date.

Mr MASTERS: I refer to the second output, multicultural issues, at page 76 of the *Budget Statements*. I ask a question on behalf of the member for Hillarys, who is the opposition spokesman on this issue. The member asked the Premier a question last year that was answered with supplementary information. He asked about the number of invitations the Premier had received from Western Australian multicultural groups, how many he had attended, and how many the Premier sent representatives to. The member was not particularly happy with the supplementary information because it included details of invitations associated with the Premier's overseas visits and that of ambassadors visiting Australia. Will the Premier, by way of supplementary information, indicate how many invitations he has received from local multicultural groups to attend functions, how many he has attended and how many he has sent representatives to?

Dr GALLOP: I cannot answer the last part of the question at the moment. We hold the strong view that we would like members of the Government to attend every function to which they are invited. Unfortunately, due to parliamentary commitments, there are occasions when that is not possible. However, the Government sends representatives to all functions. Since 27 September 2001, I have attended 37 functions associated with the multicultural interests portfolio.

Mr MASTERS: How many invitations has the Premier received?

Dr GALLOP: I cannot answer that, but I can provide supplementary information. I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition would provide the same information?

[*Supplementary Information No A57*]

**The appropriation was recommended.**