

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Division 43: Western Australia Police, \$1 202 477 000 —

Mr A.P. O’Gorman, Chairman.

Mr R.F. Johnson, Minister for Police.

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

Mr C.J. Dawson, Deputy Commissioner of Police.

Mr C. Ward, Assistant Commissioner, Business Technology.

Mr G. Dreibergs, Assistant Commissioner, Police Academy.

Mr S. Hodges, Director, Strategy and Performance.

Mr L. Bechelli, Assistant Director of Finance.

Mr G. Lord, Director, Asset Management.

The CHAIRMAN: This estimates committee will be reported by Hansard staff. The daily proof *Hansard* will be published by 9.00 am tomorrow.

It is the intention of the Chair to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point. The estimates committee’s consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated account.

Questions must be clearly related to a page number, item program or amount in the current division. It will greatly assist Hansard if members can give these details in preface to their question.

The minister may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee, rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. I ask the minister to clearly indicate what supplementary information he agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the minister’s cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk by Friday, 8 June 2012. I caution members that if a minister asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk’s office.

I now ask the minister to introduce his advisers.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Minister, I see there is a reduction in the delivery of services within the police budget of \$6 million and that the total appropriation is down. Further, I see that the “Efficiency Dividend” on page 489, starting off in 2012–13 of \$21.184 million, goes up to \$33.458 million, and progressively increases until 2015–16 to \$59.564 million. I would like to know what has been cut from the budget to deliver that efficiency dividend.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I thought a member would ask me that question tonight. The simple answer is that I cannot at this stage identify what savings we are looking for. We are at present looking to see where some savings can be made. We are making every effort, but we will not know the full amount until 1 July. I think it is 1 July we are informed we have to deliver those savings by. I am not going to announce piecemeal savings—a little bit today and a little bit tomorrow. I will inform —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Will the minister table that in Parliament on 1 July or soon thereafter?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I would not think so.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Will the minister provide that information publicly?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am sure at some stage I will provide that information, yes.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Why will the minister not provide it in July, once it is clear?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Sorry; I cannot hear the member.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Would it not be accountable and transparent for the minister to provide that information once he has it in July?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Provided I have got it by July and I am in a position —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: When the minister has it, will he provide it publicly?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Once I have identified, and police have identified, what savings can be made in relation to the efficiency dividend, I will certainly let the member know when that is, what the amount is and what it is.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Given that so much of the police budget is the cost of FTEs and the cost of accommodation, be that for police at stations or their private accommodation in country areas, the only areas that can therefore be cut are front-line services.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, not at all. We are not going to cut front-line services at all, so please do not go running off to do a press release saying that we are going to start cutting front-line services because I can assure the member we are not going to cut any front-line services.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: How does the minister know that if he does not know what he is doing? The minister has just said that he has not got a clue what he is doing!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am telling the member! I can see how we are going to go tonight. I am telling the member quite clearly now that we are not going to cut any front-line delivery services. Does she understand that? They are very simple words: we are not going to cut any front-line delivery services. The member can shout, she can get nasty with me—that is up to her—but we are not —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister said that he could not hear me before, so I am speaking louder and now he is complaining!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am telling the member quite clearly that we are not going to cut any front-line services. The member might want to say that we are, but we are not going to. I am giving that commitment.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can the minister give me one single example of something he could cut that would not be a front-line service?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I told the member I am not going to come out piecemeal with any savings that we may identify. I will provide the whole range of savings once we have established what savings can be made. We will not be cutting any front-line services in relation to police.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: This whole budget process is a joke! We have \$150 million worth of cuts, if we add up all the budget estimate amounts. It is nearly \$60 million by 2015–16, over \$20 million this year, then \$33 million and \$46 million. That is \$150 million worth of cuts. I do not believe it can be done without cutting front-line services. The minister will not name a single service and he will not be open and accountable and tell us what is being cut in this year's budget.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have answered the question about five times so far, Mr Chairman. I do not know how many more times the member wants me to answer the question. I am telling the member, finally: we are not going to cut any front-line services in police. I will let the member know as soon as we have established and identified what savings we can make.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister is telling me that this budget has been framed without a clue about how to come up with \$150 million in savings.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We are not talking about saving \$150 million. How is the member working that out?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister is going to save \$20 million this year —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is two per cent —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: — \$33 million next year, \$46 million the year after and \$60 million the year after that.

Mr P. PAPALIA: We better get someone smarter than you to answer!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: You are a nasty bit of work at times; you really are. I can see how we are going to go. Mr Chairman, can I ask you to pull that member into line because I am not going to be insulted by him all night long?

The CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you to stop so I can say: only questions, and only through the Chair, otherwise I will call you to order.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister started by saying that he expected to have some clue about what he was going to cut to make up the so-called efficiency dividend on 1 July. He is now suggesting that he does not know when he will know. Is the minister really going to hold to what he first said—that is, he expects to know on 1 July—and, if not, when would be the latest date he would know what he is going to cut to make that efficiency dividend, and when he will make that information public?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will say this very slowly and clearly: the police and I are looking into all the areas and any areas where there might possibly be some efficiency savings. By 1 July we have to give Treasury an indication of what those savings are, where they are and how much they are. Until we get to that stage I am not going to announce to the member or anybody else, piecemeal, any savings there might be. I will do that when we have established the two per cent savings we are being requested to find; once I have done that, I am sure that the member will be one of the first to know.

[7.10 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: My actual question was: when does the minister expect to be able to inform the public?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: As soon as I have established where those savings are and as soon as police have established where those savings can be found.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can the minister advise me in approximately what month this year he expects to be able to advise the public?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, I am not going to give an approximate time. I tell the member, once again, that I will let her know as soon as I have established where those savings are.

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: My question relates to the “Major Aircraft New and Replacement Program — Helicopter” line item under “Completed Works” on page 500 of budget paper No 2. What law and order benefits will an additional helicopter bring to the community of Western Australia?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: This is not so much a replacement helicopter; it is an additional helicopter—certainly at this stage it is an additional helicopter. It is Polair 62, and it is the latest \$20 million addition to the Western Australia Police aircraft fleet. It was delivered to WA Police in September 2011. After taking delivery, the helicopter was fitted with specialist role equipment, including a rescue hoist, an electro-optic suite, a forward-looking infrared camera, an air mission management system and emergency services radio suite. The helicopter—a Eurocopter Dauphin—will be the second helicopter providing front-line policing services to the community of Western Australia. WA Police has spent six months reconfiguring the helicopter to accommodate the various systems that the police air wing needs to carry out its roles. The helicopter will be fully operational by the end of June 2012—so not long to go—and it will significantly ease the burden on the agency’s sole existing helicopter, which has been in operation since 1989. It will ensure a consistent airborne law enforcement presence during maintenance periods of either aircraft. The expansion of aerial support will enable WA Police to meet its primary outcomes and more specific operational objectives through airborne patrolling, tactical aviation support, airborne search and rescue, remote area first response, airborne emergency management, airborne surveillance, special transport, and secondary air ambulance response. Finally, it will provide benefits in that it will increase operational availability and readiness to respond to counter-terrorism, emergency management, and search and rescue incidents. It will significantly improve the police response across the entire state, compared with approximately half the state now, and the helicopter has the ability to perform more tasks when it reaches the area of operation. It is a fantastic helicopter and it will be a great asset once we get it in the air, which we hope to do, as I said, by the end of June.

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: Will the police be able to use it for looking for hot spots and fires and so forth?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, certainly; it has that FLIR capability.

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: Is that what that is?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, and it can pick up people leaving a vehicle that has been stolen, and when they decamp from the vehicle, they can be seen running; they can even be picked up in houses. I think it has fantastic benefits that we have seen worldwide, and we are delighted that we will have it in WA. It is a great asset and it is long overdue.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Looking at the full-time equivalent numbers that appear on several pages, it appears that the minister is estimating an increase in FTEs of 151 between 2012 and 2013, but there is no breakdown. Can the minister give a breakdown for both 2011–12 and 2012–13 of the FTE numbers of sworn officers, auxiliary officers, Aboriginal police liaison officers—there are still a few there—and civilian staff to show how we get that 151 increase in FTEs?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Which page is the member particularly looking at?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: At the bottom of each output is the number of FTEs.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Just give me one example.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Has the minister not read this?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Sorry?

The CHAIRMAN: Page number?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Near the bottom of page 493, under output 1 is the number of FTEs. It might come as a surprise to the minister, but it is on the next page and the page after that and the page after that and the page after that; I have simply added them up. I will lend the minister my calculator if he wishes to do it.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Sorry; the member said output on page 493, at the bottom of the page?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Yes, have a look: “Employees (Full Time Equivalents)”.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: That is what “FTE” means—full-time equivalents.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: On page 493?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Yes, near the bottom.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, the member said at the bottom.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Near the bottom—second from the bottom: “Employees (Full Time Equivalents)”. It is in every section of the budget. I cannot believe the minister has not noticed it.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is the third item up. If the member wants —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: No, it is a footnote.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, the member told me it was the bottom line, so she did not look at it at all, did she? So she is not bothering to look at the pages.

The CHAIRMAN: Members! Minister!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: If the member wants to waste time arguing, that is up to her.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: We are wasting time asking the minister questions, I think.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, the member is not, and she is just making silly, stupid statements.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What is the answer for the member then?

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

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

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Sorry, I did not catch that; “wages clerks”, was it?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Was the last item wages clerks? I was not sure what the minister said.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, we have “wages” here; 43.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: “Wage clerks”—is that what the minister is calling them?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I presume they are; they are just other employees. They are employees who are simply on wages then, that is obviously what that means.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Are they separate from the civilian staff?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes; correct.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Can I have the same figures for 2012–13, please?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: For 2012–13 the estimated actual is: police officers, 5 679; police liaison officers—was APLO—15; police auxiliary officers, 174; police staff, 1 806; crossing guard traffic wardens, 125; and wages, 49, so it has gone up. What are classed as “wages” are mostly cleaners, I am told.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The point of the question, then, is the commitment of 150 police officers each year. What the minister is saying is that he is actually going to employ only another 68, not the 150 who were promised. When will those officers be employed, and are they going to be employed right at the end of the year? How far will the minister fall short of his 150 police officers a year promise?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Let me first of all say that the commitment was the same commitment that the opposition made prior to the election, which was 500 extra police officers over five years. We will maintain that commitment.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: So is the minister going to employ them all in the next year if the government is re-elected?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We will certainly keep our election commitment, I can assure the member.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Can the minister give some indication of the rate of employment of those additional 150 or 151 FTEs? It will clearly relate to the WA Police annual budget if they are taken on early in the financial year, or is one of the minister's savings to push them through and not employ them until the end of financial year?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is not intended; we have a recruitment campaign going on at present. We have had a recruitment campaign going on for some time. The member has probably seen the advertisements on the television; some of them were the same ones as when the member was minister, I think.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Can I take the minister's answer to mean that the recruitment campaign will run along at a fairly uniform and even rate?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is certainly our intention, yes.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: What is the anticipated extra cost of those 151 FTEs across the financial year?

[7.20 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Across the next financial year?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Yes.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member will have to put the question on notice; I will have to find out. It is a fairly detailed question and answer.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The point of the question is that if the minister is in any way serious about how he is going to make savings, he will have to not only make a lot of reductions, but also find all the wages, add-on costs and equipment for 151 extra full-time equivalents, which means that he will have to cut deeper into areas that he says are not front-line services. Had he not thought about that?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have already told the member that we are not going to cut front-line services at all, and we will maintain the commitment that we made going into the election.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister has obviously given no thought at all as to how he will actually make the savings, and he has to find an extra \$10 million, \$15 million or \$20 million for 151 extra staff in addition to the savings.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is the member's opinion.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister is not going to pay these extra people.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is certainly not my opinion; it is the member's opinion.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: What is?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What the member just said.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Does the minister think he will not have to pay them? My opinion is that the minister will have to pay them, and if it is averaged out, depending on whether the minister will have sworn officers, it will be close to —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member's opinion was that we were not going to keep our election commitment, and that we would not be able to both find the savings and take on the officers needed. That is the member's opinion. I am telling him that we will not cut front-line services and that we will retain and maintain our election commitment.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Everyone knows that the minister will not keep to his promise. My question is: where is he going to find the money to actually pay them? I thought he would be able to address that question. He has no idea. He is going to pick the money off trees to pay them.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is a good one.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I would have thought that, as the responsible minister, the minister would have some idea about where he will find the money.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We will find the money to pay our officers. Did the member ever go a year when he could not find money for his police officers when he was Minister for Police?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: No, because we increased expenditure on police by twice the amount the current government has.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Okay.

The CHAIRMAN: There was a suggestion about putting a question on notice or provision as supplementary information. Is the minister able to provide that information as supplementary information?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No. If the member wants to know, he can put the question on notice.

Mr M.J. COWPER: I refer to “Workforce challenges” on page 491. I am particularly interested in how the police service is going to deal with the increase in population and the large number of people coming into this state to work in the resources sector. I am interested to know how the strategic planning of the police force is going to deal with such things as a mobile workforce and the large number of people traversing borders, from overseas and from the eastern states, and the intelligence sharing arrangements it has with its colleagues elsewhere.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Does the member’s question relate to “Workforce challenges” on page 491?

Mr M.J. COWPER: Yes, and it goes further down into “Interagency collaboration”, “Advances in technology” and “Alcohol and Drugs”, so it is a compilation, if you like, of all those things and how police are going to deal with them. We have a very much evolving society, so we need to have an evolving and responsive police service to deal with that.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is it predominantly “Interagency collaboration” that the member is asking about?

Mr M.J. COWPER: It is about the workforce challenges. Policing is not going to stand still; our society is not standing still. We need to be ahead of the game. How are we going to deal with the large number of people coming across our borders? We will have 230 000-odd workers coming into Western Australia over the next seven years; 40 per cent will come from within Australia and the other 60 per cent will come from external sources. That will create challenges for all government departments, but particularly for policing. We have seen in the papers recently that various crime syndicates are targeting Western Australia because they see us as being cashed up. There is a whole range of challenges that we need to be on guard about.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member is quite right. WA Police really came to the fore with the challenges of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, for which I think the police did a fantastic job; there is no doubt about that. I have every confidence that they will maintain that professional and very decisive way that they behave and deal with problems. Interagency collaboration is obviously critical to the delivery of effective, efficient and targeted policing services. A joined-up, coordinated and collaborative government, both federal and state, and associated entities, are crucial for ensuring that positive outcomes are achieved for specific issues. The importance of collaborative relationships was reinforced, as I said, by the success of the CHOGM event. WA Police, federal agencies, Australasian policing jurisdictions, state government agencies and the private sector worked in partnership to ensure the security of the event. WA Police places great importance on forming, growing and managing collaborative relationships with national organisations, policing jurisdictions, justice sector agencies, emergency services and other state government agencies. I think the best thing about WA Police in being able to face the challenges of Western Australia’s economic success and the number of people who are coming to live here—I think it is 1 000 a month we are getting —

Mr M.J. COWPER: A thousand a week.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: A thousand a week are turning up on the doorstep in WA to live and work, and that is a challenge for any government, but I believe WA Police is geared up to be able to deal with that. We are obviously increasing the number of police as we go on, and we will continue to do that. Providing that we, as a government, are in a position to be able to fund WA Police in every way that it needs funding for front-line delivery of services, I am confident that those new individuals who come to WA will get the benefits of living in this beautiful state.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to footnote (a) halfway down page 490. It reads —

The Western Australia Police is currently reviewing its Outcomes Based Management (OBM) Structure and Key Performance Indicators. Amendments to the OBM structure will be reflected in the 2013–14 Budget Statements.

Can the minister advise what the revision of the OBM structure is, the review of the KPIs, and the impact of those?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I can say that WA Police is currently undertaking a review of outcomes-based management reporting. Any outcomes will be reflected in the 2013–14 *Budget Statements*. This process will better align WA Police’s external reporting structure with its internal reporting structure and will improve WA Police’s ability to capture the costs of services, which will enhance the process of decision making on the allocation of scarce resources to ensure alignment with the strategic direction of the agency and the government.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What does that actually mean, minister?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will ask Mr Hodges to elaborate on this one.

Mr S. Hodges: Currently we have seven services and they are broken down into intelligence, crime, community support and so on. We collect that information through an activity survey that goes out to police officers for two weeks a year, and from that we determine our budget. We are saying that that is probably not the right way to do this type of activity to better align our budget to what we actually do as a police service. We should not be looking at a two-week window; we should be looking at the whole year. So, we are looking at realigning our activities to what our cost centres are and where we actually spend the money. Does that make sense?

[7.30 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It makes more sense than what the minister said, but that is not a huge achievement!

I refer to page 491 of the *Budget Statements* and the heading “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency”. Part of the first dot point reads —

A key challenge is legislative reform, noting the time and resources required to establish and implement legislative change is significant.

Could I have some examples of where there has been a challenge in legislative reform or any challenges that are anticipated as part of this budget process, since it is mentioned in the *Budget Statements*, and whether those challenges are funded?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get the deputy commissioner to answer this question.

Mr C.J. Dawson: One legislative example would be the controlled operations legislation that would enable Western Australia to adopt a national model, which has been adopted in all other jurisdictions in Australia. It would allow us to conduct operations that may involve invoking some additional powers that have ordinarily been used by way of officers assuming identities, and being able to undertake controlled operations in covert areas primarily to interdict serious and organised crime. That legislation has been through the lower house, as members would be aware, and it is still in the upper house. That will require the drafting of regulations, and Western Australian police are keen to exercise those sorts of powers should both houses of Parliament complete that piece of legislation. It requires quite extensive procedural and oversight requirements given the specific requirements that the commissioner or his delegate would have to allow undercover officers to be involved or at the scene of serious and organised criminal activity. That is an example of where the legislative reform is both required and necessary because it is additional to what has fundamentally been a response to crime using what has often been very old legislation. This is a contemporary piece of legislation, which will require extensive training and systems to support it.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The first dot point notes that the resources required to establish and implement legislative change are significant. Mr Dawson has referred to the additional money that would be required for training and so forth if and when that legislation is passed. Is that funded as part of this budget?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, it is.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What is the amount required or where will I find that heading?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It will be absorbed under the general appropriations in relation to training and some information and communications technology development.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Appropriately, WA Police is treated differently, along with the Department of Health and the Department of Education, with respect to the management of the full-time equivalent growth, which has a ceiling, except for police. The budget papers state that growth will be allowed in police for —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What page is the member referring to?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I am looking at budget paper No 3, which gives the general policy that applies to police. It refers to growth only for operations staff in police. If we go through the people the minister has given me, clearly sworn officers would be operational—one hopes—so that growth would fit in with policy. Is the minister saying that all the auxiliaries are classified operational staff?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: A lot of them are doing custodial work at the lockup

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The point is that there are not a lot of them. If the minister is going to comply with the government's policy, additional FTEs can be employed only if they are operational staff. Are all the auxiliary officers operational staff?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get the commissioner to answer that.

Dr K.J. O'Callaghan: There is no one definition of the word "operational". The essential difference between the auxiliary officers and the fully trained police officers is that the auxiliary officers are not tactically trained, and they are trained for just one scenario. So for argument's sake, some auxiliary officers work in watch-houses, some are equipped to do escorts, and others work in forensics. Although we would probably class them all as operational, they are not tactically operational, and that is the main difference between the two.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I thank the commissioner for his answer. The *Budget Statements* also say that civilian staff will increase by 43; so are all civilian staff operational?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get the deputy commissioner to answer that.

Mr C.J. Dawson: Similarly to the commissioner's answer, when we do our allocations, it will depend on the job requirements. I will provide two examples. If they are employed as an analyst, they may be employed in our state intelligence portfolio or in a district criminal intelligence unit. In that sense, they would be performing operational duties but not exercising the power of a constable. They may accompany police to scenes of crime if they are required to do analytical work, but primarily they will be providing operational support. Another example will be at scenes of crime for forensic duties. We recently engaged additional staff in our forensic division. Again, these people are being attracted to WA Police. A lot of them have excellent tertiary qualifications but while they may not enjoy full powers, they will be deployed in operational settings so we can optimise our forensic services.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I thank the deputy commissioner for his answer. However, the point of the question was not that there is not an opportunity for civilian staff to be involved in operational matters—I know they will be—but are all the extra 43 staff going to be operational officers?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am informed that they are not allocated.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: But according to the government's policy, if they are not operational, additional FTEs cannot be employed. Is the minister not adhering to the government's policy?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Of course we are. We promised —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister does not know.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I do know. We promised 500 extra police officers over five years plus 200 civilians.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: If the minister listened he might be able to answer the question. The question does not relate to the growth; we have dealt with that. The question relates to the policy laid down by the Treasurer and the Premier that the government will not increase its FTEs in 2012–13 unless they are operational staff. The minister has told me that there is an extra 43 civilian staff. Is the minister saying that all 43 additional civilian staff are correctly classified as operational?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: They will be.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: What about the wage staff, which we were told are, in large part, cleaners? Are all those cleaners operational staff?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, they are not.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: So how does that fit in with the government's policy of employing six additional wage staff, some of whom are cleaners, if they are not operational staff, or is the minister thumbing his nose at the Treasurer's directive of no extra FTEs in 2012–13?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I certainly do not intend to thumb my nose at the Treasurer's directive, but I will have to find out where we stand as far as a few extra cleaners are concerned. If the member puts that question on notice, I will get him an answer.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is part of the budget! Surely the minister should take that as a supplementary question.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member can put it on notice.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I take it the minister is not actually interested in complying with his government's policy; either that or he does not understand it.

[7.40 pm]

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: I refer to page 489, the heading “Major Spending Changes”, and the item summer crime reduction strategy. Can the minister please outline what this funding provided for WA Police, and what the outcomes were, if known?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, certainly. In relation to the summer crime reduction strategy, which has been mentioned quite a bit in the media lately —

The CHAIRMAN: Hopefully we are not going to have a big long media statement. I need the answers to be shorter.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Do you want the answer or not, Mr Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I have to get in as many questions as possible. I am asking the minister to make it as short as possible.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will make it as short as I possibly can, Mr Chairman; I am known for my brevity. The summer crime reduction strategy was announced in December, and we committed funding for the summer period up until the end of April, so it was about a four-month period. That was done to specifically target mid-level drug dealers; improvised drug manufacturers—clan labs; pawn brokers and second-hand dealers; property crime; graffiti; antisocial behaviour; and violence in public places. The funding boost provided an extra 43 000 policing hours, which enabled police officers to dedicate additional time and effort to investigate specific crime types. Importantly, police were able to invest more time in tracking down drug dealers and manufacturers who have significant links to property crime. As a result, WA police arrested and summonsed more than 7 000 offenders, and seized drugs, weapons, cash and stolen property. It was a success, member, and it was well worth the investment, because in the six months leading up to November we had seen an increase in criminal activity of approximately eight per cent, which was of concern, and that is why the commissioner and I fully supported the strategy and decided that we needed to put some extra funds there in order to be able to pay a lot of overtime to specific officers to do all those jobs that I have outlined. As a result of that, we managed to reduce that eight per cent increase to roughly five per cent; the difference obviously is about three per cent. If the member was one of those people who was not burgled or did not have his car stolen or did not have his property graffitied and so on and so forth, obviously it was a very good thing for him. It worked, and with the number of arrests that were made, those people obviously have faced, and are facing, the courts, and my hope is that they serve a reasonable amount of time at Her Majesty’s pleasure and give the community a bit of respite.

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: Is the minister looking to do that again this year?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think it is something that will come up from time to time if we see a spike, as we did last year—and we will see a spike. We saw a spike, because the crime figure for the previous year was extremely low—extremely low—and we are very proud of that. As I said in Parliament last week, if we compare the last four years of the Labor Government with the first four years of the Liberal–National government, the Labor government was up here in crime, and the Liberal government is trending down, which is good news. My colleagues opposite do not like my saying this, but they know it is a fact that crime was almost unabated under them. We have dealt with that since we have been in government, and certainly we deal with criminals in a very harsh way, with our legislative program, and with the number of criminals who were put away, and of course I was very grateful to the Prisoners Review Board for not letting out some of those people who are recidivist offenders, and I think that is why we saw quite a big decrease in our first two or three years in government. We get a spike every now and again, but we will deal with it.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further to that, I note on page 489 that the \$3 million for the summer crime strategy is not being repeated next year. Can I ask why?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Because, as I said to the member, we might do it earlier, or we might do it later. We will only do it as and when we feel there is a need to do it. It was successful.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Where is the money to do it? The money is not there. There is no money on the actual budget page, page 489. The \$3 million has gone.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is the \$3 million that we spent in this year. That did not show up in last year’s budget papers as a specific item, as the member would be aware. But I can assure the member that if we need to increase some funding at any time to deal with a spike in crime, we will do that. We are committed to trying to keep crime down and deal with criminals in the way they should be dealt with. We will support our police every time in the very difficult job that they do in dealing with some of the worse scum in society.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to page 492 and the second outcome on that page, offenders apprehended and dealt with in accordance with the law. The first line is sanction rate for offences against the person, and the third line is sanction rate for drug trafficking offences. I refer also to the second note at page 493, in which the attribution

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

for what is not only a significant drop from the budget target in 2011–12, but also a significant drop from the previous 2010–11 fiscal year actual achievement, is stated as being due to changes to the Evidence Act 1906, the Criminal Investigation Act 2006, and other legislation enhancing transparency and accountability that increased the time required for police to complete investigations. That is why it is claimed that there was a lower sanction rate for both offences against the person and drug trafficking offences. Could there not be some other explanation for both those failures to achieve the target, and for actually getting worse outcomes, not only for the target but also for the previous year? Could there not be another justification?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will find out for the member. The commissioner will answer that.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: I think the issue here is that whenever we load compliance onto the police, there is a time cost to it. Just to give the member a broad idea of how this works, about four or five years ago, we did a review of how much extra compliance had been loaded onto the police in the previous decade and how that translated to an impact on front-line policing, and it loosely translated to about 28 minutes per officer per day. So, if we change the Evidence Act and if we change the disclosure legislation—if we add any level of compliance to new legislation—it has a cost. When we look at the trend over the years, these pieces of legislation that have compliance with them, the Evidence Act being one, have contributed to the fact that the police cannot process as quickly, but the quality increases. So there is always this balance to be had between the quality of policing and the quantity of policing.

Mr P. PAPALIA: As a follow-up, through the minister, conceding that, how robust was the analysis process to exclude any other potential cause; for instance, saying that we did not achieve as well as we had hoped to achieve? Are we absolutely certain that all of the worse outcome can be attributed to the additional legislative change?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: One of the difficulties is that policing is not an exact science; there are so many factors that can impact on policing and its outcomes, including a lot of social factors that are beyond the control of the police. The member would have noticed that I have been talking a lot in recent times about the impact of juvenile crime and how juvenile crime is driving up, particularly, property crime rates. That will not be fixed by police action alone, and that is a trend that is starting to occur and recur. So there are other things impacting on this that are outside of the control of police, but they are things the broader government has to address in the longer term.

Mr P. PAPALIA: As a final follow-up, how then did we determine targets for this budget year as being so much higher again? Are we just setting them as what we failed to achieve last year? Is there any science to that particular target setting?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: In terms of the target setting, I will ask Shaun to answer that.

Mr S. Hodges: With target setting, we like to go to stretched targets to try and make sure that we actually can achieve them. One of the things I would say in relation to target setting, and as the commissioner has quite rightly said, is that what we have seen is a reduction in the sanction rate as a result of some of the changes that have been brought in. But we have seen an increase in the quality—for instance, the guilty pleas before trial have gone up—and that is what we would hope to see; if we are providing a better quality investigation, we would hope that an offender pleads guilty prior to trial. Again, even at trial, we have seen that there has been an increase in guilty verdicts as a result of what we believe is the quality of investigations.

[7.50 pm]

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I refer to the first dot point on page 500 regarding the planned Cockburn Central police station regional hub. As the minister knows, this was an election commitment made by the Labor Party in 2001 and 2005. It gives me some great personal satisfaction that my election commitment in 2008 to build a police station at Cockburn Central has been fulfilled. Better still, it is now a regional police hub. Can the minister give us more information on that project, such as how big will it be, how many staff are expected to be employed and what will be the benefits to the community?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: The Cockburn district hub will accommodate 120 staff, which will include general duties officers and other key support services. Some of the support services that are located at the old Fremantle Police Station will be relocated at the Cockburn hub. That is not to say that Fremantle Police Station will close from an operational perspective, but the support services such as traffic will move to the Cockburn hub. A suitable site with an area of 3 003 metres has been identified in the Cockburn Central town precinct, which, as the member knows, is in close proximity to Mandurah freeway and the Mandurah railway line. The project is currently at the project definition phase whereby service delivery objectives and functional requirements of the new asset have been identified. It is anticipated that the project will be ready for tender in the last quarter of 2012, with construction commencing in early 2013. The Cockburn Central district hub project planning expenditures in 2012–13 are \$2.4 million for investing activities and the estimated overall cost is \$24.93 million.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: In line with the issues in Armadale and the police station hub in Cannington, does the minister anticipate that the Cockburn hub will pick up some of the Armadale area to help with the problems in Armadale?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: No. There is no suggestion that the Cockburn hub will service what is currently part of the south east metropolitan district. I said at the recent Armadale forum that there is some discussion about whether Armadale itself will become a hub in the future because it is such a rapidly growing area and the south east metro district is a long district extending from the Causeway around the Burswood Casino almost to Byford. It has a very large population and there is no doubt that eventually it will have to be split for management purposes.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I want the minister to clarify a couple of matters regarding district allowances under “Major Spending Changes” on page 489. The first matter is that the estimated actual for the district allowance this year was \$5.822 million and the budget estimate for next year goes up to \$6.037 million. I would like to know whether that is just for increases in the amount of district allowance payable for existing officers or whether additional officers are being allocated to country regions; and, if so, how many?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am told that it is based on the existing FTEs.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Are zero extra officers being sent to country regions to be accommodated on a permanent basis in 2012–13?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No. I am informed that the commissioner and the deputy commissioner are yet to do the allocation. Of course officers will be sent to country areas throughout the next financial year.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: How much of this money is for that purpose?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: They are fighting over who will answer it. Mr Dawson.

Mr C.J. Dawson: In general, the salary appropriations are calculated based on an average. That incorporates accommodation costs for additional officers who may be stationed at a regional centre, be it Karratha or some other locality, the equipment they are issued with and any ICT computers or fleet increase. Where we may notionally put in an additional five officers, we may increase the fleet, but that is built into the overall recruitment appropriation. Those additional matters, including allowances, are calculated as part of the overall appropriation when new officers are recruited.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Through the minister—perhaps to Mr Dawson—there is a set number of officers in the country regions that are currently paid an allowance. If just those officers were paid an allowance in the next financial year, how much would that cost? How much would the entitlements cost in the next financial year if they were paid for the exact number of officers who are currently there?

Mr C.J. Dawson: I cannot give the member a definitive response because the officers in the Pilbara, for instance, are forwarded an additional allowance because of the zoning and tax thresholds, whereas in the great southern they receive a different allowance. It would be proportionate, depending on what locality they are sent to. Recently I visited a number of country regions and the officers in some districts asked why they are not receiving the same allowances as officers in other regions. We are not always able to do it. They are proportionally increased because of the cost of living and tax thresholds et cetera. In the example I have used, the officers in the Pilbara receive a district allowance of approximately \$16 000 per annum, whereas officers in another district receive a smaller allowance.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What would an officer stationed in the Eucla or the wheatbelt get compared with an officer in Karratha who receives \$16 000?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The deputy commissioner tells me that we do not have that information with us tonight.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I ask for that as supplementary information?

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the minister to detail the exact supplementary information he will provide.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member wants to know what additional allowances will be paid to police officers who are stationed in the Eucla and—what was the other place?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I would like to know what the allowance is for a police officer based in the Eucla or a representative stationed in the wheatbelt in comparison with Karratha.

[Supplementary Information No B14.]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have a further question about these changes. I refer to “Hoon and No Motor Driver’s License Suspension” on page 489 under “Major Spending Changes”. In 2011–12 that amount allocated is

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

\$6.560 million, in 2012–13 it goes down to just \$5.560 million and then it tapers off to half of what it was in 2011–12, down to \$3.560 million. I seek an explanation of that reduced funding allocation.

[8.00 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I can tell the member that in relation to the legislation to reduce the incidence of hooning and remove unlicensed drivers off the roads, the objective of seizing vehicles is to immediately remove the opportunity for reoffending following the commission of serious driving offences. I think we are talking about the fact that the hoon and no motor driver's licence suspension initiative was fairly successful to start with. The member may remember that it was the colleague sitting next to her who brought in the no driver's licence suspension initiative in relation to the impounding of those vehicles, but the former government never put any money in the budget for it and we have been playing catch-up ever since. It costs the state money to impound and store those hoon vehicles or vehicles for which the driver does not have a driving licence, and some are never collected. We are working on some possibilities for reducing that cost to the state, because it takes a long time for the vehicles to be auctioned or taken out of storage. I may at some stage bring into Parliament legislation that will attempt to reduce the amount of time it takes to transfer legal ownership of vehicles to the police from the current owners so that the police can dispose of them. The member is probably aware that people can sign a new form that transfers ownership of the vehicle from them to police. That gives the police the authority to take the vehicle out of the storage yards where they are kept and to auction them off and try to retrieve whatever money they can from them. The reference to the figures going down indicates the intention to bring in legislation that will make life easier for police to take those vehicles out of storage.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: For clarification, can I ask how many cars were impounded in 2011–12 and whether the minister expects the number of cars impounded to reduce or increase?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The number of vehicles impounded per month in 2010 was 846; in 2011, 805; and 2012 to date, 752. So there has been a slight reduction in 2012 to date. At the end of April 2012 there were 574 uncollected vehicles in paid storage. The number stored for 56 days was 149 in the metropolitan area and 129 in regional areas. The number stored between 56 and 90 days was none in the metropolitan area and 136 in regional areas. Quite a few vehicles, therefore, are not picked up. Approximately 15 to 20 per cent of impounded vehicles were uncollected and subsequently auctioned. Typically these vehicles are of low value and in the vast majority of cases the auction proceeds are insufficient to cover the cost of towage, storage and sale. Based on 150 uncollected vehicles a month and a potential shortfall of debt write-off averaging \$2 000, this translates to an estimated annual loss in the order of \$3.6 million. It is therefore an expensive exercise. It is a very worthy exercise, as we are getting those vehicles, many of which are not roadworthy, off the roads and we are getting the drivers off the roads.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Chairman, can I return to my original question? How is the figure going down from \$5.5 million to \$3.5 million?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There are two reasons. One is that we are seeing the trend of the number of unlicensed vehicles taken off the roads going down anyway. The member will find the number of hoon offences has been going down over the past three years. Also we want to reduce the costs involved, and I am looking at bringing in legislation that will enable police to dispose of vehicles a lot quicker than they are able to by law at the moment. Under the existing law, getting ownership transferred from the person who was responsible for having the car impounded by police in the first place and then for police to send them to the auction rooms is a long and drawn-out process. In my view it takes far too long. If somebody has no intention of collecting their vehicle, we need to urge them to sign it off as quickly as possible so that we can get the vehicle out of the storage facility. The member must bear in mind that although these vehicles are being stored, at the moment it is at a cost to police. The police will always try to get the money back from the offenders who have caused the vehicle to be put in there in the first place, but getting that money back from those people is a long and winding road. Ultimately, therefore, the police will auction off the vehicles but they still may not get back the full cost.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: My question goes to the road trauma trust account referred to on page 489. The 2011–12 estimated actual shows a dash indicating zero. That is a bit semantic, as we know there is money in 2011–12, even if it is only for the strategic targeted enforcement program. The first part of my question is: can the minister tell me how much money the police received for STEP or for other programs in 2011–12 from the road trauma trust fund, as it was then called—but clearly the money is coming from the same sources?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The road trauma trust —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I am putting “fund” and “account” together. I do not want to play with the different names, whether it is the road trauma trust fund or the road trauma trust account.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is the same thing.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Yes; as long as we agree.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, it is the same thing. The actual legal term is the “road trauma trust account”. Many people have called it the trust fund for years. But it is not actually; it is the trust account, as the member would be aware. The government provided additional funding of \$22.7 million over the period —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I am sorry, minister, that is not the question I asked.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What was the question then?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The question is: set out along that line is the amount of money coming to police as a major spending change from the road trauma trust account. The 2011–12 shows a dash, indicating no entry at all. I am saying that it is my belief there was money that came in in 2011–12 because the STEP program has been funded almost every year, and there may be others. I am asking: how much actually came from the road trauma trust account in 2011–12 to the police?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have just been told the amount; it is \$2.2 million in 2011–12.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I now come to the next item along.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this a further question, member for Balcatta?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Yes; thank you. The 2012–13 budget estimate is \$5.2 million. I would like a breakdown of that \$5.2 million, please.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There is \$4 million to increase breath and drug testing and \$900 000 for drug testing machines. An advanced traffic management vehicle, which is the vehicle —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Is it possible to have an amount for each item for the year 2012–13? I have already written down the list of things the minister put in his press release. I want to know which figure should be recorded next to them out of the \$5.2 million.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am giving the member the amount that makes up the total of \$5.2 million.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Yes, but I am asking for the subtotal against each heading, please. How much for the concept car; how much for the concept bikes; how much for additional road enforcement; how much for drug testing and breath testing; how much for the drug testing machines; and how much for any other item that adds up to \$5.2 million?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is what I am giving the member now. I will go through them again.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Yes, please.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: For increased breath and drug testing there is \$4 million; for drug testing machines, \$0.9 million; for an advanced traffic management vehicle, \$0.2 million; and for the strategic traffic enforcement project—STEP—\$100 000. That comes to a total of \$5.2 million.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: And the concept bike, or is that not being purchased in the 2012–13 financial year?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am told that is inside the \$0.2 million for the advanced traffic management vehicle.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I thank the minister. Then we go to 2013–14.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that a further question, member for Balcatta?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Yes, please, Chair. I would like to know about the growth in 2013–14 and beyond. Where is that going? Is it across all of them or any specific part of them?

[8.10 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes. For 2013–14 I think there is \$4.5 million under increased breath and drug testing; drug testing machines \$0.6 million; advanced traffic management vehicle, \$0.2 million again; traffic enforcement program, \$0.2 million, which comes to \$5.5 million.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Thank you. Are the police buying the concept car and is the fit-out being paid for out of the road trauma trust account?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Correct; the vehicles are standard patrol vehicles and, as the member knows, the police purchase hundreds of them. The road trauma trust account is paying for the enhancements to turn them into concept vehicles; in other words, it will put all the high-tech equipment inside them, such as the cameras and all the communications equipment, which will enable them to become concept cars.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I assume the largest part of the actual purchase of the concept car will come out of police capital expenditure. Is that part of the normal vehicle replacement or is there additional capital to cover that?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is part of the normal replacement program. The member may want to ask me some more questions about some of these issues when we get to road safety tonight.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Sure, but in terms of the police expenditure on page 489, are there any other programs in addition to the \$5.214 million that are likely to be funded out of the road trauma trust account?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get Gary Lord to provide additional information in relation to this because it is quite an important subject.

Mr G. Lord: I have just referred to the advanced traffic management vehicle. We will fit 48 out of the amount, and that is reflected on page 501. You will find the motorcycles for trial under there as well.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I am aware of that; it goes to my next question. On page 501 there is \$80 000 for the motorcycles and \$3.293 million for the vehicles. Is that part of the normal expenditure for vehicle replacement brought forward because they will be purchased in the 2012–13 year? Is that what you are saying?

Mr G. Lord: The vehicles themselves are leased. We continue to lease them, so that particular amount is for the actual fit-out. That is the technology component as well as what goes on the vehicles from a mechanical point.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is coming from the RTTA. The \$3.293 million on page 501 and the \$80 000 will come from the RTTA for the fit-outs—technology, cameras, computer systems that give immediate voice recognition of stolen vehicles, unlicensed drivers et cetera—on what will be the 48 concept vehicles.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I understand the car, from the minister's media release, but that is not the point of the question. The minister has now confused me. Can we go back over what he has told me? On page 489 there is \$5.2 million from the road trauma trust account. I asked the minister where that money was going. He gave me a breakdown, which came to \$5.2 million. There was only \$0.2 million for the concept car. I also asked whether there was any other funding and he said no. Now he is telling me, on page 501, that there is another \$3.3 million out of the road trauma trust account. It does not add up. Perhaps it is just my misunderstanding. Can the minister clarify that please?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am informed that the \$0.2 million is recurrent funding, whereas the \$3.293 million comes under capital; it is assets.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Is it coming from the road trauma trust account?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Correct.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Can we get a designation of all the particular sub-items that police are funding with money from the RTTA? The minister has given me the \$5.2 million.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member might need to ask me that when we get to road safety.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I am only interested in the police budget.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, but the road trauma trust account funds certain areas of police and I can give the member a much clearer overview.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I am seeking a list of that, please.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I can give the member that once we get to road safety.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: No, because they do not cover the police budget. We are here on Police.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: They cover the police budget in relation to the RTTA, member. He knows that and I know that.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: This is about the police budget; it is listed here in this budget. It is ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, member for Midland.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is funds that come from the RTTA; the member for Balcatta will know better than the member for Midland, obviously because he is much brighter than she is. Quite frankly, I can provide a much clearer picture when we get to road safety because I can tell members exactly how much from the road trauma trust account will go into police and whether it is being used for recurrent expenditure or capital expenditure.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister is saying that, as police minister, he cannot tell us how much money his police portfolio is getting.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes; I am telling the member that it is getting \$3.293 million for the advanced traffic management vehicle project and \$80 000 for the advanced traffic management trial —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: From the road trauma trust account?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes. Obviously, in relation to page 489 that —

Mr G. Lord: The one on page 489 is recurrent and this would be related to ongoing fees et cetera that are associated with the vehicles when they are in commission. I imagine that that would be the case for the vehicle costs in particular. The technology component has ongoing maintenance costs associated with it.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Are any other items in the minister's police portfolio budget being met from the road trauma trust account?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The STEP funding.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister has already covered that.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There are some other areas but I cannot give the member that information until we get to road safety.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Is the minister saying that, as police minister, he cannot give me what is coming out of the police budget?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I can give the member all the detail he wants to know once we get into the next division because I will have my advisers here who have all the details with them.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Police must think it is lovely that the minister is pouring money into their pockets and they do not even know how much is there.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: They do love me; they think I am a very good minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, members.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Why can the minister not tell us?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: They think I am a very supportive minister.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Why can he not tell us how much money is in this budget before us?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will tell the member that in the fullness of time when we get to the other division.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: This is estimates, where the minister is supposed to be accountable and explain the money that is being expended from the police budget. We have a line item that shows that money is being spent from the road trauma trust account and the minister is saying that he cannot answer it.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: One question at a time and let him answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, member for Jandakot.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have answered it; I have told the member what is coming via capital and what is coming via recurrent. If he does not like the answer —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister just said there is other expenditure and he cannot tell us.

[8.20 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member for Balcatta can shout as much as he likes but I have given him my answer. If he wants me to elaborate on the road trauma trust account, I am happy to do that when we get into the other section.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have a point of order, Madam Chair. The minister has said that on page 489 there is a total amount for the road trauma trust account of \$5.214 million. He has further referred to page 501 and pointed to the figures of \$80 000 and \$3.293 million. He has then said that there are other moneys coming into the police budget from the road trauma trust account but he will not detail what those other moneys are. If the minister cannot answer that tonight, could he provide it by way of supplementary information?

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, do you have that information or do you wish to provide it via supplementary information?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have tried to be as helpful as I can —

Mr P. PAPALIA: When did you do that?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What did you say?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Don't worry.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: The member is being his normal funny self!

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, would you please provide the answer?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will certainly do my best, Madam Chair. The information I have been given is that in the 2012–13 budget—this is RTTA-funded programs; I will read out the whole lot—the allocation for increased breath and drug testing is \$4 million. We have done that one already. There is also the expansion of drug-testing capabilities, \$0.9 million; advanced traffic management concept car, recurrent, \$0.2 million; advanced traffic management vehicle project, capital, \$3.3 million; advanced traffic management motorcycle trial, capital, \$0.1 million; strategic traffic enforcement project—STEP—\$2.2 million; and enhanced speed enforcement administration costs, \$7.1 million. That is a total of \$17.8 million.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister is saying that the figure on page 489 of \$5.2 million from the road trauma trust account is totally misleading and in fact it is \$17.8 million.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, I am not saying it is totally misleading.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: It is \$17.8 million, if we put in both recurrent and capital.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: If we look at recurrent and capital, certainly, yes.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Thank you. It is like extracting teeth!

On page 501, the cost of the concept car is \$3.293 million, which the minister has now explained to us through his officers is not for the cost of the vehicle, which is leased, but is simply for the fit-out of all the fancy equipment. Am I right in assuming that the fit-out costs are nearly \$70 000 per vehicle?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am told “Yes”.

Mr M.J. COWPER: I refer to the efficiency indicators under “7: Traffic Law Enforcement and Management” on page 499. The net cost of service in 2011–12 is \$196 million. It goes up about \$10 million in 2012–13. The line item “Employees (Full Time Equivalents)” goes from 1 483 to 1 578—a difference of 95 additional FTEs. There is a note down the bottom that states —

1. Significant increases in the 2012-13 Budget Target is attributable to Road Trauma Trust Account funding.

Can the minister please give an indication of what that extra \$10 million will target and where these 95 additional FTEs are coming from? Will they be found within the service or recruited during that period?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get the commissioner to answer that.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: I think the member has to understand, as he would, that in policing there needs to be a fluctuation of FTEs so that they can be moved from one role to another. Where there are variations in the number of FTEs dedicated to a certain output will very much depend on what else is going on in police at the time—for argument’s sake, whether they have been sent to another part of the state to do some work. Those fluctuations occur from time to time. They are not significant fluctuations but they are there nonetheless. That is the nature of policing. It needs to be flexible in that way.

Mr M.J. COWPER: I understand that fluctuations may be 10 or 20, but here we are talking about nearly 100 officers—95 in fact. Will they be found within the service or will they be recruited?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: They are from within the service.

Mr M.J. COWPER: Potentially will they come from all aspects across the board?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: Yes.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to the efficiency indicator of “Average Time Taken to Respond to Urgent Calls for Police Assistance in the Metropolitan Area” on page 497. What is the span across which those average times are arrived at? What are the longest and shortest times that result in those average response times? It is separated into two types—there are priority 1–2 calls and priority 3 calls. The figures in 2010–11 would be the actual figures. Can the minister provide any other indication of the worst and best response times across the metro area to arrive at those averages?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get Shaun to answer that one.

Mr S. Hodges: I do not have an exact figure on me today. Basically it works like a bell curve. Some urgent calls we get to within a minute or less, and some would be about an hour. Ninety-five per cent would be from one minute to an hour for priority 3 calls. The priority 1 calls would be a lot less. I do not have the actual figures on me today.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Relating it to end note (l) and the acknowledgement that the outer metropolitan growth areas can be hard and will probably receive longer response times on quite a few occasions, how useful is the average?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

I know police have to measure something, but putting an average across the metropolitan area will be skewed by the inner city, close to police station-type responses, would it not?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get Shaun to answer that.

Mr S. Hodges: We have geospatial information systems. We try to map that information. We look at arterial roads and so on. We try to take an average across the metropolitan area to give us that picture. That is what that picture is taken on—it is an average across the metropolitan area. As I say, it takes into account road systems, times of day and so on. We have picked an average within the metropolitan area. If the metropolitan area was to expand, or road systems were to expand, again we would look at that information and alter the target.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get the deputy commissioner to add to that answer.

Mr C.J. Dawson: In addition to what the member already cited, the inner city generally has, for instance, a central metropolitan district that covers the Perth CBD. For many years quite a proportionately lower amount of time has been required to attend all priority jobs simply because of the geographic stretch. I will use the example of the member's own area, the Peel district. When we are deploying staff to travel from Mandurah, south Dawesville or across to Mundijong, the geographic stretch will mean that the same priority jobs simply take longer to get to. The districts are not uniform by way of geography, as the commissioner indicated in one of his previous responses. To try to put an average out is not an exact science, but we try to put in other factors, as my colleague just spoke to, such as what road systems are available and the nature of the job. It is very much dominated by the geographic spread.

[8.30 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think the commissioner might also want to add something.

Dr K.J. O'Callaghan: As I have pointed out before and the other day, we also have to think that the deployment of police officers, particularly in outer metropolitan areas, is not simply always from police stations. It is not as though they are being dispatched from the police station to a place further out. Often we are using the regional operations group, and when we know, for argument's sake, that on a Friday or Saturday night there is a high likelihood of demand and we think the local police might be under pressure, we will supplement those local police with the regional operations group—the tactical enforcement group. The dispatching of police vehicles is not station-centric, it is vehicle-centric. It will depend on the closest unit.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is it possible for the minister to provide a district-by-district average of the fastest and longest parameters of the bell curve for the response times in each district?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We can do that as a supplementary.

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, could you just confirm what you will be providing?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes. Do you want to ask the member exactly what he wants?

Mr P. PAPALIA: For each district, would the minister please be able to provide priority 1 and 2 as one set of figures, and priority 3 as another set of figures?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We can do that for the metropolitan area only, I should say.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Just for the metropolitan area?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes.

Mr P. PAPALIA: For each of those districts in the metropolitan area, the average, but also the best and worst, response times of the bell.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Okay, we can get those.

[*Supplementary Information No B15.*]

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: My question refers to the line item of "Perth Police Complex" on page 500 of budget paper No 2. Could the minister update the house on the progress of that project and when it will be completed?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is a very opportune time to ask this question, because I was down there this morning with my hard hat on, having a good look around, and, yes, the work is coming on very well indeed. The information I have that I can share with the member is that the tender for the complex was awarded in August 2010. It is anticipated that practical completion is expected to occur by March 2013—we are hoping it might be a little earlier, of course. The project remains within the allocated budget of \$93.27 million, of which \$87.6 million was funded through the asset investment program, with the remaining \$5.6 million funded through service delivery appropriation. My notes state that the proposed 24-hour Perth police complex consists of the Perth watch-house, Magistrates Court, and the Perth police centre, which comprises Perth police station and the

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

central metropolitan district office. The project intends to co-locate the previously fragmented units into a state-of-the-art building that will also address the shortcomings of the existing Perth watch-house. The new complex will have a gross floor area of 17 090 square metres; it is a four-storey building over a single-level basement. The facility will support front-line best-practice policing to meet the current and future needs of the Perth central business district and the Northbridge community, and it has been designed to accommodate 497 police officers and police staff. Perth watch-house will provide overnight—up to 48 hours—detention for 72 persons in custody who cannot be bailed and are awaiting an initial court appearance, or short-term accommodation for 40 drop-and-go detainees. The single Magistrates Court part of the complex will operate six days a week, so I think that will certainly help out in the CBD and Northbridge area.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Page 495 of budget paper No 2 deals with the matter of 131 444 calls. How many 131 444 calls are there in each financial year; and how many of those calls, in terms of a real number, are abandoned?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Which year did the member want to know—in each financial year?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: For the completed financial year.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Or the minister can give me month by month. What figures has the minister got?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There were 688 000 calls to 131 444.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: And how many were abandoned?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The abandoned rate is about 7.5 per cent; I have not got the actual number. I am sure the member is good at maths, or her colleague next to her, the member for Balcatta, is very good at maths and he can work it out for her.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is all right; I can actually use a calculator myself. I have a further question on the same topic. Was a review or audit of the call centre undertaken by an outside company in recent times; and, if so, by which company and at what cost?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The deputy commissioner can give the member the accurate details on that. It was six months ago.

Mr C.J. Dawson: There was an independent review commissioned. My best recall is that Deloitte was engaged to provide some recommendations as a result of that; those recommendations are still under review. I do not have the actual amount, it was not awarded under my portfolio, but we could provide supplementary information about how much that consultancy was paid.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Would the minister be able to provide me with a copy of that review?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That might be possible. Can I get back to the member on that one? If we can sort it and it does not have any cabinet confidentiality implications for cabinet funding or whatever, then certainly I do not have a problem.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I ask the minister when he is likely to be able to get back to me on that?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I need to talk to Greg Italiano, who is away at the moment. I think he was pretty much in charge of organising all of that. I would hope to get back to the member by the time Parliament resumes.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I thank the minister.

I notice that Deputy Commissioner Dawson said that the recommendations of the review are still under consideration. Have any of the recommendations thus far been implemented?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Once again, I will probably have to get back to the member on that one as well. I need to get some detail for the member.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Would that be able to be provided by way of supplementary information?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think I would prefer the member to put that on notice or to simply rely on me to give her the detail as soon as I get it.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I will give relying on the minister a go—how is that?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That will make a change.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: On pages 500 and 501 of budget paper No 2, among “Works in Progress” and “New Works”, money has been allocated for information and communications technology, which is clearly very welcome and important. I am not going to the actual quanta, but which major ICT projects will be funded in 2012-13 and 2013-14?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

[8.40 pm]

Mr C. Ward: The funding for ICT is split into two components. One is around infrastructure replacement and continuity, which is replacing some end-of-life equipment, allowing us better disaster recovery, and some failover towards some facilities in Midland to allow us to get out of the ageing structures we have in police headquarters. That is an ongoing process, and we are applying our funding towards making sure we have some solid backbone to allow us to continue with our infrastructure going forward. The other part of the funding is around our core business systems, and that allows us to bring forward matters such as the investigative case management system; forwarding some matters arising out of the covert investigative powers legislation; and looking at some legislation around driver's licence disqualification by notice and criminal penalty infringement notices.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Is the work required to get your firearms licensing system up and running on the list; and, if so, how far out is that?

Mr C. Ward: The firearms licensing system funding was looked at in consolidation with our licensing and infringement management process, whereby we were looking at replacing some of the firearms matters along with applying a non-traffic infringement management solution to allow us to progress the criminal penalty infringement notices. The firearms licensing area, which has been under new management since February 2012, has done a lot of business process re-engineering and has looked at the way procedures and processes happened within firearms licensing. The conclusion it has reached is that the current system is actually suitable and fit for purpose, depending on a number of enhancements that have now been made. Funding for that has now been drawn towards the achievement of a non-traffic infringement management solution. As it is at the minute, the business process re-engineering that was undertaken by the licensing enforcement division has actually managed to achieve a great number of efficiencies around firearms licensing processes, whereby the current firearm licensing system is now seen as a suitable, fit-for-purpose application to get us through this immediate period.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: We actually had an Auditor General's report that revealed the firearms licensing system, particularly part of the IT, to be a disaster. There were 10 000 people with unlicensed firearms who did not know about it, and the Minister for Police actually had to give them an amnesty. I am not convinced that the answer the minister's officer has given will give people any confidence that we are not going to have another major disaster in firearms licensing in this state. I am wondering whether the minister can have a look at it and give us an assurance, by way of supplementary information, that he is confident that we do not have another disaster brewing in our firearms licensing system.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have said before that there were some dreadful problems in the firearms licensing section. There were; there is no question about that, but since then, as the member has heard from Craig Ward, there has been a change of management within the firearms licensing area. A lot of money has been spent on bringing IT up to date, and the latest information I have received is that we appear to have got over that hump of problems, and the length of time it takes for people to have their licences turned around is now very reasonable, in general terms, compared with the situation in the rest of Australia.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The minister said a lot of money had been spent on bringing IT up to the required standard for the firearms licensing system. Can we have the amount of money it actually cost? What was spent on re-establishing or upgrading the firearms licensing system, particularly the IT that controls it?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We do not have that figure with us tonight.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Can I have it through supplementary information, then?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We will certainly supply that through supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: The supplementary information is that the minister will provide —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: In relation to the funding that —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The money that has been spent in the last year or so on actually upgrading the firearms licensing system, particularly the ICT.

The CHAIRMAN: Can I clarify that that is for the last year, rather than the "last year or so"? That is just a bit vague.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Just for the last year.

[*Supplementary Information No B16.*]

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to the second dot point on page 491, under "Significant Issues Impacting the Agency". Reference is made to increases in demand for services, and, in the last sentence, a new regional prison and

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

detention centre requiring increased policing effort. Assuming that the prison is in Derby, and the detention centre is in Northam, what additional policing services are required and where have they been provided?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: As the member quite rightly said, one is the Derby prison facility. There are two centres; the Curtin detention centre and the Leonora alternative place of detention are now operating, with a third, the Northam detention centre, to open in the near future. I think that is pretty close now. The increasing number of centres and the proposed populations, particularly at Curtin, and the soon-to-be-opened centre at Northam pose major challenges for WA Police. These are the demands for service.

Mr P. PAPALIA: But the sentence refers to “a” detention centre, not centres, and Curtin and Leonora are already operating. I assume it is Northam that is referred to on page 491. What additional policing effort is required for Northam?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: The issue of the Northam detention centre, as far as risk activity goes, is quite low, so we are not expecting a significant problem with the detention centre itself. One of the things we have done, not only for Northam but also for Curtin and Leonora, is to train a number of people to be able to respond quickly if need be. There are local tactical response teams that can deal with those issues. There is one in Broome, one in Kalgoorlie and we can get to Northam quite quickly. With our own air support, we can get crews up there if we need to, so we are not planning to physically increase the size of Derby Police Station or Northam Police Station to cope with the detention centre expansion or establishment. What we are doing is training people to be able to respond if they need to, but the risk is quite low.

Mr P. PAPALIA: So those centres are not really creating any additional burden beyond plans for deployment of current assets?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: I guess it is a pressure because it is something new, something that we have to take into account and something that we have to develop a risk profile around; we cannot simply ignore the fact that they are there. There is some consideration about training and thinking about how we respond, and having plans in place to respond to those facilities. But it is not a physical demand to put more and more police officers in either Northam or Derby at this time.

Mr P. PAPALIA: In the course of analysing the potential risks associated with the new facility, was it considered whether we should approach the federal government for additional funds to meet any additional capacity requirements?

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: Yes, there has been some discussion with the federal government on providing some funds; those discussions are not yet concluded. I also point out that one of the biggest pressures for us in the Kimberley will not necessarily be the detention centre, but the opening of the regional prison, because it will bring with it a range of people who will come into town and who would not otherwise be there; they will be visiting relatives who will not have accommodation, and that will create pressures for the police in Derby—probably a lot more than detention centre facilities will.

[8.50 pm]

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: My question relates to page 500 of the *Budget Statements* and “Works in Progress” with the public sex offenders register. Can the minister please outline what the public sex offender register is about and the benefit it will provide to the community?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The public sex offender register is currently being developed and work has commenced on the computerisation and the program itself. It is expected to be available to the public by 1 October. I was there a couple of weeks ago to see how it is progressing, and tier 1 is ready and up and running. However, that tier to me is not the most important one; tier 3 is the most important facility for concerned parents and guardians in relation to sex offenders who may or may not be living nearby or having unsupervised access to children. Tier 3 is the most important, followed by tier 2 and tier 1. Tier 2 and tier 3 are taking a little longer to progress because in relation to tier 2, under the legislation, the commissioner has to identify and communicate with those sex offenders who are living in certain locations and who are identified as being available, if you like, to go on the register that the public can access. The commissioner has to inform them that they are likely to go on the register, and if they do not like the idea—they may not—they have to appeal to the commissioner and give reasons why they should not go on the register. At the end of the day, it is the police commissioner’s decision whether they go on there, but the intention is that unless they have a very good reason that it would be in the public interest not to go on there, then they will go on there. They have 21 days to respond from the time the commissioner gets in touch with them. That is the length of time with tier 2. Tier 3 information will be available from 1 October this year. There was some talk that it might be a month earlier than that if possible, because it is something that the general public is keen to see up and running. The communications I get on this one is that it is

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

welcomed by the public, and particularly by parents and guardians for the safety of their children. It will be a very positive step in helping to protect children. We will never protect all of our children, but it is a step worth taking even if we spare only one child from a sex predator.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: On page 492, under the heading “Outcome: Lawful road-user behaviour”, the line item states —

Percentage of vehicles monitored for speeding by speed cameras that are found to exceed the lawful speed limit

The minister has dramatically increased the number of speed cameras in the metropolitan area. The minister has previously advised me that he expects there will be fewer people speeding as a result, and that he will probably collect less revenue because people will know that the cameras are there, which will serve as a deterrent and fewer people will speed. Does the minister stand by those comments?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I do not stand by those comments as the member has misquoted me once again. I have never used those words. What I have said many times in the past—not just to the member but to anybody who wants to listen—is that enforcement does work. It has been proven in the eastern states that if there are enough cameras and enough police officers catching people speeding, and if we have red-light cameras that clock people not only going through red lights but also speeding, that people get fed up with being caught. At the intersections where we have installed cameras we have seen the number of incidents reduce quite dramatically from when they were first installed. People are learning. It is an expensive education for some of them, but we are not catching so many people, which I am quite pleased about.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister saying that a lesser percentage of people are being caught speeding?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We are catching a lesser percentage of people who are going through intersections with a red light or who are speeding, or people who are doing both. We have seen the number of incidents decrease at certain intersections since the cameras have been installed. People are getting fed up with being caught going through those particular intersections, and that is a good thing.

We have increased the number of dual-lens cameras out, through the \$30 million investment that the government made in its first year to upgrade cameras from the old analogue ones that were falling apart. I think some people in the police had to go onto eBay to see whether they could buy some spare parts for some of them—that is what members opposite left us with! We invested \$30 million in new electronic cameras and they are working well. We have increased the number of cameras.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister saying that with the extra cameras, the percentage of people who are speeding is going up or down? Is the percentage of people speeding higher or lower?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: With the increase in the number of cameras out there, we are catching more people speeding. Common sense says that.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: But is a greater percentage of people speeding or not?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is difficult to say whether it is a greater percentage of people, but we are catching more people than we were catching before because we did not have enough cameras then. It has been proven in New South Wales and Victoria that people get fed up with being caught speeding, paying fines and losing demerit points, and as the number of cameras is increased, the number of people who are caught goes up and the amount of funds that come in —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: My question is quite simple: is the percentage of people speeding going up or down?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The number of people who are being caught speeding is going up.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What is the percentage?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am giving the member the answer. The previous minister’s creaky old cameras —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is a raw number.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member does not like it when I give her the answer because it is not the answer she wants.

The CHAIRMAN: Members! Member for Midland and the minister, thank you! We will just settle. The member has asked the question and the question has been answered; and I think you are perhaps looking for a different answer.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am looking for the answer to my question.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member is looking for a different answer and I am not going to give her a different answer just to suit her purpose. The cameras that were in place when she was minister and when her colleague next to her was minister resulted in less than 65 per cent of the photos that were taken being accurate; the number in percentage terms was hopeless. This government invested \$30 million in new digital cameras and what we have now —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have two really simple questions. Are the minister's cameras having a deterrent effect? Why is the minister not answering my questions! I have the right to ask the questions I want to ask. Are they having a deterrent effect and is the percentage going up or down?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am answering the member's question; she just does not like the answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland and the minister, this is not achieving anything. I suggest that the minister has already said to you that he will not answer that question further. If you want to ask a further question, which is different from what you were asking before, you may.

[9.00 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: If the minister looks at —

The CHAIRMAN: No, member for Midland —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: You said I could ask another question, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, when I give the member the call.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: When I finish giving this answer, the member can ask me another question. That is not a problem. That is what Madam Chair has said, and that is what I said to the member initially. What I said is that the member's government did not invest any money in decent cameras. The police had to go on eBay to try to find some spare parts. What I am saying is that with the \$30 million that our government invested in our first year in government in new cameras, 98 per cent, at least, of every shot taken of a person speeding is successful, and the footage is sent through and people pay their fines. That is one of the reasons the number of fines has gone up. So there are more people who have been caught speeding—of course there are—but that is because the cameras are working better, and we have more cameras out there, and we take it seriously. What I am saying is that if the member reads road safety books and articles, she will see that what happened over east—the member's colleague knows this as well—is that people were being fined many times for speeding, because the government had invested in more cameras, so there were more cameras out there, and they were getting fed up with paying their fines. But, eventually, once people start getting sick of paying their fines, the number of people speeding will go down. It might take five years or 10 years to happen, but it will happen, and that is what we are hoping will happen here.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I draw the minister's attention to note 4 on page 493, specifically on this issue, which states in part —

The movement of the 2011–12 Estimated Actual from the 2011–12 Budget Target reflects a higher percentage of vehicles monitored for speeding by speed cameras that are found to exceed the lawful speed limit.

That basically says that the minister has not read his budget papers and that in fact there is a higher percentage of vehicles monitored that are speeding through the speed cameras. So it would appear, on the basis of the figures provided here, that there is no deterrent impact illustrated in the 2011–12 financial year by the minister's cameras; in fact, the percentage of cars speeding has gone up, not down.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, can I ask what your question is?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What I am asking is: has the minister read note 4 on page 493, and why has he wasted the last 20 minutes trying to say something to the contrary?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The problem I have, Madam Chair, is that I am dealing with somebody who really does not understand simple facts and simply wants to try to point-score and make nasty comments, which the member is used to doing. I have given the member the answer to that question. The member does not like the answer —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The percentage has gone up! Why will the minister not acknowledge it? The minister's own budget papers say that! The minister is misleading the house! Are the minister's budget papers wrong, then? Is what the minister is saying right, and are the budget papers wrong?

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, members. Member for Midland, I think some interpretation could be given to that. I suspect that we have probably done enough on this. The member for Warnbro.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to page 494 and crime prevention and public order, and the third dot point, engaging in program/initiatives aimed at fostering partnerships or improved liaison between Western Australia Police and the

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

community, including government and non-government groups. I choose that particular reference because I have been looking through the budget papers trying to find some reference to police and community youth clubs and the Premier's promise to ensure that police officers are placed in PCYCs. Where is the funding in the budget for police officers to remain in PCYCs? What funding will be provided in the budget to ensure that takes place? If it does not appear as a line item, how are we to know that the Premier is going to keep his promise to the people of Western Australia and keep police officers in PCYCs, like the Rockingham PCYC, where Tim Ellis has been doing such a wonderful job?

[Ms L.L. Baker took the chair.]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The question is: where is that in the budget papers? It is in the general fund for salaries for police officers. Police officers who are based at PCYCs are not paid in a different category from the other nearly 6 000 police officers who are doing front-line duties. They are all police officers. They are all in the global figure that makes up their salaries and their entitlements. They are in that global figure. The member will not see a separate figure for that.

To answer the member's question more succinctly, let me just say this: there is no difference and no change of heart by anybody. From the word go, the Premier, myself and the commissioner are of one mind, and we have always intended for police officers to continue to work in those PCYCs and do the great job that they have been doing, provided that what they are doing is interacting with the youth in those PCYCs and carrying out programs for youth at risk and for prolific and priority offenders. I know what happens at the Rockingham PCYC; I have been there, and I have been to other PCYCs. What we do not want police officers doing is administration work, fundraising, doing the books for the PCYC, or taking bookings for Zumba classes or whatever else they might want to go on at those PCYCs. That is not the job of a police officer, and I think most sane people would agree with that.

We are increasing the number of police liaison officers from 17 to 20. So we are going to increase the number of police officers who will be working directly with youth at risk. But when those officers who are at present working in the PCYCs are not carrying out programs with youth at risk in the PCYC building, we want them to get out into the community. We want them to go to the local schools if they have any problems. We want them to go into the local shopping centres and identify and encourage any youth at risk, or prolific or priority offenders, whom they come across there—they would know most of them—and direct them into programs that will assist them, either the ones that are carried out at PCYCs, or the programs that are run by other organisations that can help youth at risk and prolific and priority offenders. That is what we are doing. It is not going to change anything. As much as the member might want to turn it around, I can assure the member it is not going to happen. Police officers will be there, they will be working with those youth, and they will be carrying out those programs.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Minister, how many police officers will be in PCYCs around the state under this new structure; what funding will be provided to PCYCs in the restructured system; and how much money will now be provided for the administration of PCYCs so that the officers will not have to do that work?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The government is working with the PCYC federation, and I have met with Sue Gordon, Freddy Tan and Mike Dean—all three of them—and they are more than happy with this. They know that it is about time they changed the way they operate—about time they changed the way they run their organisation. It is a separate organisation. It is not government owned and it is not police owned, as the member knows.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The commissioner is the patron, though.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Sorry. Is the commissioner still the patron? Yes, he is. I wanted to make sure he was still the patron. I know that he was the president for quite a while.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: He was once the president under their constitution.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Probably at the recommendation of the board, yes, exactly. They are more than happy with the new way things are going to be done. They want to change. They have been going the same way for so many years, and they want to change and have new directions. They can see other things opening. They will get some extra funding from the government.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The minister answered a lot of stuff but not the questions that I asked him.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The member asked me what funding was in here in relation to police officers who work in PCYCs. I gave the member the answer. They are the global ones.

[9.10 pm]

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr P. PAPALIA: What funding is being provided to PCYCs for their administration under this restructure?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We are working on that at the moment. We have agreed to slow down the process to give PCYCs a chance to recruit people who are good at the job. We will not take people out until the PCYCs have people ready to take over.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Did the minister just say that he will take some people out?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We will take some police personnel out—not police officers, but some police personnel—who have been paid for by police in the PCYCs. They will be going out but the funding for them will go into the PCYCs.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Does the minister not know the extent of that funding?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is a little short of \$1 million.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is that across the whole state?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Recently 29 sworn and unsworn officers have been provided to PCYCs at a total cost to the police budget of about \$2.2 million. Yes, it is acknowledged that those officers have been managers of PCYCs and have fulfilled administrative and other roles there. Is the minister not short-changing the PCYCs by removing those managers and administrative positions that currently cost the police budget \$2.2 million and then only giving the PCYCs less than \$1 million?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the member point in the budget where it shows that it costs \$2.2 million to provide police officers to PCYCs?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That figure was given to me by the PCYCs.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the member show me where it is?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is it inaccurate?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The opposition has come up with the figure; show me the figure. I think the opposition is just pulling it out of thin air, quite frankly.

Mr P. PAPALIA: We are acting in the absence of a line item referring to PCYCs, despite it being one of the biggest promises the Premier has made in the last six months.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What is happening to that \$2.2 million?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The total cost to police for PCYC staffing in the year 2012–13 is \$2 433 428.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I was underestimating!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is for 20 police and 15 public servants, but we will not be pulling out the police officers.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have a question about 000 calls on page 497, which we touched on before. What is the process when referring 000 calls to other agencies? There is a reference, for example, under the efficiency indicators to the percentage of emergency 000 calls for urgent police assistance being answered within 20 seconds. As I understand it, the call centre at Midland takes the 000 calls for the ambulance and fire services as well. How is that coordinated?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It does not take calls for either the fire or ambulance services. Where did the member get that information from?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What occurs when a 000 call is made and someone wants a fire or ambulance service?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get the deputy commissioner to answer that.

Mr C.J. Dawson: Under the protocols, the Telstra call centre receives all 000 calls and the caller, or subscriber, is asked which emergency service they wish to speak to—whether it is the police, fire or ambulance service—and that is routed to the relevant emergency service provider. The 000 call takers at the Police Communications Centre at Midland only receive calls that are routed via Telstra, and they are only police related. However, at times some subscribers are confused and although they may ask for the police in an emergency, at times police are not required to attend and other services are provided. Sometimes people are distressed and they get put through to the police when in fact police are not required.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Someone at home might have been stabbed by an intruder and when they ring 000 they are put through to the Telstra centre and are asked which emergency service they want. Presumably, the person

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

has to make a choice between getting an ambulance or the police. What I am asking is: if they opt for the police, how are they then referred to the ambulance service, or do they have to make yet another 000 call?

Mr C.J. Dawson: In those instances the police make a direct call to St John Ambulance and we also receive that service vice versa; at times we will receive a direct call via the St John Ambulance emergency call takers. If St John Ambulance receives advice that a person is injured and it is not exactly known at that time whether the police are required to attend—it may be an industrial incident or a criminal offence may have been committed—it is usual protocol for each emergency service provider to directly communicate with each other if another emergency provider is required to attend. Depending again on the nature of the call and the caller being able to expressly ask for the service they need, the police are often called by either St John Ambulance or the Fire and Emergency Services Authority.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What proportion of the staff at the Midland call centre is allocated to 000 calls and what proportion is allocated to 131 444 calls? Also, what additional training is provided to the personnel who take the 000 calls?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am advised it is roughly 50–50 in relation to the number of calls.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I inquire as to the training of the 000 callers?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will get the deputy commissioner to answer that.

Mr C.J. Dawson: Different training is provided for the 000 call takers and the 131 444 call takers. Historically, the 000 call takers have been sworn police officers, although some public servants are trained appropriately. There is a much higher proportion of sworn police supervisors for the 000 calls and they receive enhanced training on receiving emergency calls. The call takers in the police assistance centre receive different training because primarily they have a much broader range of issues to deal with. We have a knowledge database that assists them so that when the call taker receives a call on 131 444, which in a number of cases may not be a police-related matter but relates to an abandoned vehicle, for instance, they will refer the matter to a local government authority to deal with. The 000 call takers receive enhanced training specifically for 000 calls and the 131 444 call takers receive training accordingly.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The deputy commissioner advised that, generally, the personnel taking the 000 calls were sworn police officers. How many people are on the roster to take 000 calls, and what number of them are sworn police officers?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We will give the member that information by way of supplementary information.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Could I have the same information on the 131 444 call takers, unless all of them are unsworn?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There are some sworn, apparently. We will give the member that information by way of supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: Could the minister repeat the information that he will provide?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think the member wants to know how many sworn and unsworn FTEs answer the 000 and 131 444 calls.

[Supplementary Information No B17.]

[9.20 pm]

Mr A.J. SIMPSON: In view of the time and the divisions we have to get through tonight, I wonder whether we could move to road safety.

The CHAIRMAN: The order of questions is the member for Murray–Wellington and then back to the opposition.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I quite agree with the point made by the honourable member and my suggestion is that perhaps you, Madam Chair, could find out how many more people want to ask questions in the police division and once you have done that, close off this section and move on to the next one.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the member for Murray–Wellington wants to ask a question for his electorate, and then also the member for Warnbro and the member for Balcatta.

Mr M.J. COWPER: My question relates to the efficiency indicators for traffic law enforcement and management on page 499. They are basically about providing traffic management and minimising road fatalities and injuries. I note in 2009 there were 91 fatalities; in 2010, 192; in 2011, 179; and so far this year 71 compared with 72 at the same time last year.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

The CHAIRMAN: Does the minister know where we are at?

Mr M.J. COWPER: It is page 499, item 7. Is there any information that supports the proliferation of speed cameras having any impact on traffic management and minimising road fatalities? Secondly, the line item below the efficiency indicators details the average cost per hour of traffic law enforcement. Could the minister provide the traffic law enforcement hours that have been allocated each year over the period 2009 to 2012? I am happy to take that by way of supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: That is probably a good thing. Would the minister like the question repeated?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No. We are just trying to find out whether we are able to give that answer by way of supplementary information, Madam Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I can tell the member that there has been a significant reduction in the number of serious injuries so far this year, about which we are obviously delighted. I have some information that I can probably give the member. He wants to know the variation between the 2012–13 budget and the 2011–12 estimated actual; is that right?

Mr M.J. COWPER: I am seeking the actual traffic law enforcement hours for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011 and for 2012 to date. I wonder how that correlates with the number of fatalities that are caused by road trauma and whether the proliferation of cameras has had any impact. I am happy to take that by way of supplementary information.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think we will have to do that, as that is quite a bit of detail the member wants. We do not have that information in front of us here tonight, so we will take that on notice.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry; I am a bit confused. Could we just have the question again for *Hansard*?

Mr M.J. COWPER: For *Hansard*'s purposes, I am seeking to know the traffic law enforcement hours for the years 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 to date, and whether there is any supporting evidence to show that the proliferation of speed cameras has impacted on the number of road fatalities in Western Australia.

[*Supplementary Information No B18.*]

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to the asset investment program and the information communication technology programs in the second dot point on page 499. About 18 months to two years ago I asked a question of the minister in the upper house to determine whether he could tell me how many mentally ill people had been charged with assaulting police and subsequently imprisoned as a result of mandatory sentencing legislation that had been passed. The response at the time was that the minister could not tell me because there were two databases; one that recorded the call for the police to attend the task and one that recorded the ultimate charge, I think. I tried to do searches of the databases to find the actual *Hansard* reference and could not find it. However, the problem is that the minister could not say whether anyone had been subjected to a situation in which someone's mother or a hospital had called police to have someone escorted to a secure facility and that person had assaulted the police because they were psychotic. What he did say was that there were two databases that did not talk to each other and, therefore, he could not answer the question. I want to know whether this program referred to in the budget will enable cross-referencing of all the databases to ensure that we have visibility of individuals who, for instance, are mentally ill. If someone calls for assistance to escort someone to a secure facility, as a hospital is required to do or as parents may do by necessity, and some other offence occurs and they are charged, do we have a way of tracing them or will the upgrades enable that?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will ask Mr Ward to answer.

Mr C. Ward: The situation has not changed as such insofar as there are three databases concerned. We have a computer aided dispatch system—CAD—that tracks our dispatched units; an information management system—IMS—that tracks the response of police; and the BriefCase system that tracks the progression through court. We are currently progressing a business intelligence strategy that will allow us to put—for want of a better term—another piece of software above that, which will allow us to aggregate those three databases into one, which will then allow us to integrate that information. That is the strategy we are going forward with, and at this stage that is unfunded.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Just to follow on, the minister understands what I am getting at. It would build the police's intelligence, I would imagine, a lot better than it currently does if the police ended up charging an individual but they knew at the other end he was actually mentally ill.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Tony Simpson; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Joe Francis

Mr C. Ward: Absolutely, and that is the rationale behind having a business intelligence piece of work that will allow us to go not just into those three discrete databases, but also into every database and extract that sort of information.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: On page 503 there is reference to the community safety and crime prevention partnership fund, which we can clearly see is running down so that it will be just over \$2 million next year and then down to \$1.25 million. That clearly is a reduction in the role of the office of crime prevention, which has been incorporated into WA Police. Which ongoing programs will be funded in that budget?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The community safety and crime prevention partnership fund provides grants to local communities and to local governments for crime prevention programs, and is administered by WA Police. Controlled grant programs currently in existence under the fund include our election commitment of providing WA community crime prevention program funds, which are focused on community safety grants; closed-circuit television and special purpose grants; the Graffiti Taskforce; other grant programs such as the Indigenous partnership fund; and the local government partnership fund.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: For each of those programs the minister mentioned, can he tell me the amount of money actually set aside for 2012–13?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Certainly. In 2012–13 for crime prevention in schools, \$250 000; the WA community crime prevention program grants, \$360 000 and administrative, \$660 000; the Graffiti Taskforce, grants of \$200 000 and administrative, \$800 000; and other grants of \$1.2 million. Therefore, that is a total in grants of \$2.015 million plus a total for administrative of \$1.46 million. The total program funding, therefore, is \$3.475 million.

[9.30 pm]

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: How can the minister come up with more than \$3 million when it says only \$2.015 million?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That reflects only the grants.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I was asking about the grants. The minister is throwing in an extra amount. Which is the extra?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The administration.

The appropriation was recommended.