

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr
Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED ACCOUNT) RECURRENT 2012–13 BILL 2012

Third Reading

Resumed from 13 June.

MS J.M. FREEMAN (Nollamara) [10.36 am]: I rise to complete my comments from yesterday. I will not go back over old ground other than to again thank those agencies that came to the estimates hearings and responded to our questions. I note the contribution made by the member for Gosnells regarding the feeling of futility of those in the community who are seeking assistance with housing and the housing crisis not being addressed by this government. It is a crisis and I have stood a number of times to point out that in the Mirrabooka area there is a large tract of land that has been owned by the Department of Housing since the area was first developed in the 1950s. It is bordered by Mirrabooka Avenue and Chesterfield Road and Milldale Way. That large piece of land would be perfect to develop. It would inject money into the housing portfolio, which is desperately needed, and would give capacity to build the many needed houses in the area. I did not attend the debate on the Department of Housing budget, but I note that the member for Balcatta raised his concerns during that hearing that land acquisition seemed forecast to decrease in the next few years and that, due to the present market in Western Australia, this is a good time to buy land for future housing. The minister actually outlined that at this point the focus is on getting land on the market. I wish this was illustrated by what should be happening with the Mirrabooka land.

Again, I said I have raised it, I have written to the minister and I have had briefings with the Department of Housing on the minister’s recommendation and briefings with the City of Stirling; yet there seems to be an intractable series of delays in getting that land developed. It is a big issue for the area. It is degraded and derelict land, and it gives a sense that the area is not being cared for and not being respected by the Department of Housing. If the same large tract of land—I think it is about 12 hectares—were in any other area of Western Australia, such as one of the leafy green suburbs, it would be made into parkland while it sat there. The land that I refer to is scrub land, yellow land. When I complained that people were camping on that land, all the Department of Housing did to deal with that issue was to stick up signs that told people they could not camp on the land, that it was private property and that they would be prosecuted if they camped on it. It then removed some of the decent trees that people used to sit under! I implore the government to see this as an opportunity during this crisis in housing. Certainly, the housing crisis is illustrated in how much financial assistance the Department for Child Protection has had to give. We all deal with homeless people; indeed, at least one homeless person comes to my office each week seeking assistance. Members would have seen Cherie Pearce on television talking about her situation. She is a young woman who is a mother of two children. She just wants a chance. She has tried to get a private rental, she has tried to get crisis care and she has tried to get into a refuge. She has had the assistance of social workers. She is at her wits’ end because she cannot provide for her two children. The extent to which she is at her wits’ end was demonstrated by the fact that she was willing to put herself before the media. It is a pretty extreme measure for a person who is desperate for housing to put themselves in front of the general public. But she is in an absolutely desperate situation.

During the Legislative Assembly’s estimates, I asked how many vouchers the Department for Child Protection had given for crisis care from 1 July 2011 to 31 May 2012. The answer was that 664 instances of financial assistance for crisis housing accommodation had been provided by the department to 474 clients. Of the vouchers given out, 235 were for hotels, motels and resorts; 329 were for lodge-in guest houses; 49 were for holiday villages and caravan parks; and 51 were for other types of accommodation. That was done at a total cost of \$160 000. That should not be happening. One of the problems is evident in Cherie Pearce’s situation. Cherie was given hotel accommodation for seven days; that is what the voucher covered. At the end of those seven days, despite her efforts to accommodate herself and her children in private housing, they were homeless again. The vouchers are just one-offs. It is almost like giving people respite. They get to stay somewhere and then they go back into the extraordinary situation of living in poverty. We need to encourage people to downsize. I note that an article in *The Australian* referred to people renting out vacant rooms. That is pretty extreme, because it would involve people living with other people and there is a set of complex social issues involved in that, especially if children are involved. The reality is that there is under-occupancy in both private and public housing. I was approached by residents in Alexander Heights who were keen to move to a more affordable and smaller property. However, they were pensioners and they could not afford the stamp duty. It is disappointing that the government did not include stamp duty discounts to seniors who want to downsize, as was recommended in the report of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, which you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr A.P. O’Gorman) would appreciate. That is one mechanism that could be used. The minister can bang on about his strategy, but his strategy is wasteful. The Minister for Housing recently opened public housing in Mirrabooka. He was accompanied by a federal senator, because the money for the housing came from the federal stimulus package. As far as I can see, none of that housing is going to relieve the housing waitlist. It will be sold.

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr
Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

It is currently being used by community housing. We are in a crisis. I take issue with the government because although it has received one of the greatest ever injections of money into the housing system through the federal government's stimulus package—and at a time when we are seeing a greater growth in demand—it must be wasting that money because, frankly, it cannot be seen out there. What is the government doing? People cannot get maintenance done. There is a blowing out of contracts. The minister has been derelict in his duty to meet the housing needs of our community at a time of greatest need. The opposition questions how he has managed his portfolio.

MR J.N. HYDE (Perth) [10.48 am]: I also wish to speak in the debate on the Appropriation (Consolidated Account) Recurrent 2012–13 Bill 2012. I will refer to the misleading and unsatisfactory answers that were given by ministers during the Legislative Assembly estimates hearings. I will start with the issue of the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel's report and the manic path that the Barnett government is proceeding down to have fewer Western Australian local governments. The Premier made a statement early in his term that he wanted fewer than 100 local governments; there are currently 140. One of the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel recommendations was that there should only one council for Perth and Mandurah. That would wipe out only 30 local governments. The Premier would still have to abolish at least 10 regional local governments to reach his arbitrary figure of fewer than 100. I have stated a number of times why that is fanciful. There is no objective evidence economically, culturally, socially or in good governance to justify the notion that fewer local governments means better local government.

It has been revealed that one of the three independent members on the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel has accepted a \$10 000 trip from the City of Perth. Minister Castrilli has been very forthright in saying that the strength of the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel is its independence from local government. He has said that time and time again. I refer, first of all, to two of the recommendations in the draft findings of the independent panel. The recommendations have been received by the minister, who set up the panel and claimed that it was independent. Panel finding 14 states that in any future model the size of the City of Perth should be increased and its role enhanced. That is a very favourable finding for the City of Perth. Panel finding 20 stated that if the new local government structure for metropolitan Perth comprised more than one local government, then a forum or council of Perth mayors should be created, chaired by the Lord Mayor. Inherent in that is that the City of Perth and the Lord Mayor should continue.

Mr A.P. Jacob interjected.

Mr J.N. HYDE: Again, and there are unfortunately some little interjections from the government opposite, the government does not get conflicts of interest; it does not understand transparency. Members here would know that, as the local member for Perth, there is no stronger advocate than I am for our Lord Mayor and how effective she is and the governance she provides. I think the Lord Mayor is an amazing leader and that the City of Perth under her leadership is one of the most effective councils in all of Australia. I have also argued that it is effective because it is small. The issue is not whether the City of Perth is a great council and whether it should become the only council in Perth; the issue is transparency. If we have an independent panel, should one of its members accept a free trip and \$10 000 from the City of Perth, which is a beneficiary of this report? In the interests of transparency and good governance, that is not acceptable. The irony is that if members opposite understood local government—if they were local government councillors or CEOs—they would understand perceptions of conflict of interest and the importance of transparency. Clearly, with a member of this so-called independent panel accepting a free trip and \$10 000 of value from the City of Perth at the same time that the panel is making two very favourable findings about the City of Perth, that is not proper process; that is not being independent. It is something that this government continues to not understand. I do not know whether the Minister for Local Government is aware that one of the members of his hand-picked advisory panel has accepted this \$10 000 scholarship. I would have thought it very, very important that the minister was aware of that. The minister needs to tell us what his advice to the panel was about this situation, if he has acted since he became aware of it. The minister needs to tell us whether he stands by his original claim that the panel was ideal because its members were independent of local government, or whether he should admit what is becoming blatantly obvious to everybody in metropolitan WA—that he hand-picked them to do a predetermined hatchet job whereby the only option was fewer councils and a bigger City of Perth.

As we revealed in estimates, the government has already spent \$20 million on trying to force, bully and cajole amalgamations, yet only two of the 144 councils are actually merging. The government needs to tell the truth about its intended forced amalgamations and the eventual cost. The budget shows that there is not a brass razoo after the election for amalgamations. The government has spent \$20 million in causing all this trouble and angst, but there is not an actual cent to implement changes that will come from not only the Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel but also the Premier. If we are to achieve the Premier's aim of having fewer than 100 councils, we will lose at least 12 regional local governments. Another issue that came out of estimates astounded

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

me. I provided rational and objective evidence of where the Minister for Local Government was attaching conditions to government money going to local governments in the name of efficiency. That money was being withdrawn—taken away—when councils were making a democratic decision to not proceed with a merger. The whole irony of this situation is that at the very basis of good governments is democracy. Councils are going out and consulting fully with their local communities and the local communities are saying not to merge. The private view of some councillors is that they should be merging. Sometimes councillors think they should be the boss cocky, so that is why they think they should be merging, but they do not realise that, as with musical chairs, some people will be missing out. When we have this very expression of democracy at its fullest—the best expression of good governance—the government is spitting the dummy, taking the money away and misleading Parliament.

The minister told us in Parliament that the City of Subiaco had not consulted with its local community. The minister told us in estimates that Subiaco had not provided the report to the community before it voted to not go ahead with the merger. If we look at the local newspaper from Post Newspapers Pty Ltd, there is a picture of the two local mayors—former Nedlands Mayor, Sheryl Froese, and Subiaco Mayor, Heather Henderson—with the \$140 000, 300-page report that the City of Subiaco put out for public comment for three weeks, which ended on 16 June last year. The minister categorically attacked that very good council, the City of Subiaco, for not having consulted its residents. There is something even more disappointing in the performance of this Barnett government. When Subiaco council met on 7 July last year, its councillors ended up unanimously voting against the merger plans, citing local opposition from local people for their decision. That is because they had undertaken an independent report prepared by KPMG, which went out to the community for consideration for three weeks. The community said, “Hang on! This does not justify mergers. This does not justify amalgamations.” This is the point I am hearing from so many local councils and communities around Western Australia. Having fewer councils—having the Jeff Kennett or Margaret Thatcher option—does not equal good governance in Western Australia. The Barnett government needs to understand that quickly. It can wait until after the election, which is when Jeff Kennett discovered it, or it can understand it now and say to the local community that this philosophical bent, this fatwa that it is proceeding with against local government on mergers, is totally unwarranted. The government cannot produce the economic justification for it and, most importantly, it cannot produce the good governance evidence to show that we will end up with better local councils. The Minister for Local Government has totally misled Parliament on the issue of Subiaco. I think he insulted, if not defamed, that council by saying that it did not consult its local community by putting out the report. Clearly that happened. The government needs to apologise for that. I also raised the issue of the Trayning and Koorda councils. The minister said I was wrong there. I was right. Those councils undertook the proper consultation with their communities. As we have said, it may be the individual view of councillors that they should merge or amalgamate, but when they consult with their local communities and their local communities say no, a good council will listen just like a good government will listen.

It is all very well for people on the government benches to accept democracy when it allows all the minority parties in this Parliament to join to form government while the biggest party is not part of government. That is democracy. Similarly, the government must listen to the democratic view of local communities in WA that are saying, “Don’t force us to amalgamate. Don’t force us to merge.” It is a very, very important issue.

I give another example—the cemeteries botch-up. After knowing about this for 25 years, the minister finally came to Parliament two weeks before the deadline on 2 July, when the first tranche of 25-year tenure burials from 1986 expire, and told people that they will have to renew those tenures. The costs will be over \$2 000 in many cemeteries. The member for Joondalup has written to the minister for more than a year to alert him to this issue. Proper information did not come from the government and the cemetery bodies about these changes. People are accidentally finding out. Some people are getting direct mail, but only a couple of weeks before the expiry date. Many of them may be pensioners. Some of them are service personnel. To say, “Your graveyard lease expires on 2 July; pay up or lose it” is a tremendously disrespectful way to treat people who have served our nation. We need the minister to intervene to bring a stay to the proceedings and show good governance in this area. It is a very big problem. It just starts on 2 July, because after that we will have period after period when people who believed they had a grave site for life discover that they do not have one.

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee) [11.02 am]: I finally get my opportunity to speak on the estimates hearings. I think I may well be one of the last, if not the last, speaker on this topic. I, like others, was particularly disappointed when we went into these estimates committees to try to get the answers that we as the opposition deservedly should have to provide full scrutiny of this government. I used the Estimates Committees to correlate that which had come before from the ministers’ mouths in the relevant areas of interest to me and that which we found out in fact. The disparity between what has come forth from ministers and what has come forth from departments has never been more evident as being crook than in the housing portfolio.

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

It is important to understand the context of what is happening with housing in the Western Australian community. All of us would have our own version of this through our insights in our own electorates, but there is a housing crisis along the continuum of supply in this state. It is affecting not only crisis care and available beds—they are at breaking point now and many, many nights go by in this town when people cannot get crisis beds—but also the supply of housing in the affordable end and in the general end. Just recently, we saw a 46 per cent drop in housing approvals in the free market commercial end at this government's own hand. That is the result of this government's direct inability to introduce legislation that has a comprehensive answer for all the stakeholders. They are gridlocked between the local government authorities and the developers. Evidence of that is that this government has had to bring in a rush of ministerial orders to get housing going. Goodness knows what will happen when all those councils have to go back and issue work orders for noncompliant work to those developers and who will take responsibility, but we will see.

The continuum of housing is broken. It is broken for a range of factors both inside and outside the control of the government. The reality is that if someone wants to get a home loan now, the lending criteria is particularly difficult. A loan value ratio of 70 per cent and a 30 per cent deposit is required. These sorts of things and the market sentiment of uncertainty because the economy of Western Australia has been talked down by many stakeholders, are making it a very difficult prospect for people to consider entering the housing ownership market.

The other failure in the system is the supply of two-bedroom and three-bedroom units at both the affordable end and what we would call "age in place". The affordable end is also directly correlated with the fact that this government is not serious about its Directions 2031 and 11 activity centres. It needs to bite the bullet and be the leader in relation to the density of dwellings and the span of activity at the transport-orientated developments that are required.

In the rental market we have also seen availability drop below three per cent. I think we are at 1.9 per cent vacancy rate for rentals, which is great for landlords, but not so great for those trying to get into rentals. Anglicare Australia's "Rental Affordability Snapshot" for 2012 placed the average rental in Perth at \$565 a week. Anglicare looked at 3 828 rentals across the state. I think that is sobering. The crisis care end is broken by any estimate. The rental vacancy rates are very high and the impact on the cost of rental is so great that it is causing between 20 and 30 people to turn up at rental home opens. Rental properties are opened like home opens for house sales. People are bidding for rental properties. Imagine a single parent. If a single parent on a single parent pension turns up to a rental home open, they will not present very favourably to landlords. Their capacity to support the future rent increases that most landlords would like to impose does not necessarily make single parents prime candidates. They are pushed back into the crisis housing sector. They cannot get support there. There is no hope of housing ownership. It is a completely flawed system and the government must take responsibility for the sections of this particular crisis and deliver better outcomes. The key indicators of this are that 51 000 people are on the public housing waitlist. That is 8 000 more than when we left government. That is a 40 per cent increase. This waitlist figure represents 23 000 children or dependants waiting for a secure place to live. The priority waitlist has now more than 3 000 applicants. They are dealing only with applications made in 2009. Nearly 4 000 children or dependants are included in that.

It is important to remember that behind these statistics of those affected by the public housing waitlist are people—ordinary, normal people such as Cherie Pearce who we highlighted in some media last week. She used to work in the mines. She had a job and some skills. She was a semiskilled plant operator. She met her partner and they married and had two children; one is now two years old and the other is six and a half months. Unfortunately, as often happens in our society, their marriage broke up. Cherie is particularly unique, but I suppose not completely unique, because there are others who are challenged like her. As a single mum, Cherie deals with Sachin, her baby who was born with a hole in his heart and a rupture of the diaphragm that holds the organs of his lower torso in place. Sachin is a sick little boy; he has had two operations. Cherie spends several nights a week with those two children in her car, which has a flat battery. She has to get it jump-started so she can move from parking lot to parking lot, which should be safe to keep out of the reach of the rangers. She spends some nights hopping between girlfriends' houses and family members' houses. Cherie is particularly challenged; she is a particularly determined and proud woman. This determined and proud woman came to see me via the member for Nollamara's office—on the member's recommendation—to see whether she could get something done. She was exasperated. She had been ringing for crisis accommodation care every single day trying to find a bed. Cherie is also a very ordinary Western Australian; she is not subject to domestic abuse, she is not alcoholic, she is not a drug user, she does not have a clandestine laboratory and she has never been convicted of anything. She is just a normal, ordinary Western Australian trying to make her way in life and to deal with the challenges life puts in front of her. She cannot get crisis care because there are not enough beds for people in her circumstances; in fact, there are no beds for people in her circumstances. She almost contemplated the idea that she needed to get a conviction of some kind or to get admitted to some drug rehabilitation program

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

in order to qualify for the appropriate style of housing. Of course, she has more scruples than that; she did not go down that path. She decided to go to the local member or the nearest local member who would hear the case and ended up with me. This woman, who takes her duties as a mother very, very seriously and who is a proud Western Australian, decided that the last resort was to go to the media. Her last resort was to put her dignity aside, stand in front of a camera and tell the world as she knew it what her situation was. What did she get? We wrote all of the usual letters, faxed, rang and sent all the different bits and pieces we needed to various ministers. The only response we got from the Minister for Housing, on Friday, was that there would always be people in acute housing crisis, but that his government acknowledged the housing affordability crisis and was investing significantly to address the issue.

Let us have a look at exactly what investment this minister, under this government, is actually making for the housing continuum that he so often bangs on about. The 2012–13 budget tells us the truth about this government's seriousness. The Department of Housing receives \$105 million less in total appropriations in the 2012–13 period. That is a fantastic advertisement for complete ignorance by this minister and this government about what is happening to the people of Western Australia and their everyday needs. By comparison, in this budget the government will provide \$163 million in total appropriations for the Department of Housing. That is the amount the government is actually putting in; I will not have it said that the Keystart dividend should be counted as government money. It is not government money; the Keystart dividend is a profit made by Keystart from the people of Western Australia, and I put that on the record. Let us not forget that there is \$163 million for housing, \$185 million went to sport and recreation, \$216 million went to environment and conservation and \$744 million went to corrective services. Corrective services received \$744 million; that is more than three times what was allocated to housing. We spend over three times more to keep people locked up than we do to house them. The irony is not lost on me and I am sure it will not be lost on others in this house. An additional \$200 million of appropriation went to the stadium—the stadium we had to have because there was nowhere else to build; a stadium that was so essential. However, on the other side of the ledger, this minister has overseen some of the biggest wastage of any department of this government. The housing maintenance scheme under the head contractor model issued to Transfield particularly, and the other head contractors, is nothing short of absolutely disgraceful. It is completely disgraceful. A good example is in Northam, where six transportable houses were approved and moved onto a vacant Department of Housing block in December 2010 at a cost of \$1.62 million. No-one lives in those six units in Northam 18 months later. Eighteen months later, there is no-one living in six Department of Housing houses. Closer to town, 30 Homeswest units in Maddington are still empty, yet this minister has no capacity to accept any personal responsibility for his leadership. There are technical issues. We can talk about departmental fault, and we can talk about head contractor fault or subcontractor fault, but we cannot at any point get from this minister an acceptance of any personal responsibility for leading. The absence of leadership and his capacity to demonstrate it, and to demonstrate it publicly, is a particular disgrace and a blight on this government. This Premier is looking to find a new team; he is looking for his own heir apparent. Does he have that in the Minister for Housing? I do not think so. Does the Minister for Housing have the capacity and the proven track record to step up and accept the leadership responsibility that his party will foist upon him by default? The housing minister has to stand responsible for the waste and the \$140 000-odd he has already spent on an independent KPMG report; he needs to become accountable.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): Member for Kwinana—Mindarie; sorry!

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Mindarie) [11.18 am]: We will clarify that, Mr Acting Speaker. I am currently the member for Mindarie, but the seat is to be called Butler. Therefore, it is on behalf of the constituents of what was known as Mindarie, but will be the new state seat of Butler, that I rise to respond to this pre-election budget and expose the trickery it contains. It is built on two pillars. When the Premier and Treasurer took it to the public, it was based on two pillars that looked pretty solid. The first was that it would deliver a surplus in this fiscal year, and the second was that funds would be put into a future fund for the good of the community in the future. But the pillars, when examined closely, were like those pillars we see on a kiddie's ice-cream cake—under the harsh glare of scrutiny, of course, they melted away. Firstly, I deal with the so-called claimed surplus of, I think, \$196 million; I might be a couple of million dollars out, but \$196 million or \$198 million is the claimed surplus. Even going through the spending provisions just in relation to the Attorney General's portfolio—this is not big-ticket items such as education and health—we can see that the government has ticked the box that the community wants addressed, such as mental health in the criminal justice system, so it can be said that it is instigating a program of mental health court diversion services for about \$1 million, but we suddenly come to realise that that will go nowhere near covering what is required. I have had the opportunity on impromptu travel trips to examine this sort of scheme in Melbourne where it has been working particularly well. The budget states that in conjunction with the Mental Health Commission, a mental health diversion support program is being introduced to the Perth Magistrates Court. There is no detail in the budget and not even in estimates committee could we get to the detail of how these people will be selected. Do they self-select by saying, "I've got a head

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 14 June 2012]

p3722a-3722a

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

space problem, Your Worship; I want to go to a different court”? Do the police triage these people? That is putting an unfair burden on the police. It has been shown from their contact with people on the street that it is very hard for them to differentiate between anger, substance abuse and a mental health problem. Or, do we go the full wozza and give them the full treatment like they are given in Melbourne—to the benefit of the community—whereby everyone who wants bail has to go to a counter and be interviewed by a mental health nurse, someone to do with housing and someone to do with welfare? We know that it is hopeless just taking people who are burdened with a mental illness off the street, whizzing them through court and then releasing them on bail. Of course they will commit further offences because they are not coping. In Melbourne, once a person has come to a window and been identified with a mental health problem, the state purchases mental health treatment programs for them in the private sector because we all know that the public mental health system is at breaking point. All members know that from the problems they see in their electorate offices. There is no provision in this budget for the purchasing of mental health treatment—none at all. It is just a simple line item in the budget saying that the mental health diversion program will cost \$412 000. That would barely pay for one magistrate’s wage and a bench clerk in a courtroom. The real cost of having an effective mental health program is not in the budget.

Let us take the Corruption and Crime Commission. I am glad that the temporary Treasurer, the Premier, is in the chamber. His big ambition is to have the CCC take over a *de jure* role in organised crime—that is, a concurrent and parallel jurisdiction to Western Australia Police. It is to be an original jurisdiction of the CCC to look at organised crime. We have heard from the previous commissioner of the CCC, Mr Len Roberts-Smith, when giving evidence on this before the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, about what this might cost. He said that over a five-year period it would cost \$42 million, which is about \$8 million a year. This is from the former head of the agency charged with the responsibility. In the estimates committee it came out that there is no extra money for this program. It just ticks another box so that the Premier can go to the public and say that the CCC will take over organised crime. It will be another one of these types of shemozzles that has happened in the past with these agencies because there is no extra funding for it. At the estimates committee I pressed the CCC on this and was told it was cutting back on other functions. Come out and tell the public chapter and verse what are the other areas and investigations that the CCC will be told to desist with, because 25 per cent of its work will have to be cut back. It gets approximately \$25 million a year and is saying that it will cost between \$5 million and \$8 million a year to run a mature, proper organised crime investigation unit.

As members can see, the whole concept of there being a \$198 million surplus is just not sustainable. The public has been hoodwinked. This comes months before there will be an election campaign when the Premier will go out and make promises. It is little wonder that the former Treasurer, the member for Bateman, did not stay the distance on this budget bill and pulled out so that he did not have to sign off on it because he would not have had any credibility come the middle of next year—none whatsoever—because on top of this budget, we will have what will be large election promises made by the Premier to buy his way back into office. He will point to his responsibility by establishing the first future fund in Western Australia to put aside \$1.1 billion of borrowings. We know that our borrowings are going up. I revert to my second reading debate contribution, because the people in the electorate of Mindarie—soon to be Butler—are not silly. They know we have the biggest debt we have ever had in Western Australia and suddenly we are putting money into a savings account. They know that this is like borrowing on the credit card to start a savings account. As I said in the second reading debate, they know that if they went to the ANZ Bank in Clarkson and said, “Mr Bank Manager, I want you to give me a credit card so I can run up a \$10 000 debt on it and start a \$10 000 savings account”, the bank manager would think they were on drugs and would tell them to get out of his office. This is crazy stuff. Only the Premier and Treasurer can get away with this in Western Australia.

This money will be put aside for future generations when there is infrastructure that can be purchased at today’s prices and can be built now that will last for generations. That infrastructure will affect not only today’s voters, but also their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. For example, the northern extension of the Mitchell Freeway is a badly needed piece of infrastructure. Most of the fly in, fly out workers are being housed in the new housing estates starting in Quinns Rocks going out to Two Rocks. That is miles from the current terminus of the Mitchell Freeway at Burns Beach Road. There is not one dollar in the budget for the design works of that freeway. The Premier commissioned a community group headed by the member for Ocean Reef, my friend Mr Albert Jacob, to consult the community about what it wanted. We can tell him now. What do we want? A freeway. When do we want it? Now! Where do we want it? Up the guts of the freeway reserve, not through the streets of Butler. The machinery of government has managed to build a freeway from Bunbury to Burns Beach Road without a community group having to design where it goes. Where did it put it? Down the freeway reserve. When the Leader of the Opposition announced that he would institute a very sensible proposal—that is, a committee to discuss the infrastructure needs of Western Australia for the next 20 years and

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

to prioritise them—the Premier gave the game away about his view of these types of committees when he said, “You have a committee when you don’t want to undertake action.” That is the Premier’s view. He believes that a committee is formed when the government wants to fiddle around with talk and not undertake action. He has given the game away about exactly what he is doing with the northern extension of the Mitchell Freeway. He has not put even one dollar into the design works for the freeway. He has not put any money into it. He wants to put the money for that project into the future fund. Those funds could be used to build the freeway now, which is urgently required and would be used by not only this generation, but also our grandchildren who would benefit from the mining boom by building infrastructure now that would last their and their grandchildren’s lives. Stirling Highway has served everyone for generations and generations, as will the Mitchell Freeway. Instead of that, the Premier cynically put together a community committee to talk about it with a reporting date of Christmas. As the Honourable Premier of Western Australia said, “You have committees when you don’t actually want to undertake action.”

What other action is required in Butler? The traffic lights at the corner of Hester Avenue and Wanneroo Road are of critical importance and in urgent need of attention. There are only two ways out of Butler—down Marmion Avenue, because there is no freeway, or down Wanneroo Road, but drivers have to turn right onto Wanneroo Road in the morning and take their lives into their hands. The traffic travelling from the north is doing 90 kilometres an hour and all the families that I represent have to play Russian roulette when trying to turn right onto Wanneroo Road to go south. Is there any mention of that in this budget? There is not a dollar, not even for forward planning, for those traffic lights.

Where is this state booming? It is booming in that north coastal area. The Department of Education has identified for years that the facilities at Yanchep District High School are substandard. There is no doubt about that, as anyone who drives out there and looks at it could tell. It has been on the list for ages. Is there any money in the budget for this school? I am not talking about money to do up Yanchep high school, as it has the land for the new high school on the eastern side of Marmion Avenue. There is not even a dollar in the out years for its planning. A huge population of children out there have to be bussed for miles down to already over-bulging schools further to the south in Clarkson and soon to the new one in Butler.

We asked for some miserable little thing out in my electorate. The Premier talks about putting a new swimming pool on the beach at Cottesloe. We do not have a swimming pool anywhere within cooee of my electorate. The government took away the \$2 million that Labor had put aside for a swimming pool. All we want is a concrete swimming pool on Quinns Beach so that the local primary schools can take their kiddies to swimming lessons during the height of summer. We cannot even get that. Those who can afford binoculars and telescopes see signposts 50 kilometres to the south saying that a lovely waterway will be put in at The Esplanade, Perth and a football stadium will be built over at Burswood. This means nothing to the people in Butler and Mindarie who are screaming out for infrastructure and being told to wait their turn as first of all the government is going to start this infrastructure fund for the future so that their relatives, heirs and successors can build these things in 30 years.

MR A.P. O’GORMAN (Joondalup) [11.33 am]: It is always a privilege to follow the member for Mindarie because he seems to fire people up in this place. I wish to take up some of the points that he raised, particularly relating to the Mitchell Freeway and the Burns Beach Road exit off that freeway. When the freeway went through to Burns Beach Road, the traffic volumes that we were experiencing were far less than they are now. Over the past year or so I have started to get complaints about the traffic noise from residents living adjacent to Burns Beach Road. A number of trucks travel along Burns Beach Road, causing disturbance to the residents. The noise from these trucks generally starts between 4.30 am and 5.00 am. The noise is constant, causing those people and their children living adjacent to Burns Beach Road to wake up. It starts again mid-afternoon, about 3.30 pm, and continues until about seven o’clock in the evening, which is when people like to be outside having barbecues during summer. People living along that interface of Burns Beach Road tell me that they no longer have quiet enjoyment of their backyard because of the noise of those trucks.

The section of road near the roundabout of Joondalup Drive and Burns Beach Road is uphill. The trucks power up that section, so the noise gets quite loud. When they come down the other way, they move down their gears, so it is quite loud as well. Signs have been erected asking truckies to reduce noise. I am sure that most truckies are responsible, but unfortunately it is quite a steep hill and they have to use their gears to slow their trucks down and to speed up to get up the hill.

The proposed extension of the freeway to Hester Avenue will have little, if any, effect on my electorate. The truth is that it will take some of that traffic off Burns Beach Road and allow those residents to return to some enjoyment of their backyards in the future. The only road that will connect up further from Burns Beach Road is Neerabup Road. That will eventually join onto Flynn Drive, which is adjacent to the major industrial area up that way. There are plans to put some traffic lights at the intersection of Flynn Drive and Wanneroo Road. Flynn

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

Drive sweeps to the left in a southerly direction, and it is quite dangerous. The proper way to fix it is to straighten Flynn Drive, as is the proposal in the long term. Wanneroo Road is to become a dual carriageway. The five-kilometre stretch between Joondalup Drive and south of Hester Avenue, where the dual carriageway is already, badly needs to be upgraded to a dual carriageway, with the proper intersection of Flynn Drive, which will then form a continuation of Neerabup Road onto the freeway. That should take away some of the trucks and some of the noise that these people adjacent to Burns Beach Road are experiencing at the moment. It is fine to extend the freeway up there; it is absolutely needed. As we know, Joondalup is 26 kilometres north of the city and the development goes a further 26 kilometres north to Yanchep.

We are also seeing clutter on the Mitchell Freeway every morning from Burns Beach Road right through to Hutton Street some mornings. This morning was not so bad. We had a bit of a glut from Ocean Reef Road to Hepburn Avenue and then a free run until Reid Highway, where it slowed up again. The government has money in the budget—from memory, it is \$30 million—to put another lane in the northbound section of the freeway from Hepburn Avenue to Hodges Drive to get people home quicker in the evening. That is fine and all well and good but we also need a third lane southbound so that people can get from the far northern suburbs to their workplaces in the city or the southern suburbs in a timely manner. This morning was not too bad; it took me only 45 minutes to get in here, but it often takes between one hour and one hour and 15 minutes to get from Joondalup, which is only halfway out, in the mornings. The freeway really does need that third lane.

I move to a couple of other issues that I did not manage to mention in my speech on the second reading. First, I refer to the West Perth Falcons clubrooms. I think the Premier and his cabinet were out there on Monday. I hope he took the opportunity to meet with people from the West Perth Falcons. I know the Minister for Sport and Recreation had an opportunity to meet with them. It is a fantastic club. Since moving to Arena Joondalup, they have claimed three premierships. Unfortunately, they are not going too well this year, but hopefully in the second half of the season they will pick up and the Falcons will win their fourth premiership since their move to Joondalup. It is a great club but it is working under extremely difficult conditions up there. Aside from Subiaco, we probably have the best oval in the state, but the clubrooms are an integral part of any footy club. I know that the Premier knows that because he is intimately connected with Claremont Football Club, having played for it or been involved with it previously. He knows how important it is for a footy club to have its own clubrooms. Thankfully, we got \$400 000 or \$600 000 from the government —

Mr C.J. Barnett: I visited about a year ago and there was about \$400 000 in the budget to do some immediate improvements.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: That money was used to upgrade the gym, which opened a couple of months ago, prior to the start of the season. It was very much appreciated by the club and the local community. The club performs a huge role in promoting footy to the local schools and to young people up there. It has a great development squad. It is great to have this club up there; we just want it looked after properly.

Another club in the northern suburbs is the Wanneroo Wolves, which is part of the Wanneroo Basketball Association and which caters for 2 500 juniors. The club is in a facility that I think was built in the mid-1980s—1984 or 1985. The lease is due to expire this year.

The land is owned by LandCorp. Between the local council and the government, nothing has been put in place to accommodate the Wanneroo Wolves into the future. If 2 500 young people play basketball at that facility on a weekly basis, and sometimes two or three times a week, I shudder to think what would happen if we no longer had a Wanneroo Wolves basketball facility in Joondalup. The suggestion has been made to move the Wanneroo Wolves to Arena Joondalup. It is an option, but it would require construction of another four courts. The original estimate for the courts was about \$3 million, but we are now up to anywhere between \$12 million and \$18 million, depending on how flash the courts are. But there is an issue at Arena Joondalup. The Falcons have an issue, the Joondalup Brothers Rugby Union Football Club has an issue, soccer has an issue, netball has an issue, and users of the gym have an issue. The issue is that three to four times a year, those groups are excluded from using the premises because of the concerts. Everybody agrees that the concerts are a good option. I got a number of complaints after the last concert, so I surveyed the people in the houses immediately abutting the arena. The vast majority of the responses—I got a lot of responses; it was about a 40 per cent response rate, which is a lot more than I expected—supported the arena having the concerts. These groups have an issue with the fact that they are excluded from the facility not just for the day of the concert, but for a week or two before and a week or two after, depending on the size of the concert. That time is needed to do the set-up and the tear-down. The Wanneroo Wolves club is fearful that if it moves there and it gets knocked out of the facility three or four times a year for up to four weeks at a time—that is a maximum of 12 weeks a year—that is a huge amount of time out of its season when it cannot provide facilities for the junior players. This issue has to be considered properly and appropriately. One of the solutions is that if it will take up to \$12 million or \$18 million to rehouse the Wanneroo Wolves, why not leave the club where it is. It has a facility. Yes, it needs some repair. It has in its

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

coffers some \$200 000 or thereabouts that it could put towards upgrading and doing maintenance on that facility. I think it needs a new roof, some new change rooms and new plumbing. I am no valuer, but, at a guess, that land would be worth somewhere between \$3 million and \$4 million. It is a possible option that the club is putting forward. It would still have clubrooms, as well as facilities for the 2 500 juniors.

I move on to housing and getting projects to market. This issue has been mentioned in this chamber quite a lot in the past three or four years. We all know that the Craigie high school site in the northern suburbs, which is about 10 hectares in size, is still vacant. The high school was closed in December 2003. The school buildings were bowled over in 2004. That was done with the agreement of the local community through the local area education planning because it was fearful that the buildings would turn into a squat if they were left standing. When the Labor Party was in government, it had agreement to get rid of those buildings as quickly as possible. All the buildings have been gone since January 2004, except for the basketball courts, which were asked to be retained by the City of Joondalup for a graffiti wall, which, unfortunately, went sadly wrong. If I remember rightly, the current Premier and the now Minister for Education went out there prior to the 2005 election with the media to show how wrong it had gone. That has now been removed. The structure plan for the site has been done. It has been approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission and the local council, but still we do not see bulldozers out there getting that site ready for sale to the community. It is right in the middle of an area that has all the necessary facilities. All we need is the land to come onto the market. The schools, hospitals and shopping centres are there; everything is there. In the same suburb, there is the old Camberwarra primary school site. That school was closed in 2009–10 and there is no sign of any work being done there to bring it to market. There is another 10-hectare lot on McLarty Avenue in Joondalup. Again, that land is right beside the arena, the hospital and other facilities, yet there has been no movement to move that along. That land belongs to the Department of Housing. It was working on it when we lost government in 2008. It had some concept plans, but they are nowhere to be seen now. These are great blocks of land to put houses on. They are close to facilities, and no more infrastructure is required except for the roads to be put in and the blocks to be subdivided. The land at McLarty Avenue is a prime location for multistorey development.

I move on to some training issues. West Coast Institute of Training has been doing a great job in the northern suburbs. It expands every year. Sadly, it lacks a gym, science labs and some lecture theatres. It is currently using the Australian Institute for University Studies site at McLarty Avenue. We have suggested that that be handed over to the West Coast Institute of Training. It is now falling into disrepair. I am told that people can even see rats running around there. It was purchased by the previous government for about \$25 million when the former owners put it up for sale. It is a great facility. We should not let it deteriorate. We should hand it over to West Coast so it can continue to deliver education and training in the northern suburbs. At the moment 700 students use that facility. Most of those students are in the nursing sphere. Those courses need to be delivered to people in the northern suburbs.

I keep mentioning the Motor Industry Training Association, which is in my electorate. I have spoken about MITA many times. It is struggling with funding because government funding comes through only on the completion of courses. A major part of vehicle maintenance is the safety features. MITA has suggested that a small percentage of the road trauma trust fund could be set aside and channelled into training, not just for MITA, but for all the automotive training institutions, so that they can provide training on safety issues.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [11.47 am]: I would like to make a few comments on the Appropriation (Consolidated Account) Recurrent 2012–13 Bill 2012.

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I may be mistaken, but I am quite sure that the member for Maylands has already spoken in this debate.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Sorry, Premier; I have not.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): No; I think the member spoke on the second reading. Is that right member for Maylands?

Ms L.L. BAKER: I have spoken to the second reading.

Debate Resumed

Ms L.L. BAKER: I have a brief contribution to make about some issues that are of concern to me, particularly the lack of leadership shown in some parts of this year's budget. I start by drawing attention to an issue that has been on this Parliament's mind for the nearly four years that I have been in this place—that is, the implementation, or the funding and rollout, of the state trail bike strategy. I raise this issue again because what has been lacking is the capacity of the ministers involved to break through some of the bureaucratic negativity

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

about owning and running this strategy and making it work in the community. Every weekend it seems that we hear on the radio or read in the paper about a dreadful accident involving off-road trail bikes that have run into each other and people dying. I think the statistics around major trauma incidents at Royal Perth Hospital show that trail bike accidents are one of the biggest contributors to the dreadful trauma in our hospital system. I am bringing this up because I find it inconceivable that our Minister for Sport and Recreation has not shown enough leadership to get this strategy implemented. He needs to take the leadership; he needs to pull the departments together. It is my understanding that there is a problem with the administration. Who will implement this? Is it the Department of Environment and Conservation? Is it the Department of Sport and Recreation? Nobody wants to own the process. It is absolutely deplorable when young people are being killed off-road in bush blocks. Many of us hear of this every weekend in our electorates. Why is the sports minister not capable of showing leadership, pulling these departments together and getting funding for the state trail bike strategy? I remind members of some of the components of the strategy. Every trail bike sold should attract a registration fee to go into a trust fund so that those funds can be used to fund the development of new safe, off-road trail bike areas so that parents can take their children, if that is their sport, into a safe area to pursue it. None of this is happening, although I acknowledge that some small concessions have been made, such as the development of a couple of existing trails. But when I speak to the stakeholders who ride bikes and run the trail bike associations, they are still very, very disappointed with this government's lack of action on implementing the state trail bike strategy.

I want to make one other comment on an issue that is missing from this budget. I raised in the second reading debate quite a few issues in relation to my electorate and I do not intend to repeat them; they are on the record and I will be pursuing them. The other issue that warrants further discussion is the need for a strong policy position from this government through our Department of Education on gay, lesbian, bisexual trans-sexual and intersexual—GLBTI—homophobic bullying.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Intersexual?

Ms L.L. BAKER: I will talk to the Premier about it later.

This issue has been the subject of speeches made in the upper house by my colleagues of all political persuasions. It appears that in the estimates committee, the Department of Education was unequivocal in saying that it has no stand-alone policy on homophobic bullying in schools. This is to me a complete abrogation of responsibility. We are dealing with a group of people who have a suicide rate six times the rate of the general population. That alone means the government has to pay attention to the need for some specific strategies. Indeed, the Western Australian of the year, Professor Donna Cross, an expert on bullying, has provided data on the prevalence of homophobic bullying and said that she favours a stand-alone policy that reflects the best research currently available on the area. That is despite the Director General of Education, the Minister for Education and the minister in the upper house representing the education minister claiming that we do not need it; it can be wrapped up with the policy on all bullying. It cannot be. There is clear evidence that it is not effective to leave the policy like this. I will quote some of the data which Donna Cross has provided and which my colleague Hon Linda Savage spoke about in the upper house. Professor Donna Cross states —

5–11% of Australian youth are gay or bisexual, and they may be up to 6 times more likely to commit suicide than other young people ... The experience of homophobic bullying contributes to poor health and wellbeing outcomes among these young people.

In 2010, of over 3000 Australian same-sex attracted youth, 61% reported experiencing verbal homophobic abuse, 18% reported physical abuse, and 26% reported other homophobic abuse (e.g. exclusion, rumours).

Professor Donna Cross went on to say —

80% of those who experienced homophobic bullying reported that this was most likely to occur at school.

The data she provides indicates that homophobic bullying was targeted at males more often than at females. She says —

Gay students in Australian schools who felt that their schools supported them and had clear policies against homophobic bullying were less likely to self-harm and attempt suicide ... However, 37% described their schools as homophobic or very homophobic. Almost half felt they had no access to social or structural support for homosexuality in their school. Many gay youth desired sexual education in schools which was more inclusive of same-sex attraction ...

This data comes straight from Donna Cross, who is an acknowledged expert in the field of bullying. I draw the attention of the house to this matter because there are young people who are struggling with their gender and

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

their sexuality. There is absolutely no way that they can find their way through the Department of Education's website or its policies to find any support. I was in one of my primary schools last week and the acting principal of that school described a situation in which a young girl is having gender and sexuality issues. All the schoolteachers and the principal tried to find support for her from what was available within the education department, but could not find anything that would help this young girl. They went outside the department and found a non-government organisation—I think it was the Freedom Centre—that could provide some advice and direction. I am saying to the house that this is an ideal opportunity to find a way to help a portion of the 10 per cent of the school population who find themselves struggling and in need of support. It is not good enough to use the standard bullying policies. These kids will not use them; they cannot find them; they will not go to them. They already feel victimised, they already feel fragile, and many of them may be suicidal. We need stand-alone policies.

So my final question, in addition to what happened to the leadership from this government on cutting youth deaths on trail bikes, is: where is the stand-alone policy in the education department and schools to help the increasing number of young people who find themselves struggling with their sexuality and who need help but cannot identify that help? Thank you.

MR M.P. WHITELY (Bassendean) [11.56 am]: I want to make specific comments about questions I asked during the estimates process. I will begin with a question I asked of the minister representing the Minister for Mental Health seeking clarification on whether early psychosis prevention and intervention centre services have a preventive pre-psychosis function or whether the early intervention occurs once psychosis is established. I also asked for the minister to provide some details of the rollout of the EPPIC service that was identified in the budget. The question was: will the early psychosis prevention and intervention centres treat only those who are psychotic or will it treat those who are considered to be at risk of becoming psychotic? The answer I received was incredibly confusing because it answered both yes and no. It states —

The Early Psychosis Prevention and Intervention Centre (EPPIC) services are for young people with first episode early psychosis and for detecting those with ultra high risk of developing psychosis. Those who eventually do not develop psychosis will be transitioned out of the EPPIC to more appropriate service providers.

I will repeat in part what it said —

... for detecting those with ultra high risk of developing psychosis.

The same answer goes on to say —

The services do not have a prevention pre-psychosis function, ...

That is entirely contradictory. Seeking to detect those with a perceived ultra-high risk of developing psychosis means that they have never actually had psychosis. It is a preventive function. To then say these services do not have a preventive pre-psychosis function is entirely contradictory, which further elevates the concerns I have raised in this Parliament before about the operation of EPPICs. EPPICs were originally badged as early psychosis prevention and intervention centres. The key in that title is the second “p” standing for “prevention”. In other words, they were badged as being services that were designed to help prevent people from developing psychosis. There has been significant international debate about whether the condition known as psychosis risk disorder should be included in the next edition of what is often described as the bible of psychiatry, the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Because of concerns about inappropriate labelling, concerns that I have shared and spoken about at length in Parliament and elsewhere—I possibly get more interest from people outside Parliament than from those in Parliament—and of people being identified as being on a track to becoming psychotic and the dangers of self-fulfilling prophecies; and even greater concerns about the inappropriate application of medications or, in other words, the use of antipsychotics as a preventative treatment for psychosis, the whole idea of psychosis risk disorder, which is also known as attenuated psychosis syndrome, being put in the next edition of DSM was knocked on the head. People were so concerned that people would be inappropriately labelled and drugged that the preventative task of identifying who was in danger of becoming psychotic that recognising it as an official psychiatric disorder was knocked on the head. Nonetheless, our system of EPPICs persist with that second “p”, with “prevention” in the title. That might seem like an abstract concept to members, but is a very important concept. A significant amount of money—\$222.4 million—has been identified to be spent over five years across Australia for the rollout of EPPIC services. That funding is federal funding and when the agreement was signed, it was to be met on a dollar-for-dollar basis by the states.

A key question in the function of those services that needs to be resolved is whether the services will treat only those who have become psychotic—people who have had a first psychotic episode—or whether they will treat people who are judged to be at risk of becoming psychotic. As I said, the whole reason that attenuated psychosis syndrome or psychosis risk disorder was knocked on the head was because some people are convinced that we

cannot reliably predict who will become psychotic. Proponents of psychosis risk identification argue that as high as 36 per cent of those identified as being at risk of becoming psychotic actually go on to be psychotic, whereas critics say that the figure is as low as only eight per cent. There is concern that more than nine out of 10 of those identified as being at ultra-high risk of being psychotic will never become psychotic. The whole reason it was knocked on the head was because of the perception of the risk that people would receive a stigmatising label that would create a prophecy of doom that they would go on to become psychotic and, in many cases, develop schizophrenia. That concern was sufficient for the whole notion to be knocked on the head. Yet when I asked a clear and unambiguous question of the Minister for Health, who was representing the Minister for Mental Health—the answer was provided by way of supplementary information—they clearly demonstrated that they do not understand the issue. Going back to the answer again, it reads that part of the function will be to detect those with ultra-high risk of developing psychosis. In direct contradiction, the answer also states that these services do not have a preventative pre-psychosis function. That may seem like abstract detail to members in this place. I imagine that members are either not interested in or do not understand what I have just said, but it is incredibly important. Nationally we are looking at rolling out about \$445 million for these services. They are one of the major items of expenditure identified in the national blueprint for mental health; yet we in this place are not clear about the function of these services. I suggest that if these services are to be of use, they need to reflect the international consensus; that is, the idea of preventing psychosis before it happens is not a realistic or justifiable function. EPPIC services need to be “EPIC” services, not EPPIC services. In other words, the second “p” which stands for “prevention” should be dropped. They should be early psychosis intervention centres, not early psychosis prevention and intervention centres. They should service people who have become psychotic and deal with those people. There will be enough need to gobble up the resources that have been put into those centres. It is an incredibly important issue.

Members who are interested in these sorts of issues may have read the opinion piece I wrote for *The West Australian* about how we as a nation need to embrace a recovery-based approach to mental health. We need to start from the fundamental position that most people who become mentally ill will recover. We need to develop a system of mental health that helps people recover rather than one that facilitates their further demise.

I recently attended the Asia Pacific Conference on Mental Health, which was organised by the Richmond Fellowship. It was a brilliant conference. I congratulate the Richmond Fellowship and its head, Joe Calleja, for the fantastic job they did in putting on the conference. People at the conference expressed a broad spectrum of views. I have been to a lot of mental health conferences. The thing that impressed me about this mental health conference was that when I walked into the foyer, I did not see great stands sponsored by the pharmaceutical industry. There was no Eli Lilly or Johnson & Johnson. This conference was completely devoid of pharmaceutical company sponsorship. It very much had a recovery-based focus. The majority of those who were heard at the conference were consumers of mental health services and their carers. Their consistent message was that they want a recovery-based focus on the mental health system. They want a system that helps them, rather than one that debilitates them. There were numerous stories from mental health consumers. One story came from Lyn Mahboub, a Western Australian long-term consumer of mental health services who is also an academic. She talked about how the mental health system had helped to restrict some of her abilities. It was only when she removed herself from the system that she was able to engage on a pathway to recovery. She argued very strongly that we need to resist the forces of medicalisation of behaviour and the undue influence of the pharmaceutical industry and that we need systems that provide people with support—psychosocial support, support with housing and education facilities and support in all those sorts of services that give people the building blocks for a useful and productive life. She argued that we need a more positive outlook on mental health, a recovery-based outlook, rather than following the American style whereby a person is diagnosed and drugged or the new focus on preventative psychiatry whereby clinicians try to identify who is at risk and predict future doom, and then intervene to try to prevent that future doom. She said that largely we should forget about that and concentrate on delivering services that help people in distress and that help with education, counselling and physical supports when necessary with an appropriate conservative medication regime. Like others at the conference, she certainly was not anti-medication but argued that it is far too dominant in the provision of mental health services.

In the second part of my question I asked for some detail to be provided on the state of negotiations on the rollout of EPPICs. It is clear that the state is committed to the rollout of EPPICs, but until it actually understands and addresses the fundamental issue of whether these EPPIC services will be early psychosis intervention centres or early psychosis prevention and intervention centres—committing that sort of expenditure into the future is an extraordinarily unwise thing to do. Obviously, the \$222.4 million is an Australia-wide commitment. With Western Australia's population base, we can probably guess that the state government will need to match that dollar for dollar, so something in the order of \$20 million to \$25 million would need to be committed by the state government. It is alarming that the government has committed to the rollout of one of these services without clearly understanding what the function will be. Will the services have a preventative function? It is a seemingly

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 14 June 2012]

p3722a-3722a

Ms Janine Freeman; Mr John Hyde; Mr Peter Tinley; Mr John Quigley; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Martin Whitely

technical question for those who are not obsessed with these sorts of things, as I am, but it is a very important question. There is a real danger that if we do not sort out this question, we will be rolling out services that have the potential to harm and not help individuals.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe — Treasurer) [12.11 pm] — in reply: I thank members for their contributions to the debate on the Appropriation (Consolidated Account) Recurrent 2012–13 Bill 2012. I understand that a few more comments will be made during the debate on the Appropriation (Consolidated Account) Capital 2012–13 Bill 2012, so I will leave any further comments until that stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.