

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

## TREASURER'S ADVANCE AUTHORISATION BILL 2010

### *Second Reading*

Resumed from 11 March.

**MR J.C. KOBELKE (Balcatta)** [4.18 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010, which seeks authorisation of expenditure of \$1 150 million, a huge amount of money, to meet the blow-out in the annual budget. That figure is exceeded only by the amount requested last year. While a lot of people, including the last speaker, the member for Riverton, who was addressing his remarks on a different matter, want to use the global financial crisis as some sort of smokescreen to cover up the problems created by this government, I put it to the house that those problems have been created simply by a lack of control. It is the huge blow-out in expenditure that is far and away the greatest problem.

Clearly there are challenges with revenue being a lot softer; however, we have not had a situation of negative revenue growth. Revenue has continued to grow, huge amounts of money have been coming from the commonwealth and the period in which the Western Australian economy was in a severe dip was quite short. The huge problem created by this government is its lack of financial control over expenditure. That has resulted in expenditure growth being way out of control, which has created continuing problems in the budget. It has also created continuing problems for the people of Western Australia.

I briefly turn to the key budget aggregates that were contained in the *Government Mid-year Financial Projections Statement*, which was delivered in December last year. It reveals that the growth in expenditure in 2008–09, which the government had a clear ability to control, was 13.5 per cent. It also reveals that expenditure for the 2009–10 year, as taken at the midyear review, was nine per cent. In the two years that this government has had control of Treasury, there has been a 23.7 per cent increase in recurrent expenses, and that is without the Treasurer's advance, which is added on. Even without those figures, the state's net debt has grown from \$3.6 billion at the end of 2007–08 to \$11.9 billion according to the midyear review at the end of the current financial year; that is, net debt is more than three times what it was. That has primarily been driven by the lack of control of expenditure by this government. As we know, the Liberal Party had to do a deal with the National Party that required the government to put an extra \$3 billion into its expenditure over four years, and that is causing the huge growth in expenditure. There have been cutbacks in health, police, education and in a range of other services to try to fund the deal done between the Liberals and the Nationals and, as a result, there has been a huge blow-out in expenditure.

The Treasurer continues to claim that he is bringing expenditure under control. Such a claim is symptomatic of the Treasurer and the government. What they say is not what they do. They keep talking about bringing expenditure under control; however, there is little or no evidence of that. In the second year in which the government has had responsibility for the budget, there has been a huge blow-out of nine per cent midyear and a further \$1.1 billion blow-out through the Treasurer's advance authorisation. I will talk about those figures in a moment.

Members should compare the growth in expenditure over the past two years with the growth in expenditure that occurred under the previous Labor government. The rate of expenditure growth was high, because year after year we did not meet the self-imposed limit of keeping that expenditure growth to the consumer price index plus population growth. However, that expenditure growth went into fixing a range of problems left by the Court government—the current Premier was the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party at the time—and into providing enhanced services. We provided hundreds of extra teachers, teacher aides, police, nurses, doctors and child protection workers. There was a huge improvement in the resources available to the disability services sector. Yes, there was high expenditure growth, but clearly it was used to ensure that the benefits of the boom flowed to the people of Western Australia. Although we did have a large increase in expenditure in most years, we balanced the books and reduced debt. By the time we reached the end of the 2007–08 year, the last full year in which we had responsibility for the books, we had record low state debt. The current government is not in a similar situation, because it has been pushing up expenditure at a huge rate without revenue streams. Rather, debt has been used to pay for that expenditure. The previous Labor government made sure that it had large surpluses each year, which it used to fund its capital program and to reduce state debt while at the same time producing real benefits for the people of WA with extra police, teachers, doctors, disability services workers and so on. There was a huge increase in a range of services.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]

p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

I refer to the growth in the Treasurer's advance authorisation, which I will use as evidence to support the picture that I am trying to paint; namely, it is this government's lack of control over expenditure that is creating the problem. In 2008, the Treasurer's advance authorisation was for \$750 million. Last year, under the Barnett government, it was for \$1 200 million, and this year it is to be \$1 150 million. That is a huge increase on the Treasurer's advance of 2008, which itself was much bigger than what we had in preceding years. However, let us look at what was spent in 2008 when the current Leader of the Opposition was the Treasurer. Although there was a Treasurer's advance of \$750 million, when the financial year was finished, only 81.5 per cent of that was spent. Therefore, the then Treasurer was prudent in allowing for a larger amount in the Treasurer's advance authorisation than was finally required. However, when we look at the Treasurer's advance of last year—the accounts have now been signed off for that year—we see that of the \$1 200 million of excess expenditure for which authorisation was sought, 95.5 per cent was spent, as opposed to 81 per cent under the previous government. When we go into consideration in detail, we will perhaps look at what the Treasurer's expectation is of how much will be spent of the \$1 150 million that is being authorised under the Treasurer's advance authorisation.

If we go back to the numbers I was using a moment ago, what will be the expenditure growth in 2009–10? We know from the Treasurer's speech how much of the excess spending was already committed prior to the midyear review last November; and if we take that off the \$1 150 million, we know how much there is still to bring to book from that midyear review. I have just done some simple calculations. If 95 per cent of the Treasurer's advance authorisation—that is, the \$1 150 million—is spent, we will get expenditure growth for this year of 12.3 per cent, compared with 13.5 per cent last year. That means that across the two years that this government has been splashing the money around, we have a growth in recurrent expenditure of 27.4 per cent. If we go down to the lower limit under the last Labor government's Treasurer's advance authorisation, as I said, we ended up with 81.5 per cent of what was authorised being spent. If we say that perhaps the government will spend only 80 per cent of the amount authorised, we still end up with expense growth for 2009–10 of more than 11 per cent. That means that for the two years, the government will have expenditure growth of 26 per cent. Again, I put that to the house and ask: where is the evidence that this Treasurer is getting control of expenditure? There was 13.5 per cent growth in 2008–09, and clearly there will be growth of 11 per cent or higher when this Treasurer's advance is put into the total expenditure for this year, so it is very hard to see how the Treasurer can claim success if the figure drops from 13.5 to 11 or 12 per cent. That is far more than what is sustainable, given the drop-off in revenues that we have had.

If we look to the components of the Treasurer's advance, we can see that for the recurrent and capital components—which are bundled together regarding what the authorisation is provided for in this bill—the Treasurer's advance was made up of 73 per cent recurrent and 27 per cent capital in 2008. In 2009, in the first Treasurer's advance bill from the Barnett government, the recurrent component went up to 88 per cent and the capital component went down to 12 per cent. The figures that have been given to us for this year—I realise these will change a bit because the figures given by the Treasurer were not accurate, but I will use the figures that were provided to the house—are 91 per cent recurrent and nine per cent capital. We see from those figures that a growing percentage of the money that is advanced under the Treasurer's advance authorisation is recurrent. Therefore, there cannot be the excuse that there is capital ebb and flow because projects are delayed, or can be sped up a bit, and therefore we need to authorise additional capital. That is not part of the problem; it is an issue that has to be balanced and accounted for. But the growth to this huge amount required under the Treasurer's advance authorisation is because recurrent expenditure is growing as a percentage of the total authorisation. It is that recurrent expenditure that is the government's plastic cows, new departments and the payment of higher wages; all those issues on which the government has seen—as it has the right—a need to shift its priorities. It is through those things that the government wants to do that have caused a huge growth in recurrent expenditure.

If we go back to 2008–09 and look at the categorisation of the extra money approved under the Treasurer's advance last year to see whether it was for new items or for excess costs because things simply cost more than they were budgeted for, we find that of the recurrent costs of the advance, new items were 26 per cent and excess costs, where prices had blown out, were 74 per cent. Last year's budget in 2008–09 was the first year of the Barnett government. It had an agenda for a lot of things that it wanted to do. We can therefore understand that new items would have been brought in that were then caught up in the Treasurer's advance as well as cost increases. However, in 2008–09, as I indicated, 26 per cent was for new items and 74 per cent was for a blow-out in costs through the year. I do not have the figures for 2009–10 that relate to the amount authorised under this bill. However, given that the government brought the budget down and it was not its first budget, I would assume that the number of new items is even fewer. There are no issues that I am aware of that should not have

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

been taken account of in the budget. We will wait and see, but, again, I think that provides some support for the case I am making: the government has lost control of expenditure, particularly recurrent expenditure, which is the problem. I am sure the member for Riverton, who is very dry on the economic side, realises that increases in recurrent expenditure are built into future years. When it comes to capital expenditure, there is much more ability to delay bringing on new projects, as capital is much more lumpy. When projects are committed to, there are maintenance costs, but they then tend to get shifted into recurrent expenditure. Once recurrent expenditure is increased, it is much more difficult to bring down that expenditure. It is very difficult to sack people, it is difficult to lower their wages and it is difficult to shift accommodation and find cheaper accommodation. Although all governments try to trim their expenditure, they find that very difficult when their recurrent expenditure is locked in. The problem is that the Premier and Treasurer talk the talk but they do not walk the walk; they simply do not deliver. We are yet to see any evidence that the Treasurer is getting expenditure under control, even though he says he is.

I will give a couple of other little snippets of information, which are contained in the papers that were provided to us after the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010 was brought into Parliament, that indicate that the government is unable to control expenditure because it does not have an honest set of books. The first area in which there is clear evidence of that is the three per cent efficiency dividend. The current government said that it would apply this efficiency dividend to agencies from January 2009; it therefore applied to six months of the last financial year and the full 12 months of the current financial year. Agencies had their budgets cut by three per cent, and the government simply wrote that three per cent efficiency dividend into the books. Again that was talking the talk but failing to walk the walk. The government must have confidence that it can deliver on it. This government had absolutely no confidence that it could deliver on it. We made fun of this government back in its early months in office, as it had written the cuts into the books but had no idea how they were going to be delivered. The Treasurer went off on holidays. Clearly he had had a tough time with stepping down as Leader of the Opposition and all the rest of it. That is fair enough.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** It was very tough.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** I understand on the human side that there is a good reason why members should have a break and reconnect with their family. But for the state's finances it meant that the government wrote the three per cent efficiency dividend into the accounts of all the agencies but did not do the hard work to see how it could be delivered. Of course, it was not delivered. One example of this can be seen in the statements that are provided as part of the Treasurer's advance authorisation. The Department of Education and Training could not deliver \$52 million of its three per cent efficiency dividend. I put to the Treasurer that except for some of the smaller agencies, most agencies did not deliver the three per cent efficiency dividend. However, that is not brought to book; it is simply covered up and devices are used to hide the fact that education did not find the three per cent efficiency dividend. That is simply a shonky way of trying to organise the state's finances. The Treasurer is entering numbers into the books knowing that he cannot deliver. That means that if there is no fiscal discipline at the top, it will not be evident in the agencies.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** As much as the Treasurer huffs and puffs and tries to bully people, why would anyone take any account of it if the Treasurer is totally lacking in fiscal discipline? If the Treasurer and government cannot present a set of accounts that is accurate and meaningful and able to be delivered, why should the people in the middle to lower levels of the bureaucracy put themselves in jeopardy? Why should they work their butts off to try to deliver on something that the Treasurer himself is not willing to commit to? If the Treasurer is not willing to do the work, how can he expect other people to pick that up? I outlined in my earlier contribution a clear example of where this has been done in health, and I will touch on it very briefly again. In the 2008–09 budget year, health had a deficit of \$70 million. They broke the rules simply to keep things going so that they could pay their suppliers, although in some cases they were able to come to agreements to pay them at the later time. As a result, at the start of the 2009–10 budget there was a hole of the order of one to one and a half per cent in the budget. Given a 3.1 per cent growth in nominal terms, the health budget was in fact increasing the budget by less than two per cent. We did have low inflation, but health inflation is much higher than the general consumer price index. The Treasurer knew that he had growth rates in health expenditure of 12, 10, 11 and nine per cent through the preceding years. The Treasurer created a dishonest set of books by writing in an increase of only 3.1 per cent. We then saw the situation in which the then Director General of Health, Dr Peter Flett, who was trying to manage and keep control of costs and come as close as he could to the budget he had been allocated, realising that it was simply not possible to deliver on a budget if he did not sack well over 1 000 staff

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]

p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

from our hospitals. That was the position in which health was left. It had to get rid of 1 000 to 2 000 staff across the hospitals or it would have a budget deficit in the order of \$200 million. We see in this budget that the deficit in health is closer to \$270 million; and if it requires additional money out of contingencies that are provided for in the numbers that have been given to us, it could be even higher than that. The lesson in that is if the government is dishonest, then it will come a cropper. That is what this Treasurer and this government have done. They did not present a set of accounts that was realistic and could hope to deliver efficiencies in health while maintaining the level of service that we have. We can see across so many parts of the health system where services are being affected and where people are not being replaced because there is a cap on staff so that people have longer waits to get a health service. A report that was tabled in this place last week looked at child services and gave clear evidence that under this government those areas are being starved of funds and we have much longer waiting lists for young children to get the health services they need so that their development is not going to be held back and their whole future affected because they could not get the help they needed at preschool or in the early school years. We have seen the consequences of this government mismanaging the budget, particularly the health budget, by the approach it has taken.

It is very easy, as the Treasurer did today, to try to crack a joke to relieve the pressure when he is not across the detail. The Treasurer has a huge workload with the portfolios he has and he simply cannot do it. He has difficulty handling Treasury itself let alone all his other portfolios, including housing, science, industrial relations and consumer protection. He also had small business when he was first sworn in. To give someone all those jobs as well as the job of Treasurer when the government has announced that it will find \$3 billion over four years is absolute nonsense. Again, it clearly reflects that we have a government that is all talk. It cannot deliver. It does not know how to get in there and make things work. It is all about spin and trying to put a point of view that will not work. When that is done, the consequences are failure, as we are seeing in our health services and so many other areas. If the planning is not in place, people cannot deliver and there will be cutbacks or blow-outs in the budget. As we have seen from the Treasurer's advance, the budget has blown out and we are seeking to fix that.

The other issue that we will get to during consideration in detail is the repayable advances. I hope that the Treasurer will be able to explain how the money has been shifted around because I know that Treasury accounts are complicated. Given the track record of this government, one could be forgiven for suspecting that there has been a shonky shifting of numbers. We will wait to see whether the Treasurer has an answer to that. The Treasurer indicated in his second reading speech that the repayable advances were \$15 million up to the midyear review in November. That caused me a bit of concern because when I looked back over the past two years, the repayable advances were \$5 million and \$6 million. Instead of being \$5 million and \$6 million in repayable advances, the Treasurer has upped it to \$15 million. When he tabled his inaccurate bit of paper that did not give us the full picture, we saw that the repayable advances have gone up to \$75 million. Are these numbers that the Treasurer does not understand or is it an attempt to hoodwink us and to try to cover up some of the expenditure? How can there be repayable advances of \$5 million or \$6 million a year in a speech given on the Wednesday, repayable advances of \$15 million by the midyear review and then when we are provided with a paper the next day, the repayable advances have gone to \$75 million? Clearly, we want the breakdown of those numbers and what the money will be used for.

The other issue about which I want some answers from the Treasurer relates to the urgency of the passage of the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. The Treasurer indicated in the second reading speech that when the government got to the midyear review, it had already allocated \$460.6 million. The Treasurer's advance, which is available under the Financial Management Act and allows a three per cent overspend, comes to an allocation of \$469.2 million. That is less than \$9 million between what the government could spend without this bill and what had already been allocated. That money was allocated to a department and the government already had its substantial budget, to which the extra allocation was added. It has still got to get through to 30 June so it does not mean that it will suddenly run out of money in November or December. There comes a time when the government will be out of money, whether that be April, May or June, because it has allocated the amount to be spent up to November, nearly the whole of what is authorised. This bill allows for an advance of \$680 million, which takes it up to \$1.15 billion altogether. I will be keen to hear from the Treasurer just how close we are getting to having to defer or delay payments, or take some other drastic action, because the money is not there and, therefore, what is the deadline by which this bill has to be approved by both houses so that the extra money authorised can be used to pay for the additional commitments made by the government and also to meet the excess costs due to price increases.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

In the last few minutes that I have I want to give another example of the duplicity contained within the budget, which has driven in part the Treasurer's advance authorisation. The Treasurer had to require this \$1 150 million because the government has not exercised the discipline to put into the budget what the real expenditure is going to be. I feel some sympathy for the Treasurer because he has to deal with the Premier. The Premier has a track record of committing to things without going through proper process or without seeking approval from his colleague the Treasurer. We have seen in only the past few days the *Cambridge Post* of 13 March revealing the secret meeting that the Premier had with some councillors in the western suburbs. The start of that story reads —

Premier Colin Barnett held out the offer of land at a secret meeting this week to push council mergers.

Sunset hospital in Dalkeith could be offered as an incentive for mergers or boundary changes.

Parcels of public land in Cottesloe were also mentioned by Mr Barnett.

He said the government would pay for the transition, new council offices and for redundancies

There we have the Premier going out and doing something quite contrary to what the Minister for Local Government has been saying. He has been saying no, he will not pay for these amalgamations, but the Premier in his own little patch is keen to show success, so he just goes out and offers unquantified amounts of money to those councils to see if he can get them across the line on a merger. He was not considering the flow-on effect if he was successful in duping them.

[Quorum formed.]

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** I am glad that the Treasurer has returned to the chamber, because I am sure that his staff will look at the couple of issues that I raised as questions a moment ago and he will be prepared to answer those when we get to consideration in detail. I was also commenting to the chamber that I felt some sympathy for the Treasurer because he has a problem with the Premier, who simply goes out and spends money without actually talking to him or without making sure that it is written into the accounts. Did the Premier ask the Treasurer about offering extra money for those councils in the western suburbs for amalgamation?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I have been flat out busy reading your imprest report on your trip to the US.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** The Treasurer is most welcome. I hope that when he is doing that he will talk to the Premier.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey):** Members, before we progress, I would like to advise members that the debate on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill is not a general, public affairs debate. You need to confine your comments in the debate to whether the authorisation should be approved.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. That is exactly what I am doing when I ask the Treasurer whether he has actually had any discussion on the promises made by the Premier, because that could be money out of the advance authorisation.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** Is that the secret meeting?

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** The secret meeting, yes. The Treasurer was not in on the secret.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I would not like to speculate on a secret meeting. I talk to the Premier about a lot of things.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** As I indicated, the Premier is simply not worried about keeping an honest set of books; he does not see the need for fiscal responsibility. Whether it be the Perth foreshore project, the Northbridge Link, Oakajee or a range of other projects, the Premier commits to them, but they are not then written into the books. We do not know how much of this Treasurer's advance authorisation will be used to pick up projects not on the books that were announced some time ago. Again, we hope that during the consideration in detail stage, the Treasurer will give us more detail on the \$1 150 million advance, which shows that the government has lost control of its expenditure and has a major problem in ensuring this year's budget can be brought in without a deficit. It will be very difficult, particularly if most of this \$1 150 million authorised under the bill is spent in the current financial year.

**MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [4.50 pm]:** I would like to comment on a couple of issues that have stood out for me after reading the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill. Firstly, further detail is required before I can be confident in what this appropriation is asking for. Secondly, in my view the Treasurer has missed some key

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

issues from this appropriation. I will refer to some that are of particular importance to me. I start my discussion about this bill by talking about mental health issues in my electorate that are very high on my agenda. When this government was elected, I was delighted that it chose to appoint a Minister for Mental Health. That was a very progressive and smart decision. However, since the minister has been appointed, a number of things that concern me have not happened. Around, I think, January last year the government paid a quarter of a million dollars to hire consultants KPMG Australia to prepare a strategic plan for mental health. So far we have not seen that strategic plan anywhere. It has not been released and it certainly has not started to be rolled out. It is now 18 months since the minister's appointment. That is not a good start. The absence of a commissioner for mental health, which has been promised for 18 months, is also of great concern to me. I remember the minister coming into this chamber in October or December promising that we would see that legislation by December last year. It is now March and we still have not seen it.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** I know you have been told to filibuster on this bill, but do you realise that what you are saying has nothing to do with the bill?

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** With respect, Leader of the House, it has a great deal to do with the bill. I am going to talk about what will not be funded from this authorisation. For instance, in July 2009, a suicide prevention strategy was proposed and has not eventuated. The contract for the suicide prevention strategy should have been let before Christmas. The expressions of interest were called in October last year, and I believe the minister wrote to agencies in December saying that negotiations were taking place with preferred tenderers. Here we are in March, and still no money has been spent on rolling out a suicide prevention strategy. That should greatly concern this government.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** It has nothing to do with the bill.

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** It has everything to do with health expenditure. I draw the Leader of the House's attention to item 116 on page 11 of the notes the Treasurer gave us, which clearly refers to \$63 million for the Department of Health. Mental health has a great deal to do with the bill. There will not be the capacity to spend that money because it has not been rolled out yet; there is nothing on the floor. I understand that mental health is under such financial stress that it had to close the Morley Adult Mental Centre on the border of my electorate. This, again, has a great deal to do with the funding available to the mental health sector, and this appropriation does not show any detail about money being put in to mental health to make up for the government's closure of this facility. I think the Treasurer has missed an opportunity.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** This is not a general debate!

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** I will move on now to something that I hope the Leader of the House will find to be a bit more in line with the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010, being the subject of the lack of funding for 360 full-time equivalents in community child health, and that the Minister for Health said, as recently as a couple of weeks ago, that there was absolutely no funding to fill one of the FTEs missing from community and child health. This house remembers that the Education and Health Standing Committee tabled its report into this subject last week. Amongst other things, the report stated —

The Government is requiring the Department of Health (DOH) to find \$607 million in savings over the period 2008–13. The Acting Director General of Health reported to the Committee that the application of the 3% efficiency dividend to community child health services in the current year had led to:

- *Increased waiting times; —*

In fact, I think the waiting times had doubled for some services.

- *Increased numbers waiting for assessment, thus delayed assessment appointments;*
- *Immediate cessation of treatment/therapy/intervention plan – including cancellation of therapy groups where parents were already notified, cancellation of review appointments*  
...
- *As many contracts were declined with short notice, parents and families often had to deal with sudden cancellation of appointments – thus an increase in complaints to the service; and*
- *Many clients had developed relationships with the child's therapist, when their contracts were declined, thus loss of continuity of care.*

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

It is a very real oversight of the government that the Department of Health is unable to fund those 360 positions that are so urgently required in the area of child health, and the minister, himself, recognises the need to fill those positions.

I wish to talk to a couple of other issues close to the heart of my electorate, one of which is the health of the Swan River. This appropriation bill does not include additional funding for a number of things.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You’re not supposed to talk about what you’re not seeing; you’re supposed to talk about what you can see in the bill!

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** The appropriation bill does not include detail, and I think this government’s priorities are very questionable when one looks at funding for the Department of Environment and Conservation as shown on page 9 of the document that we were provided with.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** If you intend to speak for the full half-hour —

*Point of Order*

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** Madam Acting Speaker (Mrs L.M. Harvey), it is a very serious thing to have a member constantly reflecting on the Chair. The Leader of the House is constantly reflecting on you in your role as Chair by suggesting that you are allowing a member to speak on matters that do not relate to this bill. You would not do that, and he should not be reflecting upon your —

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** What a stupid comment you’re making!

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** Not at all; the member should stop reflecting on the Chair, and that is a grave point of order.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey):** Member for Pilbara, there is no point of order. However, I will take this opportunity to advise members that this is a debate on the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill 2010; it is not a general public affairs debate. Member for Maylands, you need to confine your contribution to the debate to comments on whether or not the authorisation should be approved.

*Debate Resumed*

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** I draw the house’s attention to page 9 of the notes that the Treasurer handed out on “Details of Excesses and New Items for the 2009–10 Financial Year”, which feature the budget for the Department of Environment and Conservation. Item 110, “Delivery of Services”, shows a decision made about a landfill levy reinstatement appropriation of \$30 million. I draw members’ attention to the fact that that is a complete clawback and reappropriation of funding into the government’s priorities, and which seemed, at the time we discussed and debated this, to be funding FTEs that were unfunded in the Department of Environment and Conservation. That money, as far as my constituency is concerned, should be spent on the health and restoration of the Swan River. A number of projects are crying out for funding not only in my electorate but also throughout the Swan and Canning River catchments. It is the government’s responsibility to continue that repair and restoration work.

Another issue I raise about the budget papers that the Treasurer has put forward is, again, about lack of content, I suppose—namely, that a year or so ago the amended Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Act 1985 allocated specific funding for —

*expenditure on projects approved by the Rivers Management Minister for the protection and enhancement of ecological and community benefits and amenity of the Swan and Canning Rivers and associated lands ...*

I note that on page 915 of the budget papers from last year there was an expectation that \$2.904 million would come forward from what is generally referred to as the Burswood Casino levy. However, I find that when I consult the budget papers now, only \$900 000 has gone from that trust into river restoration. I am very interested to hear where the other \$2 million that was expected to be collected from the Burswood Casino levy has gone. Has it indeed gone into the same funding that the landfill levy has—that is, to fill Department of Environment and Conservation full-time equivalent places? I think those comments are extremely relevant. If we also look at the funding for management of non-nutrient contaminants and of the drain system, money is urgently needed for that throughout the whole catchment area. The City of Bayswater estimated that restoring eight kilometres of riverbank will be a \$6.5 million cost at today’s prices, and we do not see any commitment in that direction.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]

p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

I will now touch on another issue where I think this Treasurer’s appropriation has missed the point in funding services in our community, and in doing so I will draw on some examples. In Maylands we are in urgent need of services for the homeless, a food bank, an extension of the Noongar Patrol, drug and alcohol services, services to help people who suffer from mental illness, and domestic and family violence services. I would be very, very pleased if the Treasurer could point to where in his appropriation, given the three per cent cuts he has made across portfolios, there will be any capacity to do that kind of funding. It also seems to me that the Treasurer will be in for some real trouble with the community sector when he starts to try to roll out the Economic Audit Committee’s recommendations. Some of those recommendations are things like the development of greater outsourcing to not-for-profit organisations, the development of more policies for the funding and purchasing of community services, and the development of pre-qualification schemes for the sector. I think that there is a range of quite progressive and good opportunities in what the Economic Audit Committee has come back with. However, the great danger is that I do not see anything in this appropriation that will enable the Treasurer to fund the implementation of any of these strategies. Where will the money come from? I draw the house’s attention in particular to the salaries in this sector. I will just quote from an online article entitled “Government backs union gender pay test case for 200,000 female workers”. This test case is being run federally at the moment. The article states —

Federal Workplace Relations Minister Julia Gillard has thrown her support behind a union test case that will push for \$100 a week pay rise for 200,000 female workers in the community sector. The test case, to be lodged at Fair Work Australia today, is one of the first to be run under new Fair Work rules that streamline the process for gender pay applications.

...

The average pay increase sort will be 30%.

If the Treasurer intends to roll out the Economic Audit Committee’s recommendations and outsource more into the community services sector, it will simply not work unless he acknowledges that demand pressure and lack of staff will force salaries in the sector upwards. The federal wage case will certainly result in more money being needed in the community sector. There is nothing in this year’s appropriation bill in that respect. The federal wage case does not come in until 11 July, so he does have some breathing time. However, there is nothing in this appropriation bill to enable the Treasurer to increase funding for contracted services that are being outsourced to the community sector. Without increased funding, those services will simply not be delivered to a standard that anyone would consider acceptable. The Treasurer will know that it is not okay to sit back and say, “Because we’ve outsourced it, we have no responsibility for what people are paid”; the government does have a responsibility, particularly in a sector that is already so low paid and gender specific in the problems it faces.

There are several other issues I want to raise around missed opportunities and lack of detail in the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. Continuing the theme of the community sector, there seems to be a push from the Economic Audit Committee to outsource to the community sector; how is the government going to manage rural and remote community services delivery? There are a number of issues relating to this, for which there is simply no money budgeted in this bill. I will pursue this further when we get into consideration in detail. With regard to the high cost of living in non-metropolitan areas, the large majority of regional workers in the sector will generally be female, while a disproportionate percentage of the workforce in the regions is male. It is impossible to get good housing for community services workers in the regions, and it has been that way since the previous government, so this is nothing new. It is a problem that simply has to be addressed. There was a little holiday during the global financial crisis, but, as we all know, we are entering a time when there will be great demand for support services in the regions for people who are doing it tough or who fall through the cracks. There simply is no funding in this bill to indicate that the government is gearing up for that. We have mentioned housing several times; the cost of accommodation and housing in the regions is particularly crippling. Three or four years ago, some services were paying more for accommodation than they were paying staff; I imagine the situation would be a lot more grim now.

What I would have liked to have seen in this bill—there is no indication of it—is indexation of funding for regional services. My understanding is that it would cost at least 20 per cent on top of what we are paying for the metropolitan delivery of community services. To make those services viable and sustainable they need additional funding, and there is no mention of that in this bill.

There are a couple of other areas that are of concern to me.

[Member’s time extended.]



Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** I return to an issue that I have spoken about on several occasions; indeed, I am not the first person to speak about it in this house. I have read government members' speeches in *Hansard* on this issue on a number of occasions over the past four or five years. I refer to funding to implement the Back on Track strategy—the Western Australian trail bike strategy. There is absolutely nothing about that in what has been presented by the Treasurer. I think approximately \$20 million will be requested to implement that strategy. As members would be aware, the strategy includes things like licensing trail bikes, and building better facilities for recreational bike users. There is nothing to show that this government has taken any steps towards implementing any of the recommendations in that report. This issue is incredibly important to many people in our electorates. That includes the electorates of many members on the other side of the house, who are also very aware of this problem.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** But it has absolutely nothing to do with this bill. You know that and I know that.

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** It has everything to do with this bill. In the priorities that are put forward in this bill, absolutely no funding has been identified for the “Back on Track: WA State Trail Bike Strategy”. That will be a dreadful loss, and it will cause a great problem.

I have only one further point to raise on this appropriation bill. I have looked through the WA Police budget on page 5. Again, there is not sufficient detail. I will pursue this further when we go into the third reading, I hope. I hope the Treasurer will be able to tell me about this.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Do you mean the consideration in detail?

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** Yes; my apologies.

**Mr T.G. Stephens:** And maybe at the third reading as well.

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** Maybe; I may. I have a question about the WA Police Mounted Section.

**Mr R.F. Johnson** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the House, please; and the member for Joondalup.

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** The Mounted Section is housed in my electorate of Maylands, on the banks of the Swan River. The mounted police are of great value to policing in this state. I am sure this is a matter of interest to the Leader of the House and Minister for Police. One the greatest deterrents that we have in Western Australia for antisocial behaviour is the crowd control work that is done by the mounted police. The arrival of the mounted police at an event or incident has an incredible impact on controlling crowds and reducing antisocial behaviour. The police and the horses in the Mounted Section travel around the state —

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Maylands, can you please talk on the item. You are talking about why there is no money for the mounted police. This bill is about an increase in the money that is going to be paid. If you want to talk about these other things, please wait until the general debate.

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker. I see nothing on page 5 of the WA Police funding that indicates that there will be any increase in funding to supplement what we have on the ground at the moment; that is, 14 horses that are worked for 10-hour shifts and that are delivering police services around the state. There is nothing to indicate that the number of mounted police will be increased. That, again, will be a big loss, particularly with some of the big events that are planned in this state over the coming years. The police cannot bring police horses onto the force overnight. It takes a long time to get them to the stage where they are safe and their riders are safe. Money should be invested now to enable a longer term or mid-term response. I see none of that in this bill.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Of course you don't! This is not the budget papers. It is the Treasurer's advance bill.

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** I am well aware that this is the Treasurer's appropriation bill. I would have dearly liked to have seen some priorities in addition to the government's priorities—the \$300 000 for the Swan Bells operating deficit, the CowParade at Margaret River, and the \$7 million for Oakajee—well, I think that is what it is, because there is no final figure on it—and a number of the other appropriations that have also been given priority by this government. I have listed some of the priorities in my electorate. I would have liked the Treasurer to have taken some of them seriously.

**MR T.G. STEPHENS (Pilbara) [5.15 pm]:** As you will appreciate, Mr Deputy Speaker, I am a relatively new member of the chamber and I will need your protection from the unruly interjections from the Leader of the

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

House, who has been peppering the previous two speakers with interjections in a most disorderly manner! I hope, Mr Deputy Speaker, that if the Leader of the House flagrantly breaches the standing orders of this place, you will deal with him in the menacing way that the Speaker should deal with an unruly member.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Let us hope he deals with you in the same manner. Talk to the bill for a change. Start something new.

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** There he goes! Before I have even been able to focus my attention, the Leader of the House is heckling and interjecting in a most disorderly manner. I hope that tonight he will finally be dealt justice from the Chair and will be brought to book.

Members will see in the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010, which is before the house tonight, a request from the Treasurer for an advance, the purposes for which are outlined in his second reading speech. The Treasurer's second speech refers to the need for increased funding of \$72.3 million for the Department of Corrective Services, which is mainly due to the increased prison muster. Just an hour ago, a very significant news item was posted on the ABC News website. The article was written by Amy Simmons and is headed "Billions wasted on 'revolving door' jail system". It says that additional expenditure is being requested in bills such as this for the corrective services system across Australia. Members will recall the debate on this part of the bill when it was raised by the shadow Minister for Corrective Services at the time the house was engaged in thinking about this issue. The Treasurer gave me the impression that he was listening with rapt attention to the points the shadow minister was making. The article throws further light on the comments that were made by the shadow Minister for Corrective Services during the earlier stage of this debate. The article states —

Criminologists have slated the nature of Australia's prison system, saying billions of dollars are being poured into jails that fail to reform offenders and improve community safety.

Figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) reveal that almost 60 per cent of people in prison last year had been in jail before.

Is it any wonder that the Treasurer is asking for an increase in the Treasurer's advance limit of \$680 762 800? That includes \$72.3 million for the Department of Corrective Services, mainly due to the increased prison muster, as can be found in the Treasurer's second reading speech? This article makes it clear that one of the reasons that this type of appropriation from the Treasurer is necessary is the revolving-door syndrome. The article continues —

The bureau also tracked a group of 30,000 inmates released between 1994 and 1997 and found that teenagers had the highest reimprisonment rate, with three out of five returning to jail within 10 years.

Is it any wonder that the federal Parliament has found it necessary for the Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs to inquire into the high level of involvement of Indigenous juveniles and young adults in the criminal justice system across Australia? On 30 March, the committee is holding public hearings in Perth on the high rate of imprisonment of juveniles, its cost and failure, and the waste that is involved. The committee is chaired by former New South Wales Minister for Corrective Services, Bob Debus. After the hearings in Perth on 30 March, he will go to Fitzroy Crossing to consult that community. Members can appreciate, from the backdrop of figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics as revealed in this media report, that we in Australia, and particularly here in Western Australia, have a problem. The article goes on to say —

Of the entire group 40 per cent were reimprisoned within 10 years, suggesting prisons may foster further criminal behaviour for some offenders.

Experts say the system is outdated and in desperate need of change.

This bill amounts to a request for additional funds, including a request for funds to flow to the Department of Corrective Services. In this case the request for funds does not respond to the latest scientific evidence about what we should be doing with those funds. Rather, the request amounts to funds being deployed to allow a further increase in the prison muster. What does this article say about that type of bid for additional funds? It effectively describes this bill as a waste of taxpayers' funds. Experts say that, as it is, the system is simply outdated and in desperate need of change. According to today's ABC news story —

Justice Action coordinator Brett Collins says the fundamental problem with prisons is that they exclude individuals from society.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

That is obviously a self-evident truism. The article continues —

He says while prison is seen as a tough approach advantageous to politicians, it absorbs community money and creates “hot beds [and] festering sores of social disadvantage”.

“You can’t exclude offenders, you have to deal with them. All you do by locking people up is allow problems to fester and you allow this cross-contamination of individuals who reinforce each others’ behaviour,” he said.

“After a period of exclusion they feel, instead of having done wrong, they are being wronged, that they have not had their human rights acknowledged.”

Members will appreciate that it is a complete waste of our time if prisons are doing simply that. If bids like this, which include a request for \$72.3 million from the Department of Corrective Services, are used simply to increase the prison muster, we are contributing to the massive waste that is going on across the country. This is not just a problem for this state government, it is a problem for all governments across the nation. Here we are dealing with the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill and, on this occasion, it requests \$72.3 million for the existing system. The article states further —

Mr Collins says today’s reimprisonment rates are unacceptable and that prison must be confronted as a “failed experiment”.

That is an unusual choice of words but, nonetheless, members can see his point. It continues —

“There has been this belief by governments that the more imprisonment the better for creating a safer society,” he said.

“We’ve done a very careful analysis of the effects of imprisonment and the conclusion we’ve come to is that prisons cause crime.”

Here we are faced with a criminologist, a statistician, who is looking at what people do with funds like these being sought.

*Point of Order*

**Mr P.T. MILES:** Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** I hope Mr Deputy Speaker throws the member out if it is a frivolous point of order!

**Mr P.T. MILES:** In relation to relevance, we are talking about the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill. Can you bring the member to order, please.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** Which standing order?

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** I rise on the point of order. As Mr Deputy Speaker will appreciate, it is an offence under the standing orders to have members rise on frivolous points of order. I was quite clearly addressing the bill and I was quite clearly responding to the second reading speech of the Treasurer.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. Member for Pilbara, continue, please.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** If the member does that again, I will take grave exception to frivolous points of order being raised in this debate.

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members for Albany, Wanneroo and Pilbara!

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** This media report indicates that the bid the Department of Corrective Services makes for \$72.3 million runs the risk of simply being a waste of funds. It will result in a failure to invest the funds in programs that are needed to reduce the cost to the taxpayer. The Treasurer does not have to come into this place with advance authorisation requests of this magnitude.

Mr Collins is quoted further in that article as follows —

He says the enormous costs associated with sending people to jail should be directed elsewhere.

When you no longer have imprisonment as an option then you free money that is spent on the imprisonment and it can be put into the community where the problems really lie,” he said.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

“That money could easily be spent making sure kids have got something useful to do, that mentors are trained and able to support people when they are released.”

The article continues —

Mr Collins says mentoring, where experienced members of the community work with offenders, and conferencing, where the victim and offender meet to discuss a solution, are two “extremely successful” ways of tackling crime.

The article then refers to alternatives that should be available through government strategies that could be financed by a Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill that is better constructed than is this bill. If that were the case we would not need the \$72.3 million that is being sought in this bill to respond to the increased prison muster. Instead we would have alternatives to this state’s prison system that would be less expensive.

The article goes on to state —

Professor of criminology at the University of New South Wales, Chris Cunneen, agrees that unless the causes of crime are addressed, Australia will stay on a “revolving door cycle” of people going in and out of prison.

Professor Cunneen says the ABS figures show how limited the prison system is in deterrence, rehabilitation and ensuring long-term community safety.

One would think that this bill, advancing \$72.3 million for the Department of Corrective Services, is focused on community safety. What we have learnt from that ABC news story—from the figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the comments by a leading criminologist—is that the opposite is the case; that is, this type of investment is doing the exact opposite in reducing the prospects of long-term community safety.

The article quotes Professor Cunneen as follows —

"And this is only looking at the extreme end. It's not even talking about people who have reoffended," he said.

“There would be a much higher proportion of people who have reoffended but weren’t necessarily sentenced to imprisonment.”

He says about \$2.6 billion is spent on Australian prisons each year.

Is it any wonder that the Treasurer’s advance bill has to be progressed through this house with a bid of \$72.3 million for the Western Australian Department of Corrective Services, which is over and above the amount that was previously made available with the passage of the last budget bill through this place? The article continues —

“It’s a significant amount of money that’s spent on locking people up and I think we could quite rightly ask for better results, for the lowering in the use of imprisonment or for better alternatives,” he said.

“With people with mental illness, there needs to be better community-based treatment facilities for them rather than simply locking them up.

I have not seen within the legislation that is before the house funds to do that, yet that is what the good professor studying these statistics calls upon governments to do. The article continues to quote Professor Cunneen as follows —

“If we’re talking about people who have literacy and numeracy problems, who find it very difficult to get work because of those problems or lack of skills, there are issues there that need to be addressed.

“And there are very significant problems around drug and alcohol abuse, which are not dealt with in prison at all.”

The comments under the next heading in this article, “Punitive response”, need to be drawn to the attention of this house in consideration of the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill. The article states —

Professor Cunneen agrees with Mr Collins that governments rely on what they see to be popular demand for a punitive response.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

I suspect that is the reason this amount of \$72.3 million is noted in the Treasurer's second reading speech. It is an attempt to try to respond to what is considered to be popular demand. The article continues to quote Professor Cunneen as follows —

“But if we actually want to deal with the problems and causes that lie behind offending then we need to look at other avenues of tackling the problem,” he said.

“Prison is not something that's effectively dealing with the social problems that lead to crime or individual problems that might lead to particular individuals committing offences.”

He says treatment of mental illness and drug and alcohol addiction are two areas in which investment needs to flow to reduce both prison and reimprisonment rates.

The final paragraph in this evening's ABC media report states —

The ABS report found Northern Territory prisoners had the highest reimprisonment rate — 48.2 per cent — with Queensland and NSW not far behind at 42.1 per cent and 39.3 per cent respectively.

I have looked at the Australian Bureau of Statistics' website to consider the figures that the good professor commented on. I think I have read the figures correctly when I say that Western Australia is catching up to the other states with rapid speed. Our re-imprisonment rate has meant that the Treasurer has had to introduce a bill such as the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill and that he has had to provide an explanation such as the one contained in his second reading speech. The recidivism rate in Western Australia is rapidly catching up to the recidivism rate in other states. Of course, in the figures that I have just quoted —

**Mr P. Papalia:** It doesn't have the Indigenous imprisonment rate, which is 60 per cent.

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** The shadow Minister for Corrective Services has interjected on my speech. I refer to some comments that were made last Friday by the Chief Justice at a public forum that I and a large gathering of people from the Catholic education system attended. I hope I will not put words into the Chief Justice's mouth when I explain to the house what he said to the audience, because God knows what Chief Justices do with those who put words into their mouths! At the conclusion of discussions about the issues of truth and justice, the Chief Justice drew to the attention of the very large gathering of people, who came from one end of Western Australia to the other and who are involved in the Catholic education system, the question of cost to the Western Australian community. This bill is focused on costs. He told the audience that Western Australia is very lucky to have the current shadow Minister for Corrective Services, because in his article in *The West Australian* he clearly and specifically drew the Western Australian community's attention to the fact that the costs associated with the rising rates of imprisonment are spiralling out of control. The Chief Justice told the large audience of Catholic educators that it was their time and that they should not simply leave it to the shadow Minister for Corrective Services to wage the debate alone. Rather, he urged them to join in the debate and be part of the process.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** The large gathering of distinguished educators included Mr Ron Dullard, the Director of the Catholic Education Office, his deputies and principals, and people from various education centres. They heard a glowing reference to the arguments put by the shadow Minister for Corrective Services, the member for Warnbro, in his engagement in this debate. It is important for the house to have a sense of this, because people are beginning to get a handle on this emerging issue. People have pointed out that the approach that is being adopted is causing the Treasurer to have to come forward with a bill such as the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill, which contains clauses that seek further expenditure, and with second reading speeches such as the one that the Treasurer gave on this bill, which seeks to justify that further expenditure. The government is seeking \$72.3 million over and above the amount that was previously allocated to the Department of Corrective Services. It is seeking the allocation of that money because the prison muster is increasing.

What do we know about the prison muster? Western Australia has the highest rate of imprisonment for Aboriginal people across the country. That seems odd. How could that possibly be the case when the Northern Territory has the highest re-imprisonment rate? When one does an adjustment on the basis of the percentage of prisoners and the percentage of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in Western Australia, Western Australia distinguishes itself with the highest rates of imprisonment for Aboriginal people. It is likely that the Treasurer's advance bill contains what has effectively become a mindless strategy that simply rolls along delivering for the community costs, not benefits.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

I know that the shadow Minister for Corrective Services is a much more accommodating sort of character than I. He is a more pleasant character, I have found, overall than I. He is charming and does not like to browbeat people or bash people about unfairly. I tend to play politics perhaps a bit harder than some. Perhaps sometimes in the past I have been a bit unfair on my opposites on the other side of the house. But I want to try to join in the debate in the same spirit with which he engaged in his contribution to the debate on the Treasurer’s advance bill; that is, it seems to be an extraordinary waste of our money to be on the pathway or on the trajectory that we are on currently.

I have to own up and say to the house—I have not referred to it previously—that a parliamentary committee of which I am a member is doing some work on this in a bipartisan way. I am very pleased to be on that pathway with some colleagues from the other side of the house. No doubt we will later have the opportunity to talk about what we have seen, what we have discussed and what we recommend. We are nowhere near that, and of course it would be a breach of parliamentary privilege if I were to go down that pathway. However, we are embarking upon some work, and it does include a visit, which has been approved by the Speaker, to Singapore, so that the committee can look at how another jurisdiction is utilising its prison system. Hopefully, we will come back with some recommendations in our report in response to looking at the training and employment strategies that are being deployed in the prison system of Singapore. Quite unashamedly, at Changi Prison in Singapore, a lot of work is being done by the prisoners; apparently, they are engaged in some work. But enough of that. All we know is that we have the Speaker’s approval to go off and do the work. That is on the public record, and I appreciate that. In fact, I know that this is nothing like other members of this house have done, but I will not go along that pathway.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** You’d better be careful.

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** Yes, I will be careful. I am sure that my opportunity might come eventually. Singapore is closer than many parts of Western Australia.

I will conclude my remarks. It was that part of the defence of the legislation that I wanted to tackle; it was simply that which dealt with the \$72.3million. In conclusion, I should remark, however, that it does seem strange that it was found necessary to refer in the second reading speech to the figure of three per cent. The second reading speech says that under the Financial Management Act, the annual Treasurer’s advance limit is equal to three per cent of the total amount appropriated for the previous financial year by the appropriation acts, and then it goes on to explain that. Whenever we see three per cent, we now think of those notorious three per cent efficiency dividends. What I found absolutely fascinating was to learn from the public sector how some of the departments are attempting at the moment to drive those three per cent efficiency dividends. I have discovered that people from head office in some departments that are delivering core services to the community are phoning people out in the field and saying, “We won’t put this in writing, but instead of you producing a three per cent efficiency dividend, you have to produce a 10 per cent efficiency dividend and cut back on your services.”

**Mr A.P. O’Gorman:** That’s right.

**Mr T.G. STEPHENS:** They say that they will not put it in writing because they know they will get into strife if they expose the government politically, but they are driving a 10 per cent efficiency dividend in some arms and areas of government. This is a great worry, because some of those areas are in fact vital front-line services to the community of Western Australia. I see that the notice paper is now riddled with questions to ministers about these concerns that are being raised across a range of portfolios. Unless the books are cooked completely in the responses that are given to the house, I fear that the answers will reveal that front-line services are facing not just a three per cent efficiency dividend, but cuts that are in the order of 10 per cent. I hear the member for Joondalup indicating to me that that is his experience also. It is certainly my experience in regional Western Australia. It is my experience that a range of people in regional Western Australia are having to wear cuts in services that they have been used to getting from this government—they certainly were not used to getting them during the period in which we were in office. I refer to services across a range of important areas of people’s health, education and safety. In fact, right today in my own little patch in South Hedland is a vital service—the Mingle Mob. The Mingle Mob group provides a wonderful response to the issues of securing young juveniles onto pathways that do not lead them into the justice system and into contact with the courts. That group is facing the risk of losing the core funding that it previously had from the state government. I cannot see anywhere in this bill we are debating this evening funds that would be easily diverted to that group. The funds seem to be cut either by the efficiency dividend of three per cent, or by the extrapolation of that three per cent efficiency dividend to 10 per cent in some cases. As well as that, funds are being diverted into programs that have been identified in this

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

legislation, such as \$72.3 million for an increase in the prison muster at the Department of Corrective Services. There is also a reference to funds that are yet to be detailed for the Oakajee project; a project that was previously scheduled to pay for itself with funds from industry in the private sector.

I hope members of this house understand that the member for Pilbara has every right to rise in this place and object to the discriminatory response of a government that is putting into the Mid West taxpayers' funds that could be better deployed elsewhere. Funds from the private sector should have been utilised to respond to the tiny tonnage that is on offer from the Mid West compared with the Pilbara region, where vast tonnages are on offer that dwarf anything that will ever emerge out of the port of Oakajee. Those tonnages dwarf by a hundredfold the inevitable small trickle of tonnages of iron ore that will flow through Oakajee. Yet somehow or other this government thinks it is appropriate in this Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill to make some reference to costs, including additional undocumented funds, to Oakajee—costs that could and should have been appropriately left in the hands of the private sector, just as has happened and continues to happen in the Pilbara. In the Pilbara billions of dollars of investment are needed that will produce multibillions of dollars of lasting benefit, not only for this state and this nation and for the shareholders of the big companies that are involved, but—if I have anything to do with it—also for the people of the Pilbara.

It therefore concerns me that this bill represents an embarrassing litany of misplaced emphasis from government—wasting \$72.3 million on Corrective Services and an unspecified amount of funds on Oakajee—while it ignores much-needed funds that could flow to a group like the Mingle Mob in South Hedland or could respond to the challenges of tackling and being tough on the causes of crime: illiteracy, drug addiction and the challenge that mental illness poses to our community. These are the challenges that need a focus from government, but they are not picked up in this Treasurer's advance bill in a form that has been explained to this house. Instead, we run the risk of seeing the government spend money, as we have seen in this case with reference to the prison system, that is likely to cause an increased cost to the community of Western Australia. If this evening's ABC news report is anything to go on, it appears that the experts are unanimous in their view that an increase in the prison muster will in fact increase the safety risk to the wider community and increase the level of crime within our community. We are in fact creating great universities for causing more crime within our community, rather than places and strategies that represent an alternative to that type of wasted expenditure.

**MR A.P. O'GORMAN (Joondalup)** [5.45 pm]: I am greatly concerned by the inordinate amount of money that represents this Treasurer's advance. Last year the amount was \$1.2 billion and this year it is \$1.15 billion. If I could see some benefit for my community, I would not be opposing and criticising this bill. I am seeing more and more services being cut from my community and more and more pressure being put on families.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Joondalup, before you continue, I remind you that you have to talk to the bill. You are talking about services in your community being cut. Can you tell me which part of the bill you are talking on? This is not a general debate.

**Mr A.P. O'GORMAN:** I can tell you exactly, Mr Deputy Speaker. I refer you to the figure for the Department for Communities, which has been increased, and the fact that in my community funding for those services is decreasing and is not meeting the needs of my community. This bill is asking for extra money and at the same time that money is not delivering extra services to the community in exactly the right spot. I am saying that non-government organisations are struggling to meet the needs of people with disadvantages, who are struggling to meet their day-to-day commitments, including their ever-increasing power bills. They are struggling to pay normal, everyday bills that most of us can afford; members in this place can cope with the increase. The government is asking for over \$1.15 billion to cover overruns that this Treasurer did not account for in his budget. We know that under the Financial Management Act the government is allowed to run up to \$460 million over budget without having to come back to this place to seek authorisation. The government has gone past that.

I have been in this place a lot longer than you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I have listened to the current Treasurer stand up here and criticise the former Treasurer for coming into this place and having the audacity to ask for an advance of \$600 million. The former Treasurer asked for that amount and he put all his figures out there, and all his figures added up correctly. The current Treasurer was continually criticising the former government and saying that \$600 million was too much, and that the former government had to cut back on spending and services. He told the former government it had to do much more with less. Now we are seeing that this government is getting much less done with much more money. Much more money is being wasted through this Treasurer's incompetence and the fact that he cannot manage the budget. He cannot give us a proper budget in May; he has had to come back halfway through the year and ask for a Treasurer's advance.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]

p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

Mr Deputy Speaker, I find it extraordinary that without even having gone a minute into my speech I am pulled up and asked to come back to the bill, having said only that the government is seeking to raise \$1.15 billion.

As the member for Pilbara has said, we are being asked for \$72.3 million for Corrective Services. I am a member of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, with the members for Pilbara, Ocean Reef, Morley and Armadale, and I am appalled at what is occurring in our prisons. I am appalled at the number of extra prisoners who are being pushed into our prisons and the amount of money we have to spend housing prisoners whom we could probably better deal with in the community. We have many, many prisoners in our prisons who are there purely and simply because they cannot read and write; and, because they cannot read and write, they cannot get a job. I do not think our prisons are addressing that properly. Not enough money is going into education in our prisons to teach these people the basics of reading and writing so that when they leave the prison system they can undertake additional courses and find a job, and we do not have the risk that they will reoffend.

We need to address these issues not just by being “tough on crime”. The fact that a large number of people are in prison simply because they cannot read and write, they do not have a proper job, they cannot provide for their family and they do not have a house or a home to go to is a disgrace on this Parliament and on this society. The only thing we can think of doing is to chuck them behind bars and double-bunk them. Casuarina Prison was built for 380 inmates, if my figures are correct, but nearly 680 inmates are now at Casuarina. This very expensive high-security prison was built at a huge cost to the state and it contains minimum security prisoners. What else happens as a result? These minimum security prisoners are in these prisons with the worst of the worst in our society—the murderers, the rapists and the drug traffickers. When those people are released, how will that impact on our community? We are asking for a further \$72 million in the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill to increase the size of our prisons and build more prisons. Is that really what we want to do? Surely that \$72 million would be much better spent on the non-government organisations that this government wants to give more responsibility to but is making them do more with less. The government’s only answer to dealing with problems in our society is to chuck more money at prisons, build more prisons and chuck more people in them. It does not matter whether they are teenagers, illiterate or highly skilled in criminal acts that they start teaching other inmates.

We need to seriously consider how we spend our money in this state. All departments have been asked to cut spending by three per cent. We have seen three per cent cuts all through this document that the Treasurer put out. It is called an efficiency dividend. That is the wrong name for it. It is not an efficiency dividend; it is called raping the population. It is called ripping the money out of services that we should be funding in our communities so that people can get a leg up and start seeing some of the benefits of the boom in this state rather than constantly being put under the thumb and being stomped on by ever-increasing harsher laws that are putting more people in prisons than we should ever consider having in prisons. I am sure that if we put this \$72 million into education programs for illiterate people in our state, we would have a much greater drop in our recidivism rate and in our law-breaking rate in the long term. It would result in fewer people breaking the law simply because they cannot do any better.

A total of \$23.2 million has been allocated to the Department for Child Protection for the reform and expansion of residential and care services. I commend the government for that. The system that we have had in place in this state for many years has not been conducive to caring for children. When we cannot find foster placements for those children, they have been put in hostels. When we put these children, who are wards of the state, into hostels, again, we are mixing the bad with the good and we are not getting it right. We are taking some of these more innocent children who are in foster placements and in the care of the state and putting them into hostels and places like that with children who are not as innocent as they should be at their age. This government is putting in this money for child protection so that it can provide houses in the community for these children, with no more than four children in care. The government is doing something good there. But why is it in the Treasurer’s advance authorisation? Surely, a government in this day and age can plan far enough ahead, see what it needs to do and provide for it in the budget, where we can scrutinise it properly. This is skirting around this Parliament and abusing this Parliament. It does not give us the opportunity to properly scrutinise the funding amounts that are being put into the advance authorisation to cover matters that should have been in the budget in the first place. If this funding had been in the budget in the first place, we could have had a proper community debate about these houses in the community, because there is a risk. The member for Wanneroo will know that, because one of these houses is to go into his electorate, and he knows that it has caused great consternation in his electorate. Am I right?



**Extract from Hansard**  
[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]  
p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr P.T. Miles:** There are two.

**Mr A.P. O’GORMAN:** This has caused great consternation. I previously had Balga Works in my electorate, which was not a government-run organisation but a privately run organisation that misused government funds. I had great difficulty in my electorate where I had 16 young people housed in four houses next door to each other in a suburb. It caused great problems. That is why all these matters should have been in the budget at the start of the year and not introduced in March when we are running out of money. The government should have had it in the budget right at the very start.

We also have in the Treasurer’s advance an amount of \$20.8 million to go to the Department of Environment and Conservation for a delay in implementing the increased landfill levy. Once again that is showing the incompetence of this government and this Treasurer, because these matters should have been in the budget and they should have been debated properly and we should have been able to get them through this place in a proper manner so that they were scrutinised properly, yet we stick them in the Treasurer’s advance so that we can slip them through quietly. There is additional funding for the police of \$13.7 million, mainly for the police enterprise bargaining agreement. This amount of money astounds me, because straight after the election this Treasurer, the Minister for Police and the Premier drove that EBA for the police and they made sure that the police would be getting the extra money. But they did not have the decency to put it in the budget where we could query it properly. They stick it in the Treasurer’s advance, where it kind of slides through, hopefully late at night when the media reporters who are usually in the press gallery do not pay any attention to it because they are at home in their beds. The government squeezes it into the Treasurer’s advance authorisation so that it cannot get properly scrutinised. What a disgrace.

We then get down to cost pressures in the Department of Health. We all know what this Treasurer did to Dr Flett. We all read in the newspaper how he forced him out. The Treasurer attacked a public servant because he dared to say what was true at a parliamentary hearing where he was obliged to tell the truth. The Treasurer then jumped on him and forced him out of the public sector. That is what has been done to Dr Flett, who is one of the best physicians in this state and one of the best health administrators in this state. Because this Treasurer did not agree with Dr Flett fronting a parliamentary committee and telling the truth, he got the boot.

**Mr P. Abetz** interjected.

**Mr A.P. O’GORMAN:** The member for Southern River should not start, because I can go back to his comments of previous times. With this Treasurer’s advance authorisation we are being asked to give this Treasurer free rein with \$1.15 billion. He keeps telling us how revenues are going down, yet his expenditure is going up and services are going down. I have in my electorate tonight non-government organisations that are being denied a room-rate payment for leasing rooms in their premises to government bodies, which are supposed to be delivering services to the people in our electorates. They cannot do it. We are expecting non-government agencies to take that money out of their pockets. How can they do it? They get funded by government mostly and they try to supplement their income by renting out their rooms. When they rent them out to government organisations, the government organisations refuse to pay for them. I will be bringing the issue into this house at a later stage. It is outrageous that we do that to non-government organisations. We then have the Premier saying there will be more cost shift from the government sector to the non-government organisations or not-for-profit organisations. The government is expecting them to take up the load. They are already under huge pressure. Now those organisations are under wages pressure because they cannot keep staff as a result of our state entering back into a mining boom. As much as the Premier hates us to say that it is a boom, it is a fact that a mining boom is coming. We are going to lose a lot of non-government organisation workers to the mining companies, yet we have this government putting more and more pressure on non-government organisations and squeezing them.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm*

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [7.01 pm]: I rise this evening to speak on the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. It is with great concern that I note that demand for an extra \$1.15 billion for the Treasurer through this bill is the second largest amount ever requested in a Treasurer’s advance bill. It is also of grave concern that I note that, in its initial presentation to the house and to the public of Western Australia, the supporting information failed to include \$210 million—\$210 million was missing from the detail on this advance bill.

I would like to go through the details of the bill, and begin by looking at those items that come under state development. This area is where the Treasurer has seen fit to request an extra \$20 million to pay for various projects that had not been anticipated in the budget presented last May—funding for projects that I believe

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

should be sourced from elsewhere. One excellent example of this is the \$7.36 million for the Oakajee port and rail project. We know that under the Carpenter government Oakajee Port and Rail was all set to pay for this project. However, the Barnett government has seen fit to subsidise it with taxpayers' money. Ultimately, the best estimates are that the Oakajee port and rail project common-user infrastructure will cost taxpayers around \$678 million. In this Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill we are being asked to cough up for this massive subsidy to industry, which was prepared to pay for it from its own reserves. This \$7.36 million will be paid for by taxpayers. The Oakajee port and rail project is to service iron ore projects in the Mid West region such as Jack Hills, Weld Range, Karara and Extension Hill. These are projects that, as the member for Pilbara indicated earlier this evening, are fairly minor given the overall Western Australian iron ore reserves. Compared with the iron ore projects in the Pilbara they are very small iron ore mines. Yet this government wants to subsidise those mines, and perhaps make it impossible to test the actual viability of those mines. Various estimates have been made about the potential longevity of these mines. The people trying to sell shares in the companies are claiming that the mines might last for 50 years or so, and some are claiming that there will be combined annual production figures of somewhere between 50 million tonnes and 100 million tonnes. The taxpayer is being asked to put in \$7.3 million to explore things further, but that raises the concern that the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010 is already giving companies some hope that they can rely on taxpayer subsidisation to pay for the common-user infrastructure necessary to get their projects off the ground.

*Point of Order*

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The point of order is relevance. The member's major focus is on the Oakajee project and the government subsidies. This debate is about the Treasurer's advance and it has no bearing on that project. No money is being spent on the Oakajee project this year, and it is not, therefore, relevant to the debate.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker):** Thank you, member. There is no point of order, but I would remind the member to please keep to the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill; it is not a general public debate.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** For the benefit of the member, I direct him to page 1 of the document entitled "Details of Excesses and New Items for the 2009–10 Financial Year", related to the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. If the member looks at that page, he will see that "Oakajee Rail and Port Project" is listed there, and it is very clearly stated that the Treasurer is asking for \$7.36 million to fund that project. I would say that that is of absolute relevance.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** That would be a first today!

**Mrs C.A. Martin:** That would be right! The government keeps standing up and spurning all this rubbish, and now we've got somebody who actually has something to say that makes some sense and is relevant! So that is rubbish!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order, Member.

**Mrs C.A. Martin:** Sorry.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Gosnells has the call.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Members, I will return to the subject of subsidisation, and, moving on from the Oakajee rail and port project, I turn now to the Browse liquefied natural gas precinct project. That is obviously a huge economic resource for Western Australia, and the Browse LNG project has huge potential to deliver all kinds of benefits to the state. Some of the world's biggest multinational energy companies are involved in developing the Browse LNG precinct project as we speak, but the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill is seeking to deliver \$12.9 million—yet another subsidy to industry—for this project. The Treasurer must account for this money on a number of levels: firstly, why should the Western Australian taxpayer be subsidising big industry; and, secondly, why was this money not accounted for in the budget delivered last May? Those two issues suggest that the government is not on top of this Browse LNG precinct project. The government has suddenly realised, or decided, that it wants to subsidise the project, but it does not seem to know what it is doing with it. We are being asked to accept that this money is suddenly required, and that the need for it was not anticipated in the May budget.

Another aspect to all of this subsidisation of two major projects in Western Australia is not contained in the state development section of the "Details of Excesses and New Items for the 2009–10 Financial Year", it is actually in

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

the environment area. I ask members to follow me on this and turn to page 9 of the “Details of Excesses and New Items for the 2009–10 Financial Year”, where they will see the Department of Environment and Conservation’s requirement for an extra \$36 million, part of which will fund the environmental assessment of the Browse LNG precinct, but I will return to that issue later on. For the benefit of members, I intend to structure my contribution to the second reading debate by working methodically through the details that the Treasurer has put out.

I now turn to page 3 of the Treasurer’s document that deals with this bill and I refer to education, which has a request for an extra \$66 million. The document details the issues that the extra money is needed to cover, including the 2010 half-cohort impact. It is a bit hard to understand why the half-cohort should have caused a \$1.225 million shortfall in the May budget. Why was that sum not budgeted for? It was fairly easy to anticipate that we would have the so-called half-cohort impact; we knew that it was going to happen. Indeed, I question why the half-cohort is an impost on the system. Surely, the overall number of students within the education system has not changed because of that half-year’s pulse through the system; it is simply a matter of where the students are located, so why has this caused such a problem to the extent that it has cost the state \$1.225 million? Why that was not budgeted for is a question that has to be asked and it is another question that the Treasurer will need to answer in his response to the second reading debate. Another issue listed is a claimed growth in student numbers that has not been substantiated. Again, I look forward to the Treasurer’s response to that issue. There is also \$12.4 million for an increase in depreciation expenses. To me, that suggests there may have been some serious accounting problems if depreciation has not been properly looked at in the overall education budget in the past 12 months. I think the Treasurer really needs to account for that as well.

I refer to transport on page 4 of the Treasurer’s document. The budget tabled in May last year had key transport elements, such as the bus replacement initiative. That certainly is not an expansion of the bus services around the metropolitan area, but simply a replacement of the ageing fleet. For the financial year 2009–10 the government was going to spend \$49.25 million on new buses. Therefore, some of the money being spent suggests there is some planning in the transport area; however, when it comes to the TravelSmart program, which is detailed on page 4, it is quite clear that there is downgrading of whole transport initiatives. The TravelSmart program has been seen as an area that can be cut back and not funded. That is the worst kind of short termism in thinking. Really, any clear thinking person would say that initiatives like the TravelSmart program are probably amongst the most cost-effective ways we have to reduce overall budgetary impacts. When good initiatives such as TravelSmart with its various pedestrian projects are being slashed by \$146 000, already a minuscule budget, that is of great concern. Initiatives like the Perth bicycle network and country pathways already exist on minuscule budgets. However, we know that the feasibility study for Roe Highway costs about \$20 million a year. The total cost of that project, by the way, is some \$551 million. If ever there was a shortfall in the Treasurer’s budgeting, that is the sort of project that should be looked at for the necessary cuts. In the 2009–10 financial year—this current financial year—Roe Highway stage 8 had an allocation of some \$8.8 million to run various workshops, feasibility studies and community engagement plans. I have heard from people who have attended the sort of Rolls-Royce community engagement events that these are! There are many scribes and facilitators, and lots of sandwiches, teas and coffees—everything one could possibly imagine necessary to try to convince the community that the Roe Highway stage 8 project is one that will actually provide a benefit. Roe Highway stage 8 is an area in which the Treasurer could have made some serious savings rather than having to come to Parliament in this way and ask for an extra \$1.15 billion.

Bikeweek begins on Sunday, 21 March and runs until Sunday, 28 March. It is an initiative that has been neglected but one that could save us massive amounts of money in the future and could, indeed, have helped reduce the Treasurer’s \$1.15 billion problem. It is an excellent initiative. A typical stretch of road carries some 800 people an hour in vehicles; bikes can do triple that. The economic benefits of having as many people as possible switch to cycling are potentially enormous, and could make a huge difference to our budgetary situation. It is disappointing that the TravelSmart initiative has been dropped and that no effort has been made by the government to improve in other areas where serious savings could be made in the future. However, we are still lumbered with things like the Roe Highway stage 8 project.

I turn now to the housing situation on page 5 of the document. Item 53 is “First Home Owners’ Assistance”. It is a very substantial package: \$235 million. However, the fact is that the government is still mismanaging many aspects of the way in which it is tackling the housing supply crisis. Although those figures might sound useful, the reality is that there is far too much mismanagement of existing housing stock going on. In my area alone there are some 63 vacant Department of Housing properties. If each of those properties is worth around

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]

p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

\$250 000, we are talking about a total asset value of some \$16 million that is just sitting, doing nothing. It is high time that the process of reallocating Department of Housing properties was better managed to make sure that people who are waiting for public housing can be dealt with far more swiftly. In the south east area of Perth there are some 5 000 people waiting for public housing, and many of them are in desperate circumstances. Some are having to wait for as long as 80 weeks for a home; that is a totally unacceptable situation. The Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill deals with one aspect of this problem, but it does not get to the core of the problem and does not deal with other things that could be prioritised.

I now turn to page 6 of the document and I refer to item 75.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Item 75 is "National Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements (NDRRA), SES Incidents and Wildfire". It is not clear why this was unbudgeted to the tune of some \$11.4 million. Why would that not have been anticipated? It is of grave concern. It is clear that the fire risk that we are facing is becoming more and more serious. Recently, the ABC screened a documentary called *Firestorm*. That documentary, which focused on the Victorian bushfires, highlighted just how severe and dangerous our fire risk is becoming. That risk is, no doubt, being exacerbated by our drying climate, and the severe storm and wind events that we get, combined with extremely hot days. It is disappointing that the budget that was presented to us in May did not allow for—did not even anticipate—the fact that FESA would need this additional funding.

I turn now to another item on page 6 of the Treasurer's document—that is, planning. I am pleased that the government is making some headway in improving aspects of the planning process. But the fact that the Department of Planning is seeking additional funding of \$749 000, when it is not tackling some recurring problems to do with the development of towns and urban areas, is of concern. I notice that the program to develop the Planning and Transport Research Centre has been dropped entirely. I should correct that. I am not certain that it has been dropped entirely. However, the funding for that centre has been reduced by \$140 000. That program has the capacity to deliver on some of the problems that people in my electorate are having to suffer. One problem is the existence of empty, derelict and shabby buildings, in which unsavoury people like to congregate. Another problem is landowners who refuse to develop their land. That is causing a problem for the reputation of the Gosnells area. Lissiman Street in Gosnells is in some way the window that people see Gosnells through as they pass through that area on the train. Some of the land on that street is in serious need of redevelopment and is potentially very valuable, but the owner of that land, Mr John Farano, is refusing to develop that land. We need to ensure that when it comes to wonderful assets such as Gosnells Train Station, and other pieces of infrastructure that taxpayers and the community have put an enormous amount of money into, those last little pieces of the jigsaw are developed and made to deliver the best possible outcome for the community as a whole. That is the sort of thing that the Planning and Transport Research Centre might have been able to assist with. Therefore, it is very disappointing that the funding for that program has been slashed.

I turn now to page 10 of the Treasurer's document, which deals with the Office of Energy. It is my understanding that there has been some restructuring at the Office of Energy. The Sustainable Energy Development Office has been absorbed into the Office of Energy. The amount of \$818 000 that is listed on page 10 is for the implementation of the recommendations of the Gas Supply and Emergency Management Committee. I am not sure what the Gas Supply and Emergency Management Committee and its recommendations will achieve for householders. I imagine that it is very important for the companies that supply gas from our various gas fields to the metropolitan area. Given the shambles that people are facing with their billing from Synergy, the increase in electricity prices and the forecast increase in gas prices, it appears that the government has placed too much emphasis on just one area of the energy portfolio for which it has provided extra funding. The government has missed the real game, which is to help our fellow Western Australians deal with the issue of rising energy prices.

I will quickly touch on a number of other areas that relate to the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill. I have noticed that there is no mention in the bill of the savings the Treasurer is hoping to achieve from the \$200 seniors' security rebate. That program has been barely promoted at all. Funding was allocated for it but it is reasonable to assume that the program has been undersubscribed. That saving should be represented in these documents. A characteristic of the delivery of the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill is that there are too many missing elements. There is \$210 million missing for health funding, and many other elements are missing. The lack of detail and information in the bill and its failure to acknowledge where savings probably will be made in various programs lets us all down. The \$200 seniors' security rebate is an excellent scheme that the

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

government should be promoting. The government should not defer it so that there will be an eventual saving later on.

I refer now to the different government benefits and the potential for the government to combine various concession cards and schemes that have been quite popular in the past. Eligible people can get discounts on bus and train fares, local government rates, electricity supply charges, water supply charges, a driver's licence and spectacles and they can get the seniors' security rebate, the seniors' cost of living rebate, the taxi user subsidy, the secondary assistance scheme and concessional TAFE rates. It has been suggested that those rebates might be combined into a single rebate, which could mean that many people would miss out on accessing different concessions and rebates. That is a saving that the government is keeping up its sleeve. It is not being up-front about how that would impact on this budget. I am concerned about that approach because those concessions need to be promoted and must be accessible to as many people as possible. Unfortunately, it seems that the Barnett government is planning to combine all those schemes into a single grant that would then be applied for, but the eligible people would access a much smaller amount.

I reiterate that the government's priorities, as demonstrated by the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill, are wrong in many areas. The subsidies provided to big industry, which I outlined earlier when I talked about the Oakajee project, are totally unnecessary. We do not need to subsidise big corporations. Meanwhile, the government is removing funding for the lower income earners, which is unacceptable. I have grave concerns about many aspects of this bill because some important information has been left out.

**MRS C.A. MARTIN (Kimberley)** [7.29 pm]: I rise to add my comments to the debate on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. My comments will not be very pretty, so be prepared. I have read the second reading speech. This will probably be the most important piece of legislation to go through this week—it amounts to \$1.5 billion. That is a lot of money. It is a huge responsibility on everybody in this house. We are not talking about peanuts here. We are talking about over 1 000 million dollars. That is a lot of money. Where is the man who is responsible? Where is he? Yoo-hoo! It is not "Where's Wally?"; it is where's the Treasurer?

It is important that, firstly, the Treasurer be here to answer a couple of questions I have. This bill does not give me the information that I require to make a decision. We are not doing *Deal or No Deal*. Let us have a look at this one—the health budget has blown out by blah blah. Did those numbers not cost a man his career? Is this not serious? Where is this man? Where is he to answer these questions? When I see a public servant kicked in the guts for no good reason, I want somebody to answer for it. Public servants are not there to be kicked in the guts, they are there to do a job. When they ask "the man" for some dough, what does he do? He argues with them and belittles them. I have been waiting a while to put this on the record—I think it is wrong. It is the wrong thing to do to people, especially when they are expected to run a huge government department.

We are \$210 million out with the health budget. It is horrible; it is a terrible thing. These things happen but we do not have to go and blame other people. We can see where it happens. We are not stupid. There is this thing called a global climate, and we are actually caught in it. We do not need to go and blame people for it. I am really concerned that we are talking about all this money and there is nobody here—sorry, present company excluded.

Let us have a look at it. The health figures do not add up; we know that. That is a "no deal". The federal government extended the first home owner grant, blah blah. We accept that; that is okay. Even I can come at that. That is a deal. The Department of Education has an increased number of students. Is that not a matter we deal with through a number of agencies to tell us about population growth? These kids were not born this year, they were born five years ago so they could enter the system. Surely we had them on record somewhere. Maybe that is a "no deal".

Then of course we look at Oakajee. We say we are not spending any money on it but there is a line item here, is there not? Maybe I should get my eyes tested! I am sure it says "Oakajee Rail and Port Project—\$7.360 million". There is a line item. Anyway, that is a "no deal" because there is not enough information to make a decision. You guys are meant to be in government to give information, are you not, so that we can make informed decisions to support good government policy? But if we do not get the information, we cannot make informed decisions. No deal. What is the next one?

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You've got to go "no deal".

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Back off! I am not here to entertain the minister. This is very serious. It is no deal. Of course we also have here the Browse project. It is a great project. Maybe we did not think it was going to come online this year. We have been waiting 47 years or something like that.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Is that all?

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Back off! I do not see any information here about the Ord. That is because the federal government has paid for it!

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Has it?

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Yes, most of it. I am really crabby because the Treasurer is not here to answer a couple of really simple questions.

I come now to “Fleet Savings” under “State Development” in the Treasurer’s document. In other words, do public servants walk now? That is okay. I can handle it. It is good for their health and I understand that. The problem is that the Treasurer is not here to answer the question.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** That can be done in consideration in detail.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I want to be able to make an informed decision.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** He is not allowed to interject.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Has he been locked out? Is the Leader of the House being nasty to the Treasurer again? That is so bad. He has been so good lately.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Who?

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** He has been very caring.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** He is. He likes you.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I am really scared now; he is frightening me!

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** I like you as well.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Really! I am terrified! I need counselling. Do not like me—fear me.

This is not about consideration in detail. We should have this information. We should not have just this document I have in my hand.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** That is all we had when you were in government.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** We are building a bridge and new relationships now. We are mates, mate, aren’t we?

Several members interjected.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Yes, we will build a bridge. I have been to Bunnings and I have got the material. We will build a bridge and we will walk over it together. Okay?

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Yes, okay.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Who cares? We do not have enough information. We are supposed to be here to contribute to the debate so that all perspectives are recorded. That is our job as MPs, is it not? The Minister for Police can answer that.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Do you know that you are never satisfied?

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I will not answer that.

I refer to the allocation of \$1.8 million for “National Partnership – Indigenous Economic Participation” under “Indigenous Affairs”. It is a lot of money. It is most of the \$2 million that we are asking for, but there is no other detail, and that is a problem for me. It is an area that I am really interested in.

In going through this document I find that the Weaber Plains flood mitigation project has finally been given an allocation. However, I thought that was to be funded out of royalties for regions. It was not a campaign pledge, but it is listed in this document.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** It is all the money needed by the Treasurer.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** It is under a different category, which means that it is a dog’s dinner.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** No, no.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** The Kimberley Development Commission does not come under royalties for regions. I am saying that there are things in this document that should not be in it; for example, “Recashflow of Election Commitments”. The government did not even get that right. Should it not be budgeted for and sorted out before the government makes a promise? The government did not know what it was doing.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You had a TA every year you were in government.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** The Leader of the House should not start on me, because he knows I get nasty and I know that he does not want to see that.

I refer now to the subsidy for North West Shelf Shipping. The allocation is for only \$500 000. I thought it was meant to be more than that. Is it not a new contract? I am just asking, but I am not getting any answers. I will keep putting it on the record, because obviously I will not get any answers.

There is something good in this document. The Minister for Police knows how I always interject about the police station in Fitzroy Crossing.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Do you?

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Guess what? Yes! What can I say?

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Is that not good news?

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I will say, “Thank you”. It rolled off my tongue. Did the minister notice that?

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You said it beautifully.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Thank you. Now can we have one at Oombulgurri? I am just asking. I asked the Minister for Police at every opportunity I had for a police station at Fitzroy and we have got it now. Can we have one at Oombulgurri? One at Forest River would be great.

I am now looking at racing and gaming on page 6. We have had a lot of action up my way with racing and gaming, especially with liquor bans. I have looked through all the documents, particularly under health, and there is nothing about mental health or how to deal with addiction. When people’s supply of alcohol is cut off they go through withdrawal symptoms. It is a physiological effect to suffer withdrawal systems after ceasing to take drugs; in this case, alcohol. I cannot see where there has been increased funding to assist people with alcohol addiction. No matter where I look, I cannot find it; not even in mental health. We now have a minister dedicated to mental health, but we do not support him. There is no money for mental health. I keep shaking these documents and nothing falls out—no cheques; nothing. I have been checking everywhere. I will not keep checking; I will go through my area and talk about what I need to put on the record. I am giving my colleagues warning that I will not take all the time that I have been given.

Another issue is bereavement assistance, which comes under child protection on page 9 of the document entitled “Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill 2010, Details of Excesses and New Items for the 2009–10 Financial Year”. The government took that money away and then it had to give it back. How bad is that? That is really nasty. Even on my worst day, I would not do something like that. I could not find anything about Redress WA. I wanted to have a go at the government about it, but there is nothing in any of the documentation. The government took away that money. That is very bad.

I turn now to health. I have already mentioned that poor fellow’s career being on the line, which is terrible. Kim Snowball is now the boss of the Department of Health. He understands country issues because he was the head of country health for ages. He is a good bloke. However, what a horrible way to get a promotion what with the Treasurer picking on the previous bloke to the point that he left.

I have had a good look at the bill and the documents provided by the Treasurer. We have not been given enough information. When we go into consideration in detail, I guarantee that the government will use guillotine motions here and there. However, that will not work. We want information. We should have been given more information in the first place. Apart from the money sought in the budget, this bill seeks authorisation for one of the biggest amounts of money ever sought in this place. It is very important. The government needs cash flow to govern and this bill will allow that.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You’ve had more information this year than we ever had in opposition.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** This is the second largest amount ever called for. The largest amount was called for last year. Is it any wonder that someone like me is concerned? As I have said, I have to represent my electorate. The people in my electorate want to know where their taxpayers' money is going and they want to know where the royalties for regions money is going. It is important that we know. There is an expectation that the Liberal–National government will be a responsible government—I believe that members opposite are attempting to be responsible in government—and that they will give us information so that we can make informed decisions, not ill-informed decisions. When we were in government, we gave the opposition information because we were nice—some days!

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** I think we will disagree on that!

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I beg your pardon. I never used to pick on you!

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** What I am saying is that there is more —

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** We used to be smoking buddies before we gave up.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Yes, in the bad old days! We have given more information than we received in opposition.

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** Excuse me!

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I was talking to him.

**Mrs C.A. MARTIN:** I do not care, baby. The member should not use that term in the chamber. It is unparliamentary—unless I say it or unless I am heckling!

Before I sit down, I want to put on the record that we have not been given enough information. The second reading speech is not up to scratch. The bill is fine. The document provided by the Treasurer is a dog's dinner; it does not provide enough information. There is some good stuff in it, I admit that. However, there is no mention of the Ord. I did look, but I am pretty sure there is no mention of the Ord because the federal government is paying for it. If I am wrong, please let me know. I would like to be proved wrong. The government cannot say it is in the budget, because it has not been around that long.

**MR P.B. WATSON (Albany)** [7.44 pm]: It gives me great pleasure to talk about the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. I refer to the member for Vasse's speech as it appears in *Hansard* on 27 November 2007. It reads —

The reason that appropriation bills need to be continually brought before the house for scrutiny is that it enables us to expose the Treasurer's complete inability to control the rampant growth in government spending in Western Australia. It is a huge issue.

That was stated by Troy Buswell on 27 November 2007 when he was commenting on a bill involving expenditure of \$342 million. Mr Buswell is now asking for three times that amount.

Let us look at all the different decisions that have been made about authorising this extra money. I could understand the state government asking for extra money if it was not putting up taxes on the ordinary person in the street. Water bills have gone up, power bills have gone up and gas bills have gone up. All these things are going up, yet the government is still asking for \$1.15 billion, which is the second largest amount ever asked for. I could also understand it if the government was delivering on services, but it is not delivering on services—not in regional areas, not in my electorate.

I will look at the figures for health, otherwise people will say that I am not talking about what is actually happening. We see that the amount for the Albany Regional Hospital has blown out by \$33 million, so that is an extra \$33 million on top of the \$135 million. That is an increase of one-third. When we went to the election, Labor said that the cost of the hospital would be \$160 million-odd, but the Liberal Party said no, and it put forward an amount of \$135 million. I can understand that the Liberals put forward that amount of \$135 million, and I can see where they budgeted for it. However, I then look at another item under the Department of Treasury and Finance, and that is royalties for regions. It was said that the hospital in Albany would cost \$135 million. The Treasurer said, "Okay; we have to give them something from royalties for regions." So he took \$30 million from the hospital and gave it to the royalties for regions fund, and royalties for regions gave it back. To me, the people of Albany have been ripped off for \$30 million. Originally, the Liberal Party said that it would allocate \$135 million for the hospital. What did it do? It gave \$30 million to royalties for regions, and \$30 million came back. When we look further on, there was \$20 million for delivery of services. The amount for the Albany gas



**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]

p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

pipeline was going to be \$20 million. So what did the Treasurer do? He said, "Okay; I'll give \$20 million to royalties for regions", and now, in the out years, royalties for regions is paying for the gas pipeline. That is another \$20 million for which the people of my electorate have been ripped off. I think people in regional areas are noting this.

Royalties for regions is a tremendous concept, but we do not want to be ripped off. There is \$50 million on just two projects. The Treasurer is asking for \$1.15 billion. He has increased the water charges of the seniors and everyone else in Albany, as well as their gas charges and their electricity charges. He has not given the seniors the rebate that they were promised. Both the Treasurer and the Premier have egos that are probably bigger than this chamber. They do not pay the seniors, they raise all their service fees, and then they say, "Oh, we've got a surplus. It's a very small surplus, but we've got a surplus." It is just shifting the chairs on the *Titanic*.

I will deal with the police. We are looking at new police stations in Fitzroy Crossing and Mt Magnet, where there is a change in capital. These and most of the other things are predominantly up north. Royalties for regions money is going up north, and most of the government money for hospitals is going up north, apart from that for Princess Margaret Hospital for Children. There is nothing for down south, unless it is for the Bunbury region. We can look at where all the money is going. I know that the National Party wants to win seats up north, and it wants to win upper house seats, but I do not think the people in my electorate and in the Great Southern should miss out on that money.

When I look also at culture and the arts, I see that money is going to the Art Gallery of Western Australia, the Western Australian Museum and the Library Board of Western Australia. Western Australia has a writing award that is very popular—the Premier's Award. There is also a Premier's Award in New South Wales and in Victoria. When we were in government, we increased the scope of that award and made it available throughout Asia. I believe that was a mistake and it has now changed, but people from the eastern states can be nominated for this award. That is fair enough for New South Wales and Victoria, but Western Australian writers and artists do not have the same sorts of connections as the people over east have. I believe that if we are to have an award like that in an isolated area like Western Australia, the money should go to Western Australian authors.

I note that a small amount of money has been put aside for hospital workers, but where is it going? Is it going to the lowest paid workers? These people have been awarded something like an extra 46c an hour. I am sure that if the Treasurer or the Premier went to hospital, they would want the best treatment in the world. If they had a child with special difficulties at school, they would want someone there to look after the child. The same thing happens in regional schools as happens in city schools. The people who do the hardest job in the school looking after special-needs children probably work harder than teachers during their working day, although they probably do not do work after school. I am not having a go at teachers here. I believe these people are the lowest paid workers and the government is being mean. People in my electorate from both sides of politics now say to me, "The government is mean. They have whacked up the power bill, they have whacked up the water bill, they have whacked up the gas bill and they are not paying the seniors." There is a very large group of seniors in my electorate and they are very vocal. They have been coming in to see me asking, "When are we getting the money from the government? They promised it, they promised it and they promised it." I have said that they will probably have to wait until after the budget comes out because, as I said before, the only priorities of this Treasurer and this Premier are the AAA rating and a budget that goes into surplus. They are not worried about the person in the street. They are not worried about Mrs Jones who lives at Lockyer. They are not worried about Mr Murray who lives at Centennial Park. They are not worried about these people; they are only worried about their egos.

This bill asks for \$1.15 billion, I will be going back to my electorate and saying, "They've whacked up all your taxes; they've done all this. Now they want \$1.15 billion more." What will the government do with it? Why have we got into this situation? Why is Parliament being asked for approval to give the government the second-largest ever ask for money?

As I said, there is a lot of money for royalties for regions—\$60 million—but where is it going? There is nothing in the bill to say where it is going. The National Party will have its conference in Albany the weekend after next. It will be interesting to see whether the sponsors who give a lot of money to the National Party come to Albany. I will go along to have a look and to take photographs of who is there just to check when all the contracts come out from the National Party whether these people paying a large amount of money to attend their conference get any special favours. It will be interesting to see whether people from Monsanto are there. I am sure that if they are there, they will probably not make much noise, but I am sure the member for Collie—Preston and I will be able to find them in the crowd.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr M.P. Murray:** I'll probably spell it backwards so no-one will notice!

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** Yes. We know what they look like because they have an aura about them; it is called poison that comes out of their skin! It is caused by too much time spent near very bad chemicals, member for Collie–Preston.

Other items within the Treasury and Finance area are the Sports Centre Trust and operating costs for the new athletics and basketball stadium, which I think is tremendous. I know that the member for Balcatta had a lot to do with the new athletics and basketball stadium. I do not care who did it; it is a win for WA sport. I brought this point up from the inception of that project: they have the finishing line in the wrong spot! As usual, they are looking after the namby-pamby sprinters so that they can run with the breeze. The real athletes, the distance runners, are disadvantaged once again. I brought up the fact that they have located the grandstand on the wrong side of the stadium, and the member for Kingsley, the athlete from across the chamber, prepared a very good report on sport in regional Western Australia when she was working in another job. It is a great stadium and I am glad to see that money is going towards that project; however, not enough consultation occurred with people from the athletics world.

I could go on all night about some of the things here.

**Mr J.M. Francis** interjected.

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** I am sure that the member for Jandakot will get up to speak in the debate. He will have plenty of time to give his opinion. It will be good if members opposite get up and talk about how proud they are of a Treasurer who has to come to Parliament to get authorisation for the second-largest amount of money advanced to any Treasurer. Can members guess who beat him? And I hear he does that quite often—beating himself at the things he does! I am sure members opposite are happy with the increased price of gas, with seniors not getting their rebates and about increasing power bills. I am sure the members opposite will get out in their electorates and say that they are really proud of their Treasurer. This Treasurer will be remembered for one thing only—or he might surpass himself and go down as WA's worst Treasurer. He might even get an Australian gong for the worst Treasurer ever. I am sure that the member for Scarborough, and the member for Jandakot, who was so keen to interject, will get up and talk about the great job that the worst Treasurer in the world has done! I used to say that Eric Ripper was the best Treasurer in the world. He left this government with a surplus. We now have the worst Treasurer in the world coming with cap in hand to the Parliament asking for \$1.15 billion.

**MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston)** [7.57 pm]: I rise tonight to speak on this bill and to criticise it right from the start.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** No!

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** Is that a surprise? No, not at all! I am referring to how this government came into power in the first place. From the start, members opposite went around the countryside promising the world without budgeting for any of it. That is now evident and it is causing the government problems of its own. Members opposite went to the electors—I will use my electorate as an example, and I have spoken on a few of these things previously—with election promises to the tune of over \$50 million. They are now saying, "Oh, sorry, what we meant was ..." That just shows that the system that was in place was not working. If the Liberal Party had done its homework and some forward estimates, this budget would not be in the trouble it is in now. That was their biggest mistake.

I take my hat off to the former Premier, Geoff Gallop. Every election promise that he made was costed and budgeted. Members of the Labor Party were not allowed to make even little promises of \$2 000, \$3 000, \$5 000 or \$10 000 or they would have been roasted by Geoff Gallop. Here we have a different Premier and a different government that is hanging on by the skin of its teeth, handing money out with one hand and borrowing with the other to keep the books in the black. That never would have happened under Geoff Gallop and the then Treasurer, Eric Ripper. That shows a very big failing of the Liberal Party.

If we look at Collie, we see that \$20 million has been allocated in the forward estimates over the next couple of years to do up the Coalfields Highway, one of the busiest roads in the South West. That road is used by over 50 buses that come up from Bunbury and the surrounding areas each morning. Those buses take some of the traffic off that dangerous road. Those buses are mixed in with ordinary commuters' cars and people who are working on the sites in that area, along with large wide loads carrying construction machinery and steel that is being transported to the Worsley site, which employs 2 000 workers. Imagine the logistics of getting people up and down a road that was built for one-quarter of the traffic that is on it now. The government has withdrawn money

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

from the forward estimates, which means it was budgeted for; money that it promised during the election campaign. The Premier even got his photo on the front page of the *Collie Mail* while he was making his promise.

Why is the government asking for extra money? Why is the government trying to keep its budget in the black through, in some cases, deviant means? I can understand why there is a \$200 million problem with the existing budget and why the Treasurer could not add up. The real reason is because he did not have to before. He just went out and said that people could have this and that. When he had to add things up, it was a bit like what happens when my kids do the budgeting. If they scrimp and save and make sure they get an extra 50 bucks out of my pocket, they will. That is what the Treasurer is doing in such a childish way. I am sorry about that. We should not forget that the general community is not that silly. It is watching. The Premier and now the Treasurer have displayed these failings for the second time. Who could forget the canal issue? That was just embarrassing. It was one of those times when we wanted to turn the television off because we felt embarrassed for the person involved; not because of our political alliance but because of the way that it was handled. When we stand up and say that something is not right, it is certainly a problem within the Liberal Party, which tells itself it is the great white hope of our finances. It thinks it is a great big know it all, born to rule group. It says it will make this state better for us. Members should look at what has happened. We have seen higher electricity prices, higher water prices, higher gas prices and higher prices for fishing licences, one of my favourite subjects. Added to those things, as will be debated tomorrow, kids will be taxed to make the budget balance.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Collie–Preston, I do not want to stop you during your speech but I know that in this place we are talking about the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. I would ask you to craft your remarks around that bill.

*Point of Order*

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** Page 2 of the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill refers to revised recreational fishing arrangements, and there is money available for that. Is it not possible for the member to speak about that?

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I ask the member to resume his speech.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I stand confused by the advice I get from all sides. This is about tax, raising money and asking for an advance of money, and it is all wrapped up in the same bill. The tax that is being applied to 16-year-old and younger kids is an unfair and unjust tax. It concerns me that the government would stoop that low and put children in real danger of breaking the law and having a record because they had not paid tax. That is where I am really coming from.

Time is a bit short tonight and others want to speak. When we look at how the government has gone about trying to save money or balance the books, it is very disappointing to see another \$20 million from my electorate moved into the Great Southern without any consultation with the local community. The \$20 million for the Greenbushes–Bunbury railway line has now gone to the Avon–Albany railway line, so I suppose some might be happy, but not all. When we see that money being shuffled around without any consultation with the community, and then the Treasurer coming into this place and asking for more money, something is not right. Something in the whole system is just a little bit askew when the Treasurer is shifting money but still asking for more money as an advance. Either something in the system is not working or not all the truth has been told. We will find out when the budget is brought down and we ask questions in the estimates committee hearings to try to find out not only why election promises have been broken and not paid for, but also why money has been transferred to other areas and yet the government is still short of money. That means to me that the budget is in far greater trouble than we have heard openly in this place. I would ask the Treasurer, when he gets down to the nitty-gritty of it, to explain some of those issues—for example, the \$40 million. I am sure it is happening in many non-Liberal and non-National Party electorates such as mine, because I believe a biased and unfair system is happening here and that people on the other side of the political fence are not getting their share or are having a lot of money taken off them. We have seen that in other areas as well.

When we talk about people who are being hard hit, we can start with Greenbushes down the line to Donnybrook, across to Boyanup and down to Bunbury. It is a shame that the member for Bunbury has just left the chamber, because there is a problem in Bunbury. The government is putting in a ring-road that will be half a ring-road because there is no money. I do not see the Treasurer's advance being anywhere near enough to be able to pick up those shortfalls, such as the Bunbury ring-road, the railway lines in the Wheatbelt and all those things. There is nowhere near enough money to be able to cover them. Those people who are doing it tough in the Wheatbelt will also be looking very closely at the budget, not just for handouts, because that is not what they are after, but

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

for infrastructure. Infrastructure projects in those areas have been cancelled. Some people in the Speaker's electorate will be feeling the pinch, so they will be looking to make sure that some of the projects and some of the work that needs to be done in that area are done and that all the money is not just squandered, as I see in some ways, on Taj Mahal-like plans and promises, such as the foreshore and such things that have not been budgeted for. That money is not in the forward estimates. The money question is not just about the appropriation bill; it is about projects that have been announced without any money attached to them. Where will that money come from? Will it come out of the Treasurer's advance? I do not think so. This bill allows only a forward payment so that the state can keep running and not get into the red, which is something we really do not want to happen. No matter which side of politics we are on, we do not want to see a budget go into the red.

Let us have a look at where we can make cuts so that we do not have to borrow madly into the future, because others will have to pay for that borrowing. It means that in the future the state may lose its AAA credit rating and pay for it in a different way because interest rates will increase. They are the sorts of issues that concern me. They are moneys that should have been put aside for new regional saleyards. It is my belief that the moneys from the sale of the Midland saleyards has now gone into general revenue. As I said earlier, the Speaker will be very disappointed when he puts his hand out for money for saleyards in his district and finds that money has gone into general revenue. If the government is to honour its promises and provide new saleyards, it will mean borrowing again. The Western Australian Farmers Federation and other members of the farming community are very concerned about where that \$50-odd million went. It is not hard to guess when we see what money has been taken out and moved around in the budget so that it will balance and avoid these borrowings being any higher than they are today. Although some members may think my remarks a little off the track, they have certainly been about the Treasurer's attitude to the state's borrowings and its ability to pay for the bills that have been run up already. When he is shown to have made a \$200 million mistake —

**Mr M. McGowan:** It's \$210 million.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I was rounding it off, but we can throw in the extra \$10 million. It was a \$210 million mistake against what should have been a quite simple project. While being initially complex, by the time the budget papers got to the Treasurer he should have been able to recognise the mistake. It is no better than the situation in the lead-up to the 2005 election when the Premier stood on the steps of Parliament House and said to the media about a mistake in his calculations, "No, no, you're wrong", but a reporter was able to find the mistake within two minutes. That situation was exactly the same as the one facing the Treasurer on this occasion.

Another issue is the limit on funding from the forward borrowings to organisations such as the Forest Products Commission. Two hundred jobs will be cut from country areas and not one mention from members opposite about it. Not one bit of concern has been shown from any country member on the other side of the house, let alone city members. When 20 jobs are taken out of a country town that has only a small population it hurts the community and makes the viability of the smaller communities very tenuous. It can mean the loss of a school teacher or a postmaster, and those sorts of losses can cause the collapse of a whole community. Once that reaches a critical mass people wander, and off they go because they want the best for their kids. Unfortunately, that is what can happen due to bad management and borrowings that will cost more in the long run and we will not be able to keep projects on track. That all comes back to what we call a very, very average Treasurer.

**MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Mindarie)** [8.13 pm]: I too rise to speak on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill to raise my concerns about some of its provisions, some of which are philosophically driven. I refer to those areas set out on page 8 of the detail supplied by the Treasurer dealing with the Department of the Attorney General. I note that, although there had been ample warning of a shortfall in the coroner's budget, there is a further allocation here of \$822 000. However, from the reports coming out of the coroner's office, it does not even begin to scratch the surface in solving the problems attached to discharging the workload in that office. The coroner investigates not only sudden and unexplained deaths but also fires, which are massive inquests, as we have seen from the Boorabbin fire.

It has been reported that the Coroner's Court may have to cancel either 75 or 77 inquests. I will explain to the chamber the process the State Coroner undertakes. Upon the notification of a death, the coroner's office firstly investigates the death, and, secondly, makes an assessment of which of the many deaths notified to his office merit an open inquiry. In talking about the cancellation of 75 or more hearings, we are not talking about an investigation into 75 sudden deaths, we are talking about cases about which the coroner has already decided it is absolutely necessary to hold an open inquest. It is very important that these inquests occur, because some of them deal, of course, with deaths in custody, such as tragically happened in the police cells in Western Australia

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

at the weekend, and deaths in our hospital system on operating tables and in care. The purpose of these inquiries is to look into the handling and management of these departments and the systems within them, and to examine the problems publicly to prevent reoccurrence of these tragedies to other Western Australian families.

Those inquests are all being cancelled because not enough money has been allocated to the Coroner's Court. The listing for of \$822 000 for "Coroner's Court — Backlog of Files" in the "Details of Excesses and New Items for the 2009–10 Financial Year" document does not relate to these hearings that will be cancelled. It is a disgrace. Families such as the family who lost their child in the hammock at Rottneest Island when the pillar collapsed and the child was squashed cannot move on with their lives. Those poor parents; the child was only about a year older than my daughter Ruby. It is unimaginable to go away on holiday to a Western Australian facility owned by the state of Western Australia and managed by the Rottneest Island Authority, lose your child, be put in a list of pending cases at the Coroner's Court, and then to read in *The West Australian* that it will be years before they ever get to examine the circumstances of the death. It is highly possible that some 18 months or two years down the track, the family, who have been waiting to find out what led to the tragic loss of their child, will be told that the hearing will have to be cancelled because we are into another budgetary period and the Coroner's Court is starved of funds. There is not even a dedicated Coroner's Court at the moment; it used to be at the Grain Pool Building, but they do not even have a dedicated court at the Central Law Court complex. This \$822 000 is similar to Peter plugging the hole in the dyke with his finger to try to stop the leak, but there has been a systemic failure.

As I have said publicly, there should be an immediate allocation of a couple of million dollars to allow the coroner to employ outside Queen's Counsel, and for the Attorney General to appoint them as temporary coroners to clear this backlog. The Coroner's Court is not just an adjunct to justice. In fact, although we call it a court, the Coroner's Court is not a court; it exercises a function for and on behalf of the executive, for and on behalf of the ministers, for and on behalf of the Attorney General and the Minister for Police, to —

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mindarie, although I appreciate what you are saying and —

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I will wrap this little part up soon.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** The Coroner's Court exercises a function for and on behalf of the executive, for the reasons that I have previously explained. I will come down a bit further. There is an extra amount, not the budgeted amount—the shortfall—of \$2.818 million for accused's costs. This is where the police—this is not in the superior courts where the Director of Public Prosecutions prosecutes—have prosecuted in the Magistrates Court and the charges against an accused person failed, and there is a \$2.8 million shortfall in the estimates. This indicates that many charges are being brought before the courts that have not been properly vetted by the prosecutorial branch of the police force, so when the cases come before the magistrates, they are being thrown out. That is not \$2.8 million for costs for the year; it is a \$2.8 million shortfall. These are millions and millions of dollars that taxpayers are paying out for charges that are failing in the Magistrates Court. Might I say that when I was practising law, in the Magistrates Court we always thought that the success rate of the prosecution was about 98 per cent; we hardly ever won because the police always came forward with such strong briefs, in the Magistrates Court particularly, and so many people were convicted. This \$2.818 million shortfall is a colossal sum. However, what is absolutely stunning is that these are issues under consideration; these are not decisions that have been made. I stress that this is not a decision made within the Attorney General's department; this list indicates it is a cost under consideration.

What is under consideration at the moment are act-of-grace payments, but there is a shortfall of \$10.5 million. As the Attorney General recently explained to the chamber in answer to a question I asked about why the government has not compensated the widow of Mr Ward, members might recall that the Attorney General said it is not compensation that we will pay to Mrs Ward; it is an act-of-grace payment like that we paid to Andrew Mallard. I thought Andrew Mallard's payment would have been one of the larger payments and that was \$2.25 million. However, these are issues under consideration; that is, the current matters the Attorney General has before him for ex gratia applications are \$10.5 million. These are matters whereby the state has left itself liable by its actions to compensate the citizen.

I remind the chamber that Quinns Rock Primary School, which I have mentioned before, does not have deep sewerage and has a failing septic system. The school has assets built in the 1950s, and the previous government promised \$3 million to fix it this year, but that has been cancelled. I have mentioned this in the chamber before. The school has had to bring in portaloos from time to time to relieve the burden on its failing septic system and it

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

has schoolrooms where the verandas are angled at such a rakish angle that it is a wonder that the kids do not do an anterior ligament. This school needs urgent funding but the state of Western Australia is saying that we have a shortfall in our act-of-grace payments of \$10.5 million. I read in the paper about the cost of just one such case. It is all very well for the government to get hairy chested, but it was not the current government; I am not pointing the finger at the Attorney General. Neither was it the previous Attorney General, because this case was carried by the police and the Director of Public Prosecutions. Apparently the assets of a Mr Nigel Mansfield, including his entire share portfolio, were seized by the DPP under confiscation laws. The DPP refused to give the assets back for a period of five or six years and held onto his entire share portfolio. When it was time for the croupier to say, “Gentlemen, put your cards on the table”—in other words, the Supreme Court judge said that there would be a hearing into this confiscation—the DPP confessed that it was holding only a hand of jokers and folded. It withdrew the confiscation order, leaving the state open to a compensation claim by Mr Mansfield of, as I understand it, some \$12 million; the state is arguing that it is worth only about \$6 million. The Quinns Rocks Primary School could be rebuilt with \$6 million! It is absolutely breathtaking that the state could find itself liable for this. The Attorney General could come into the chamber and tell us about this, because I am given to understand that he worked on this file when working in the confiscation section of the DPP. I am given to understand that the Attorney General, although not responsible in his capacity as Attorney General, bears some direct responsibility for this enormous exposure of the state of Western Australia to this act-of-grace payment of more than \$6 million, and a claim of up to \$12 million. This has not yet seen the light of day because the negotiations are still ongoing. I understand that Mr Mansfield has retained Mr Martin Bennett of Lavan Legal to act for him.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mindarie, I do not think I need to remind you of the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. That is what you should be debating or making points about.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Certainly. Knowing Mr Bennett’s competence and reputation in these matters, \$10.5 million is probably an underestimation of the act-of-grace payment; it will probably blow out to more than \$12 million in one case, and that case is the confiscation case that the Attorney General was working on.

I come back to the last of the matters that I want to comment on—the increase in the daily average prisoner population at a cost of \$37 million. This is not capital expenditure; this is recurrent expenditure. We have heard from the Minister for Police and particularly from the Attorney General, when talking about the exploding prison population, that there has been a drop in the crime rate. They attribute the drop in the crime rate—not so much the Attorney General, who is a bit too smart to do so, but certainly the Minister for Police—to the higher imprisonment rate. In fact, it has been pointed out by the Chief Justice of Western Australia that there has been a decline in the overall crime rate for some 10 years. It has been slowly edging down, except in the category of crimes of personal violence. What could be behind that? It is not that there was previously a Labor government and now there is a Liberal government. The Chief Justice, in an opinion piece published in *The West Australian* late last year, identified it and nailed it. What has made our streets more dangerous and our youth more violent is the prevalence of amphetamines, in particular synthetic amphetamines known as MDMA, which are sold as crystal amphetamine or ecstasy. Twenty years ago, when cannabis seemed to be the major drug that was used by youths, it produced its own problems in terms of mental illness, but it did not cause youths to go on the streets and rage in anger as they do when they are full of amphetamines. When youths take these amphetamines to stay awake at what I call doof–doof clubs—I think everyone knows what I mean—with this repetitive —

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I hope you’re not talking about the AC/DC concert!

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I did not go there, minister. I seek an extension, please, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Only on the grounds that you will return to the topic at hand.

[Member’s time extended.]

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I will return straight to it, Mr Speaker. The rise in amphetamine usage seems to be driving the rise in personal violence. A view abounds among some conservative politicians that there is a criminal class, and that if we keep building bigger and bigger fences until we have penned in all the criminal class, crime will disappear. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our forebears in the United Kingdom went on that sort of penal policy in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth century—and after the War of Independence in the United States, when no more criminals could be sent to the United States. Australia was colonised as a penal settlement. There simply were not enough prisons in the United Kingdom to accommodate the so-called criminal class, so they were put on hulks on the Thames and elsewhere, and it was then decided to ship them out here. That is a totally failed and discredited policy. We know

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

that criminals are not in prison because they were born into criminality. Far from it. They have taken a slide into criminality. If we are looking for a common denominator, from my experience as a criminal defence barrister for some 28 years, it is to be found in the report that the member for Pilbara referred to today, and in other reports. The overwhelming problem that these people are burdened with is mental illness. Over 60 per cent of the people in the prison system have a mental infirmity. I know that it is a conservative catchcry to say, "We are going to send them all a message by this new law and order campaign and by getting tougher and tougher on crime." Problem: the mentally ill never digest the message. I do not even think they read the paper or listen to the newscasts that broadcast the bellicose statements of the Minister for Police. They are not deterred by his threats. This is best exemplified by the debate on mandatory sentencing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Take a seat, member for Mindarie. I have heard Acting Speakers in this place read out this statement today on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. I think everybody in this place has heard it several times. I know, member for Mindarie, that you are a very enthusiastic member of this place, and I do not want to curb your enthusiasm. However, I am going to suggest to you that there is a particular bill that is before this place, and that should be the subject of debate. Although the Acting Speakers and I allow other material to be brought into this debate and used as an example of what might be necessary to make a difference to this particular bill, I will not accept, in this instance, the member continuing to talk about a range of issues. This is not an opportunity for the member to debate a range of general or public issues, except when he can definitively demonstrate that what he is talking about is absolutely relevant to this bill. If the member does not do that, I will sit him down.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I was getting to the Department of Health allocation. We do not see any extra allocation in the bill for mental health. We know that the mental health system is under particular stress and that there is a shortfall of \$37 million for this financial year. We will not drive these enormous figures down or contain the exploding costs in the corrective services area unless we deal with and put more funds into mental health. The funds being used for the increase in the daily average prisoner population should be reallocated to treat the mentally infirm. I was making a point about the cause of this exploding cost. I am sorry that I was taking so long to get to the point. I was not trying to enter into a debate on the other matter. However, on the other matter, the first relevant case involved a mental health patient who struck a public officer. That is why I am saying it is relevant. People with mental health issues do not necessarily hear the message and it is pointless to go down the path of penning up more and more people. The government will not eradicate crime until it deals with the root causes of it.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** This has nothing to do with this bill at all.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Have you even read the bill? Have you even read the Treasury estimation that got it wrong by \$270 million?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro! I have not given you the call. I formally call you for the second time today.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** This is the shortfall. We will have a budget session when we come back after the recess or in May when we go through the budget process again, and these costs will just keep on ballooning. There will be no end to this. The other capital expenditure projects will take a back seat to these ballooning costs in corrective services. There will be a measure by which we can test the effectiveness of this huge expenditure that the government is embarking upon, which amounts to \$600 million in capital expenditure for new prisons and ballooning recurrent costs. The government will not be able to hide because within another year or two we will have an empirical measure by which we can determine the rate of recidivism in the current system. We will then see whether this system is collapsing and whether we will have, time and again, shortfalls in the funding of the prison population. Therein lies the problem. That is why I said this \$37.7 million shortfall that is now being sought is very much like Peter with his finger in the dyke; the government is never going to stop this leakage until it stops the root cause of the problem and addresses the root cause of the problem. That has already been referred to by the members for Warnbro and Pilbara. They have both referred to the policy of justice reinvestment as first raised in Western Australia by His Honour the Chief Justice when he looked at the models that came out of the United States of America. Under that policy, recurrent funds are better spent on targeting mental health services to stop offenders before we incur these incredible blow-outs. We need to target specific areas where young criminals and abhorrent behaviour starts by putting services into those areas rather than coming back to this chamber to seek authority for larger and larger amounts of money to be expended for little result other than the momentary satisfaction of saying, "We have jailed more people this month than you jailed in the same month in the last term of your office." This premiership of "who can jail the most" is leading to these

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

incredible cost blow-outs. Until these issues are addressed, the government will be back in this chamber seeking more and more money to replicate failed policies from the past.

One other area that I also think is well short of the mark in terms of additional funding received is the area of Legal Aid. There is a sum sought here for "Legal Aid — Supplementary funding for Child Protection". Like the act-of-grace payments, there is no explanation given as to why these funds are sought for supplementary funding for child protection, but everyone in the law knows that the Legal Aid Commission of Western Australia is running on the smell of an oily rag. I know that Mr Speaker represents the regions and comes from the regions. There are a couple of legal practices and a good barrister in Geraldton, Mr George Giudice, but north of Geraldton there are hardly any lawyers. As we start these policies of incarcerating more and more people, citizens are entitled to some representation before the courts. There is a presumption of innocence and, even for the guilty, there are things to be said that should be taken into account when the sentence is being struck. But the Legal Aid Commission is at breaking point because of insufficient funds. It is not a service that attracts a lot of votes. We know that in the electorates people say, "The only people that look to Legal Aid are people in trouble. I am not one in trouble so let's not fund Legal Aid." It is another part of the jigsaw that has led to this massive problem in the prison population. The prison population is becoming as serious a problem in its own way as is the health budget—it is out of control and there is no end to it. There should be more funds for the Legal Aid Commission. This is an inadequate amount that is sought. There should be more funds diverted from the Department of Corrective Services back into the Legal Aid Commission. This policy of racking and stacking three to a cell, as has been —

**Mrs C.A. Martin:** Eight to a cell in Broome.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** We are going back to the nineteenth century, member.

**Mrs C.A. Martin:** They did it before, didn't they, a couple of hundred years ago and dumped them all here?

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** No, member, not a couple of hundred years ago. It was only two decades ago in America when they were pursuing the same failed policy; that is, they had to have a prison ship because there just was not enough under their three strikes and everyone goes in policy. We will be facing the same sort of situation in Western Australia.

The budget is out of control as evidenced by this Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill. The likes of this bill has never been seen before in the Western Australian Parliament and we hope it never will be seen again. If the government keep on pursuing some of these discredited and failed policies, we will see a blow-out in the budget before June and it will not be long before we have another Treasurer's advance authorisation bill before this place.

**MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn)** [8.46 pm]: I would like to pick up from where the member for Mindarie left off on the additional expenditure of \$1.15 billion that is being sought in the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010.

I have noticed over the past few days when this bill has been raised by way of questions without notice or statements in this house that the Treasurer has lampooned the opposition for its outrage to this bill. He gave the impression that we should not be outraged at or criticise what, for him, appears to be a normal request—a Treasurer's advance to tide the government over from one budget to another.

I said in this house when the additional expenditure sought by the Treasurer in the 2009 Treasurer's advance was \$1.2 billion that it is right that the opposition should express outrage. It is also right and proper that the media and every citizen in this state should express outrage. Unfortunately, the media does not follow the debate on Treasurer's advance bills with a great deal of concern because it regards it to be relatively boring. The media follows only the headline statements and not the detail of the debate. I wish they did follow the detail of the debate. If they went back to previous Treasurer's advance requests in the 2000s, they would find that in 2006 the Treasurer requested an advance of \$500 million. In 2007 there was no request for a Treasurer's advance, because there was a budget surplus and there was no need for a request for a Treasurer's advance to tide the government over from one budget to the next.

I remember very clearly the request in 2008 for \$750 million. I will repeat what I said last year in the debate on the Treasurer's advance about the outrage that was expressed by the then opposition in the 2008 debate on the Treasurer's advance bill, particularly the member who was sitting in this seat and who is now the Minister for Police. The now Minister for Police went into apoplexy over the request for \$750 million to the point that I thought he would make himself very sick because of the way in which he was expressing himself in this house.



**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]

p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

The same applied to other opposition members who contributed to that debate. It made our outrage to this bill pale into insignificance. The yelling and screaming and what appeared to be tantrums thrown by the then opposition members for the request for \$750 million in the 2008 Treasurer's advance make our criticism of this Treasurer very tame in comparison. I remind members that last year's budget and request for a Treasurer's advance and this year's budget and request for a Treasurer's advance involve serious amounts of money, particularly when they are compared with previous budgets and requests for money sought in the Parliament of Western Australia. Last year the Treasurer sought \$1.2 billion in an advance to tide the government over from one budget to the next.

When members consider the amount of money that automatically flows under the Financial Management Act—I refer to the three per cent automatic contribution that the Treasurer can expect under the Financial Management Act—last year the amount sought over and above the three per cent that automatically flows to Treasury to tide the government's expenditure over from one budget to the next was 143 per cent. This year it is not as much, because the budget is bigger and, therefore, the percentage is smaller. Nevertheless, the actual cash amount sought is only \$850 million—I say “only”, as it is less than was the case last year. The Treasurer is seeking an extraordinary amount of money. Why is such an extraordinary amount being sought? As the member for Mindarie said in his closing remarks, the Treasurer is seeking such a large amount because the budget is in a mess. One need only look at the *2009–10 Quarterly Financial Results Report* of December 2009 to see that the budget is in a mess. Under the 2009–10 figure for the six months to 31 December last year, the net operating balance was \$259 million in the negative. For the first six months of the financial year, the budget was in the red by \$259 million. Members can assume that it will be somewhere close to half a billion in the red, or above half a billion in the red, when we reach the full out year on 30 June.

The mess that the budget is in and the request that we are dealing with are despite the fact that the Treasurer slashed virtually every minister's budget. The minister whom I have a great deal to do with is the Minister for Water. I occasionally ask him the odd question and I occasionally put the odd proposition to my good friend the Minister for Water. What happened to his budget despite last year's Treasurer's advance of \$1.2 billion? His entire capital works budget was cut by one-third—nearly \$600 million—from \$1.7 billion to \$1.1 billion. Members can see the flow-on effect—pardon the pun—of the budget cuts made to the water minister's portfolio. These are the things that I have been raising in this place throughout the past nine months; that is, the cuts to infill sewerage. The entire infill sewerage program for the whole of Western Australia was cancelled, affecting virtually every member of this house who has constituents whose properties are still not connected to sewerage mains. That is the real effect of being unable to balance a budget; that is the real effect on the delivery of government services and what it means for ordinary citizens of Western Australia out there in the community every day. It means the inability to provide the sorts of services that most people take for granted. In the case of water, it was the cancellation of the infill sewerage program. That was last year.

I am absolutely positive, given the size of the Treasurer's advance of \$1.15 billion requested this year, that we will find there will be significant cuts in the budget. There will not be any minister in this chamber who will stand and confirm it, but I foreshadow that there will be further cuts to ministers' portfolios and the expenditure in ministers' portfolios in this year's budget. Why is that going to occur? Look at the size of the Treasurer's advance authorisation being sought. There is a clear indication of bad times coming up for the portfolios of all the ministers. If the water minister had \$600 million cut from his capital works program last year, with a Treasurer's advance of \$1.2 billion, what is going to be cut this year? Can more money be cut from a portfolio such as water this year, given that one-third of the entire capital works budget was cut last year? Can it be done? It may well be able to be done, but what is going to happen if that is the case? If it is not \$600 million but, rather, if another \$300 million is cancelled from the forward estimates for the water minister's capital works projects, what is going to happen? This year has been the driest year on record, and the predictions are that it will only get worse. There is a reason why that prediction is probably accurate. If we look at the modelling of the Water Corporation, the Department of Water or the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation since 1975, when some form of climate change seemed to take place here in Western Australia—for what reason, nobody really knows—we see that there has been less and less rainfall every single year. It has not gone down and then blipped back up again; it has continued to go down each year, year after year, since 1975. The nature of the climate on the western side of every continent on the planet is changing. What is happening in California, on the west coast of southern America and on the west coast of Africa is exactly what is happening in Western Australia. Those environments that are on the west coast of every continent on the planet are drying. With a drying environment, what are we seeing from this government? We have seen the cuts to the Waterwise rebate program—the most successful program that has ever been introduced in Australia to encourage people to

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

use less water. That was the subsidy program. The Speaker will remember that the government would subsidise the cost of a person putting in a bore, a rainwater tank, dual-flush toilets or low-flow shower heads—any of those things. That has completely gone. That national and internationally awarded program has been picked up by the Victorian government, which is successfully implementing it. That is the consequence of these types of budget cuts; and more of those budget cuts are coming because of what is outlined in this Treasurer's advance bill. We are therefore seeing a drying climate, but we have seen massive cuts to investment in water infrastructure, the cancellation of the infill sewerage program and the cancellation of the Waterwise rebate program. What next can be done? The government has chopped that much out of the water portfolio's budget, what else can be done? We have heard what else will be done because the Treasurer and the Minister for Water announced the other day that the Mundaring Weir upgrade will be built, owned and operated by the private sector on a 35-year lease-back deal; commonly known as a public-private partnership—a PPP.

There are sometimes good reasons for using a PPP. In fact, the District Court was constructed in a PPP program. It may well be arguable that a big stand-alone project, for example the desalination plant, could be a stand-alone private sector owned, operated and maintained plant that could be on a lease-back deal with the government in which the government could take it over if it wanted to at some time in the future. However, this program was different. It was simply normal infrastructure that happened to be a filtration plant and a pumping station. No finance company involved in PPPs would pick up just a pumping station. Why would a finance company bother doing that? Where is the money to be made out of a pumping station? A PPP like that has to be packaged with everything else in order to make it valuable. The assets have to reach a level of some value for a return on the investment that has been made. Therefore a significant amount of what would normally be Water Corporation infrastructure and assets is being pushed at the private sector—effectively privatised—through a 35-year lease-back PPP deal. That has occurred purely because the money that the previous government left the Barnett government, which was to be spent on building that project under the existing capital works budget, was cut by a \$600 million slash to the water minister's budget last year. The reason the PPP is occurring is that the minister does not have the money to do it.

The concern I have about the amount of money being sought under this Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill is that this will all happen again. It may not be the water minister's budget this time around that cops another slashing, although I think it will be; it may be another minister's budget that cops the slashing. However, if further cuts are made to the water minister's budget, because of the water minister's inability to stand up to the Treasurer and defend his own budget, we will see an unbelievably dramatic inability of the government of the day—whether it be a Liberal government or a Labor government—to tackle the future drying out of the Western Australian climate. Investment must be made and it must start now. Whichever party is in government in a few years will be in very serious difficulty unless it begins the investment program now. On top of that we will see further privatisation, probably through PPP deals, in the Water Corporation area. Some of these PPP deals will not even get off the ground because they will not be valuable to the investors themselves, which means they will fall back on government. Will the government be able to spend that money? Will the government even want to spend that money? I do not know. Until it is done—I am not talking about future generations; I am talking about when current members will still be members of this house—we will face serious difficulties in five, 10, 15 and 20 years when it comes to the availability of water in Western Australia.

I will raise one other issue with the Treasurer during consideration in detail: the *Government Mid-year Financial Projections Statement* and the comparison of the exchange rate forecasting assumptions that are always provided by Treasury. The Department of Treasury and Finance has predicted a long-run average of 81.5c to the American dollar in 2011–12 and 79c in 2012–13, and I would like to know how it came up with that modelling, given the current exchange rate and how the exchange rate has a dramatic effect on the budget of Western Australia. If that modelling is incorrect, the entire budget is out by a large way.

**MR J.N. HYDE (Perth)** [9.05 pm]: I likewise have concerns regarding the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill. I will start by discussing an item within the Treasurer's portfolio that has not been properly addressed in debate on recurrent and capital appropriations; that is, his responsibilities in regard to the Percent for Art scheme. I believe that in his role as housing minister, the Treasurer should have been talking to himself about the needs within the advance authorisation bill. He should come clean on secret plans to abolish the lauded Percent for Art scheme. That scheme has a direct cost as well as a direct benefit. My good friend the Minister for Culture and the Arts has rightly gone into print defending and sharing the views that I have on the importance of Percent for Art. I think that he shares my concerns with some of the Treasurer's statements that perhaps this police station or that public building should be exempt from Percent for Art provisions. WA has led much of the world through its Percent for Art scheme by which building projects above \$2 million allocate one per cent of the cost to an art

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

project. There are clear benefits, such as designing out crime, and social benefits of having hospitals, police stations and other places that are welcoming and inviting places not only for clients but also for the community. I directed questions on notice to the Treasurer and was most alarmed to get the response that as the Barnett government had not allocated any funding for the Square Kilometre Array radioastronomy project, it was not eligible for or required to fund a Percent for Art project.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** That will be a work of art in itself.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** I think that it would be, but as we see with the Gormleys and other artworks in remote locations the Percent for Art component can enhance the beauty of a piece of utilitarian equipment. I know that before the massive astronomy dish in Karratha was taken down and moved, it had become a tourist attraction. My concern is that the Treasurer in December put out a press release saying that the Barnett government was committing \$20 million for the SKA project on top of the already-announced \$4 million for the purchase of Boolardy station, which is located about 300 kilometres to the north east of Geraldton. If the Minister for Science and Innovation announced a \$24 million commitment and if the Minister for Housing and Works, in his role as the minister responsible for Percent for Art requirements, is not making the Minister for Science and Innovation include a Percent for Art allocation in his \$24 million contribution, that is a glaring budget omission, and it is something that is not within the Treasurer's advance authorisation when it should be. The Treasurer, wearing one of his three hats—Minister for Science and Innovation, Minister for Housing and Works, who is responsible for the Percent for Art scheme, or Treasurer—needs to say what the Percent for Art component will be. As the Minister for Culture and the Arts has mentioned, the radioastronomy observatory will be a work of art—the biggest dish site of its type in the world. Tourists and science aficionados will want to see it. Obviously, they will not be able to get up close to it. That is why the government has provided \$4 million for the purchase of Boolardy station. The government has indicated that expenses relating to accommodation and research will come out of the \$24 million that the Minister for Science and Innovation announced. As well as the capital appropriation that is needed for the site, the government also announced a commitment to a research centre in Perth to be based at the University of Western Australia, plus a centre at Geraldton. That is all bricks and mortar, and any bricks and mortar valued at over \$2 million must have a Percent for Art contribution. It is missing. The Minister for Science and Innovation, be he the Treasurer or the Minister for Housing and Works, is either fiddling and fudging the public art funding that he is responsible for or has perhaps cut the science contribution on this project and has not been upfront about it.

Last year the Treasurer said that Percent for Art projects could be reined in during 2010. These comments need to be challenged. I welcome the Minister for Culture and the Arts going on the record to defend the Percent for Art scheme. Apart from the Minister for Culture and the Arts, the Barnett government does not have an understanding of the benefits of a creative and skilful Western Australia that is derived from public art. The scheme was introduced in the 1980s and it has brought benefits throughout Western Australia. Importantly, it has shown leadership within the private sector. Most major projects of quality do not have just one per cent of the construction costs allocated to artworks but often quite more, because companies know how much these artworks enhance their developments, which also leads to better lease conditions, a smaller turnover of lessees, better client appreciation and other benefits. This is good business sense as well as social cohesion sense. Public art has clearly made WA more liveable and our economy more creative. Its inclusion in hospitals and police stations leads to better policing and health outcomes for our community.

The Square Kilometre Array project will cost \$2.5 billion. If we end up winning the bid over South Africa, most of that money will come from the federal government and research bodies. Perhaps the Minister for Science and Innovation was trying to be a little sneaky and take credit for the state when he announced a \$24 million commitment, which he should do, but he cannot have it both ways. He cannot try to claim credit for a project and then mislead the house by saying that there is no financial commitment, so there is no Percent for Art obligation. I know the Minister for Culture and the Arts cannot say that we are getting to that stage, and that is why we need a loyal opposition and perhaps the Premier needs to strip the Treasurer; Minister for Housing and Works; Minister for Science and Innovation of his responsibilities for Percent for Art within the housing and works portfolio and transfer its administration to the arts minister.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Perhaps you can get to the Treasury bill before the house at the moment.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** I am. The Leader of the House has come in rather late on an extensive intellectual discourse. Clearly, if the government has a minister that is not factoring in a Percent for Art process —

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** That has nothing to do with the bill before the house at the moment.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Of course it does.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Of course it does not.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** It covers capital appreciations, and I would detail a number of the projects of the Minister for Police. He has not asked me to be involved in the one Percent for Art contribution for the Northbridge Police Station. Has that been cut?

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You will find out at budget time. This is the Treasurer's advance.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** The minister has got to tell us now. It has started to be built already, so the minister has got to tell us out of the \$112 million if he has put the \$1.12 million on the Percent for Art.

*Point of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The Leader of the House is being disorderly. I would like you to call him to order.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** There is no point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** This has illustrated, very much on cue, why it is an important part of the advance authorisation bill, because if the Minister for Police thinks that he does not have to provide \$1.12 million of the cost of the Northbridge Police Station for Percent for Art, that is a \$1.12 million hole in the budget. Clearly, I will give further illustrations of where these aspects have not been included or articulated. I think the scar of the \$24 million commitment is a major one, because we have had the hypocrisy of the position of the Minister for Science and Innovation, Minister for Housing and Works and Treasurer all singing off a different tune sheet, despite those hats being worn by the same person.

As I was articulating, if the Minister for Science and Innovation and Treasurer is not going to support himself as the Minister for Housing and Works' having a full and frank responsibility for the Percent for Art component of his portfolio, the Premier needs to strip himself of it and transfer it to the Minister for Culture and the Arts and give it to a minister who will fully back the scheme and ensure that every minister is including, as per the policy of the state government, Percent for Art. It is very important, if we do have an open and transparent budget, that this issue be addressed.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Just before you continue, member for Perth, I will point out to you that you cannot speak to matters that are not in the bill, only things that are in the bill.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Correct. In the advance authorisation bill, in transport recurrent expenditure, is a grant saving because the government will be cutting TravelSmart. Here we have one of the most successful programs in the world for eliminating congestion on roads, ensuring sustainability and making better use of energy, which is what TravelSmart has done all over the metropolitan area and in some regional areas, and the government is cutting it by \$146 000, which is revealed in this document.

The Northbridge Police Station is not mentioned, and this is my whole point, Mr Acting Speaker—for WA Police there is a \$19.243 million re-evaluation of funding. The document mentions new police stations at Fitzroy and Mt Magnet but there is no reference to Northbridge. In the past few weeks a massive change has occurred to the works at the site of the new Northbridge Police Station. Contractors were working nearly 24 hours a day, and after intervention from others and me, because it was clearly interfering with the amenity of residents across the road and others running businesses, the pile-driving, sewerage works and reversing of trucks continuously throughout the night has ceased. We need to know from the police minister whether, at the very least, he is on top of his project, whether it has been factored in or whether it is an omission. Was he personally involved in the change to the Fitzroy and Mt Magnet Police Stations issue? Has he just accepted a piece of paper or has he perhaps made the same mistake as the Treasurer in not tabling all the papers? Will an amendment be moved next time we sit because he has not addressed the issue of the Northbridge Police Station cost overruns?

I refer now to the Western Australian Sports Centre Trust and the operating cost of the new athletics and basketball stadiums—a \$2.2 million change. It contains reference to procurement and fleet savings. The Sports Centre Trust seems to be engaging in a massive sponsorship —

**Mr R.F. Johnson** interjected.

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** The minister is talking to himself; if he wants to do that, he should go outside.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** It's the most sensible conversation I've ever had, rather than talking to you guys.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr J.N. HYDE:** Now the minister is seeking divine intervention and appealing to the heavens. He should make up his mind: Talk to himself or talk to the good Lord, but do not involve us, thanks.

I refer now to planning and 140 Williams Street, within my electorate, for which there is funding for accommodation costs. That is almost a \$1 million change in that budget. That was one of the very good proposals that was operating ahead of time and on budget. But suddenly there is a \$1 million alteration to accommodation costs, when the commitment for government offices within that building has been planned over a number of budgets. Tonight or tomorrow morning—whenever we get around to the consideration in detail stage—that is one of the issues the Treasurer will have to get information on. A further issue is culture and the arts where there is a \$1.272 million overrun in recurrent spending.

The majority of the increases appear to be for depreciation. It appears rather strange that there is a change in either the accrual system or the recording method from when the budget was brought down last year. We cannot have depreciation changes of this magnitude when, since the budget was brought down, no major capital works changes have been announced that would clearly impact on depreciation. Either the Treasurer got the budget horribly wrong last May, which means he has had to fudge by adding in more depreciation, or he has made a commitment that he is not telling us about. Again the Art Gallery and Library Board seem to be hit with procurement savings. They are issues on which I will be seeking further information in consideration in detail.

With regard to child protection, I am very concerned about the huge omission of the state's contribution to the national plan of action under which was established the National Council to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children. The Rudd government will be announcing it in May, but the states have been brought on board as partners since the last budget. Clearly, that impost must have been factored in by the Department for Child Protection, yet there is no mention of the very big impact it will have on that department's budget. When we come to the section on capital appropriations, an amount of \$388 000 is listed under "Culture and the Arts". I will be asking about this issue during consideration in detail. There is reference to Perth Theatre Trust in the amount of \$359 000, but if there has been a blow-out in the cost of the new shingles for the Art Gallery of Western Australia, that should not be deducted from Perth Theatre Trust funding. Maybe the \$1 million worth of work that is supposed to be starting in September or October will be \$1.359 million worth of work now if there has been a 40 per cent increase. The Perth Theatre Trust has been allocated nearly \$400 000 for something, and I would be delighted to be told by somebody what that is for.

The Library Board will get a lousy \$29 000 extra for something, so that might be some shelves or perhaps a way to comply with the State Records Act, which is another issue that should be covered in the Department of Health budget. The issue of those very important medical records in Derby that pertain to the stolen generation has not been resolved. There is a whole history of medical records in the Kimberley that are in storage conditions that do not comply with the State Records Act. That should have been addressed mid-budget, as it was an issue raised in November or December, but no provision has been made for it in this document.

**MS J.M. FREEMAN (Nollamara)** [9.25 pm]: I rise to speak briefly on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010. I cannot rely on being a relatively new member of Parliament any more, but this is still a relatively new process to me.

As I understand it, the Treasurer's advance exists to provide for unforeseen and extraordinary events, but from my reading of some of the debate in this place, it seems that the only extraordinary thing is the mismanagement of spending and growth. For the Treasurer to have to ask for an additional \$680.8 million to take the Treasurer's advance to \$1.15 billion seems to represent quite a massive budget overspend, whilst delivering nothing to the community I represent; in fact, the government has just delivered delays. The Alexander Drive – Reid Highway overpass, which has been promised for a period of time, seems to be not only on continual delay mode, but also on continual announcement mode, as the minister announced recently, yet again, that it would happen but he cannot tell us when. This rise in the Treasurer's advance to \$1.15 billion is being asked for, along with the three per cent cuts and efficiency dividends that were supposed to occur, but they do not seem to represent any efficiencies; they seem to represent an inefficiency dividend and delays.

After having read some of the debate on this bill, it is clear that this government inherited the lowest level of public debt on record, and the general government sector had positive financial assets of \$2.4 billion, yet this government will be taking the general government sector to net state debt of \$19.7 billion, with the highest rate of spending growth on record of 13.5 per cent last financial year. All the while, this government has cost families some \$1 500 a year. This is occurring at the same time that little to no tax relief has been delivered to the community. I was fortunate enough to sit on the tax review committee held by the previous government when a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

gathering of organisations such as retail traders, caravanners, motor vehicles vendors, and members of the Chambers of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia were crying for tax cuts that will now not be delivered by this government. The only one that we seem to have is a payroll tax cut for workers' compensation that will be gobbled up by increased premiums that have been charged through insurers by WorkCover.

**Mr A. Krsticevic** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** Order, member for Carine!

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** The Treasurer's request for this advance, coupled with his incapacity to quote to Parliament correct figures, clearly points to financial mismanagement and a budget black hole that he seems to have lost control of. It is somewhat concerning to me, and I rose to speak because it has been my experience on boards that if a chief executive officer came to us and requested such an advance, we would basically send him back to the books.

There was and there is a capacity for an advance, but this seems to be beyond what is recognised as prudent. At WorkCover, which I sat on the board of, the budget income is derived from insurers. Each year the board assesses the demands of the department, which are often set by community and government expectations. However, if that board had hit the insurers for as excessive an amount as requested in this bill, there would have been an outcry and questions about fiscal management and the board's capacity to manage the organisation. That applies equally to my experience on super boards. I have to tell members that super boards deal with billions of dollars as well, so I am not talking about insubstantial amounts of money. As members can imagine, whenever financial sector pays are increased, they are significant amounts that have to be managed on an ongoing basis because quite large increases are requested in contracts to stay on. Advertising and competition in the market are also substantial. However, the fiscal responsibility and governance of those boards could not be shirked; one simply could not say, "Well, because we've got this pool of money that's coming in at nine per cent every year from workers, and we've got it and there's no question about it, we could take a little more for admin or we could just take a bit more for that." That is not good governance. Good governance is looking at the paper clips, how spending growth happens and those sorts of things.

**Mr A. Krsticevic** interjected.

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** This is what I am talking about; it is governance. I am talking about it in terms of this bill.

I will actually wrap up my contribution now. I wanted to say that from my perspective, bringing in my experience whereby I have had to look at governance and how budgets are formed and adhered to both in government and outside government, this seems to smack of fiscal mismanagement beyond what the community would expect of a good government. The Treasurer stood in this place today and said that the opposition tells the government to spend more money and that we need to tell him where the government should not spend money. However, there are many pet projects that still do not appear in the bottom lines that come before us, and those projects are not making our suburbs safer; they are not sharing the prosperity of the boom and they place us in grave debt.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** The question is that the bill be read a second time. All those in favour say aye —

*Point of Order*

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Ordinarily at the end of a second reading debate, the relevant minister addresses the contributions that were made and makes some summing-up remarks. I thought that this would be an opportunity for the relevant minister, the Treasurer, to say a few words about the comprehensive and fulsome speeches made by the opposition. That is the ordinary convention in this place, but the Treasurer has not been in the chamber for most of the debate. I request that he come back in and do so.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** On the point of order, it may be an opportunity for a minister responsible for a bill to respond about the bill, but there is no mandatory requirement to do so. Indeed, there will be adequate opportunity for further engagement on this bill and consideration of the issues in the consideration in detail stage, if the opposition wishes to take the bill into that phase.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** On the point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I seek your clarification on the requirements of Treasury. It seems that it is generally expected that the relevant minister would respond at the

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

end of the second reading period. Once again, I think that this government, through this Treasurer, is treating this Parliament with contempt.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Further to the point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I heard the member for Carine seek the call on a number of occasions, and I thought he had the jump on the Treasurer. I thought it might be appropriate for you to see if the member for Carine wants the call.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

**MR T.R. BUSWELL (Vasse — Treasurer)** [9.34 pm] — in reply: I am pleased to close the second reading debate on this bill. I have listened in my office while massaging my crook back throughout the evening, and here in the chamber, to the various contributions to the debate. To me, the highlight—or lowlight—of irrelevance with which the opposition has dealt with this bill came from the member for Mandurah, who spent the evening swotting up on the cast of *F Troop* and wasted some 180 pages —

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** Thank you, member for Mandurah. Member for Mandurah, I call you for the first time. Do you want to keep going?

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah, I am calling you for the second time.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Mr Acting Speaker, I, of course, would never stoop to such lows—referring, as I have previously, to the opposition as the crew of *Captain Pugwash*. We have Captain Pugwash, the Leader of the Opposition; and we have Roger the cabin boy. We have all the characters over there, filling the opposition benches, but we will not talk about that.

A number of issues have been raised, some of them completely irrelevant; in fact, the vast majority of them were completely irrelevant. Before we move into consideration in detail, I want to tell members opposite that I will not be answering questions on expense items that do not appear in the Treasurer’s advance. The Treasurer’s advance is an opportunity for us to debate —

**Ms R. Saffioti:** Were meant to appear, or do not appear?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am happy to debate payouts to lackeys of the former government, member for West Swan, who received hundreds of thousands of taxpayers’ dollars.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am happy to detail all of that; in fact, I might even get special dispensation from the Speaker to table all that information, but I do not know whether I have to. I could do, if the member wants me to; no sweat.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Do the taxpayers want you to? Do you think they’re interested?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** They might.

Notwithstanding that, I will answer questions as best I can about information that is presented in the bill on matters that we have spent money on. We will not debate things that we have not spent money on because the Treasurer’s advance is not designed to appropriate money we have not spent; it is designed to appropriate money we have spent. I offer that as a word of guidance to those opposite: they can try and they can seek, but they will not find. It has been an interesting debate; there has been a lot of wasted time. I feel aggrieved, because consideration in detail is an opportunity to provide detailed information to the house. I am sincerely worried that the time available to me to do that has been curtailed by the stupidity of those opposite. However, I acknowledge that stupidity, as did the people of Western Australia when they voted in the last election. I will answer all the questions to the best of my capacity, provided they relate to the bill. I have to say that contributions to the second reading debate rarely touched on the bill. We box on in the spirit of true cooperation in the house, and I encourage those opposite to bring forward their considered questions; I am sure they will be few.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

The last point I want to make is that we have asked for \$1.15 billion, yet every member opposite—with the exception of the member for Warnbro, who made a series of sensible comments before getting a not very sensible haircut—said that the Treasurer's advance is too much, that we are asking for too much money and that it is an outrage. They then spent the vast majority of the remainder of their speeches asking me to spend more money!

**Mrs C.A. Martin:** How do you know? You were not even here!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I did not miss much, listening to the member for Pilbara. But I was listening. I have got a crook back. I was stretching and I was exercising, because I know I will be in the chair at the table for a number of hours. Let us close out the second reading and bring on the consideration in detail.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.

*Consideration in Detail*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr J.M. Francis):** Order! Members, we are dealing with the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010.

*Points of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Mr Acting Speaker, at the last sitting of this house, at the start of the second reading debate on this bill, the Treasurer circulated a document. I understand that the document that the Treasurer gave us was inaccurate. I am wondering whether the Treasurer intends to provide accurate information to members of this house.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I rule that there is no point of order.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Further to that point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, if I could just defend my position in relation to that, I have circulated that document to the one member who was deserving of it, and who came and asked me for it, that being the member for Nollamara. But if other members can present a credible case, we may be willing to provide that additional information. We have it here. I will ask the Clerks to circulate that to the members who are interested.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Mr Acting Speaker, on a further point of order, given that the —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Please take a seat for a minute, member for Cannington. I understand that the Treasurer has given an undertaking to do that. So we will move on, member for Cannington, on a further point of order.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Given that what is apparently an official document is being circulated to members of the house by the Treasurer, I ask that it be tabled.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Mr Acting Speaker, I am providing information, as has been the case every year I have been here, for members opposite to consider. That has been circulated by the Clerks. Members have an opportunity to read it. In my view, I am not sure that I have to officially table it. I have made it available for members, as I did last week, and all members can read it.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! My advice, member for Cannington —

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Further to that point of order, clearly it is inadequate if the record of the Parliament does not include this essential information, because then the people of Western Australia will not be in a position to hold the government to account for this \$1.15 billion of expenditure. Given that it is an official document and that the minister is using it as part of the debate, I do not see any reason why it should not be tabled.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Thank you, member for Cannington. My advice, and I will rule on it, is that the Treasurer is not required to table it, but he has now circulated it.

*Debate Resumed*

**Clause 1 put and passed.**

**Clause 2: Commencement —**



Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** In the Treasurer's very short second reading speech on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010, he said that at the time of the midyear review cut-off date of 20 November, the amount of additional money allocated was \$460.6 million. Under the Financial Management Act 2006, the Treasurer is able to advance three per cent of the amount appropriated in the previous financial year, which is some \$469.2 million. Without this Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill, which extends to another \$680 million, the Treasurer would have fully allocated his ability to add extra money before the end of December. By what date will the Treasurer have totally spent all the money available? I am aware that this is only an authorisation and does not mean that all the money will be spent by November; the money is simply authorised. However, it means that the Treasurer is sailing very close to the wind. When dealing with the commencement clause, which relates to the date on which the bill will be enacted, it is appropriate to have some idea of just how close to the wind we are sailing with regard to the need for the extension provided for by this bill.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** This is a pet issue for debate. The member is correct that at the time of the midyear review, the government had identified committing \$461 million under the auspices of the Treasurer's advance. That does not mean that the money had been spent by the government; it means that it had been committed. The spending would depend on cash flows, and I will not go through each one. However, I suspect that they would flow on. I will give the member an example. As of today, \$155 million of the existing Treasurer's advance has been drawn. Therefore \$314 million of the existing Treasurer's advance of \$461 million is available. That goes pretty quickly and it is pretty lumpy. The advice I have received from Treasury is that we need this bill to be passed through Parliament by the end of April to manage in a lawful and proper way the expenditure requirements of the government within the framework of the Financial Management Act and the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill. I can tell the house that as of today, \$155 million of the Treasurer's advance has actually been used and \$314 million is still available. At the time of the midyear review, \$461 million had been committed. There is a difference between the money committed and the money spent.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** I thank the Treasurer. I will pursue this matter as we are caught in a difficult situation because we are being asked to authorise another \$1.15 billion. The departments, in most part, will utilise the money that they have already been allocated in the budget. They can wait until the end of the financial year for the additional money, when they might have a problem and need a top-up that is provided for by this bill, which clearly relates to the time. I appreciate the Treasurer's answer in part that that is likely to be April. Another aspect that relates to the commencement clause is the anticipation of how much of that \$1.15 billion, which is made up of what has already been authorised plus the \$680 million in the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill, will be spent, given that last year when there was an authorised limit of \$1.2 billion, by 30 June the government had spent 95.5 per cent of that, based on the figures that I have. Does the Treasurer anticipate that 90 to 95 per cent of the full authorisation is likely to be spent by 30 June?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The nature of government spending is such that that is almost an impossible figure to give. The member is right—last year we sought and authorised a limit of \$1.2 billion, and we spent \$1.146 billion. This year we are seeking an additional \$681 million over and above that automatically generated under the Financial Management Act—that is, three per cent of last year's appropriation for general government—which is a total of \$1.15 billion. As to exactly how much of that we will spend, I cannot give the member a figure. I can say that we cannot spend any more. I am pretty sure I can say that we cannot spend any more. I will be doing everything I can, with the support of my ministerial colleagues, to make sure that we spend as little as is humanly possible. All I can tell the member is that it will not be more than \$1.15 billion; it will be less. The exact quantum will be detailed to the house at the appropriate time.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** This is my last contribution on commencement before we presumably look at the details for which this bill is authorising expenditure. As was just indicated, the total drawdown on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill last year—which goes to how quickly this money will be eaten up and therefore relates to the commencement—was \$1.146 billion out of a total authorised limit of \$1.2 billion. In fact, the Treasurer was \$54 million short of hitting the brick wall and not being able to spend any further money. It is open to the Treasurer to squeeze some money in that last stage; therefore, if the commencement is later, he might be able to deal with that problem. I am not asking the Treasurer to explain the mechanisms that may be available to hold off paying bills if it is really tight. Will it be like the situation the government had with health last year, in that the government could not authorise that extra \$70 million in health because the government simply did not have the limit; therefore, it would have been over the authorised limit of expenditure if it had allowed health to pay its bills because it had an outstanding amount of \$70 million, and \$70 million onto what the Treasurer had already drawn down would have broken the bank? Will that happen this year?

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** No.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 3: Authorisation of expenditure to make payments in respect of extraordinary or unforeseen matters or to make advances for certain purposes —**

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** My question relates to the cash injection to health. The details provided to us show a \$110 million cash injection into health this year under the capital section. I think it is outlined on page 11 of the revised —

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** “Equity Contribution”.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes. How does that compare with the Treasurer’s second reading speech in which he describes it as a \$130.5 million injection? Why is there a \$20 million difference? Is it in capital, and not expenditure, because it is a cash injection that hits a balance sheet of the agency?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The advice I have is that the capital injection for the purposes of equity was always going to be \$110 million. The balance, which was another \$20.5 million, bringing the figure up to \$130.5 million, which I mentioned, was potentially at the time for some additional capital or for some capital works.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** In the Treasurer’s second reading speech he said there is a cash injection of \$130.5 million. Should the Treasurer’s speech have said a cash injection of \$110 million plus \$20.5 million for other capital items not yet listed?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I refer the member to page 11. We have \$110 million for “Equity Contribution — Cash Injection” and we have \$1.667 million for “Princess Margaret Hospital (PMH) Emergency Power Generator”. That is all part of this. We have \$110 million and then we have \$20.5 million additional. The \$20.5 million of additional comprises the following, give or take: PMH emergency power generator, \$1.7 million, or \$1.667 million, as the member said; “Country Staff Accommodation — Stage 4”, \$6.273 million; and “PMH Fire Detection”, \$2.496 million. As I understand it there are GP super clinics at Fiona Stanley Hospital and Rockingham, which added \$20 million to the total figure. At the time of the midyear review we had \$110 million, plus the \$20.5 million that I just detailed, which is some overs and unders.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** I would like to clarify this with the Treasurer: he said there were two GP super clinics for 2009–10 and that one was at Fiona Stanley. That is a bit ambitious.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The GP super clinics are at Fiona Stanley and Rockingham. The net increase in GP super clinics was \$10 million.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** So it is the net increase.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I will run through it. This is the information I have, and it is all I have. If the member wants any more information she will have to ask the Minister for Health. The information I have is: PMH emergency power, plus \$1.7 million; country staffing accommodation, plus \$6.3 million; PMH fire detection, plus \$2.5 million; and net super clinic, plus \$10 million. That was at the time of the midyear review.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Does the Treasurer have further information on which super clinic that applies to?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** No, I am sorry, I do not.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** However, we are being asked to approve money to fund them.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** That is right; and if you want more information you can ask the Minister for Health.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** So the Treasurer is going to be like this tonight, is he ?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I am, because that is how the former Treasurer was when I was sitting on that side. I will give as much information as I have, but I can’t give any more.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Okay. My question also relates to health, and I refer to the efficiency dividend. It is listed in the midyear review that \$126.2 million is sought as the efficiency dividend for 2009–10. At page 114 of the midyear review under “Implementation of Corrective Measures”, the efficiency dividend being sought is \$126.2 million. It indicates that it is in progress. Obviously at the time of the midyear review there were question marks over whether the efficiency dividend would be met. As it will impact on the extra money that the Treasurer is requesting, would he advise us on the progress of achieving those savings of \$126.2 million?

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It is a good question. We have a situation in health in which we are asking for \$210 million of additional funding to fund recurrent spending. The extent to which that \$126.2 million of the three per cent has not been met and, therefore, is recouped by an additional \$210 million—I cannot give that detail. However, \$210 million is being sought by health arising from increased activity and costs, which it claims was greater than the outturn it expected when the 2009–10 budget was handed down. That comprises—I am talking about the \$210 million—growth in weighted patient separations of up to 1.9 per cent. The view is that this is the money required by health to meet the additional demand on its budget. I will replace the 1.9 per cent with the following figures; that is, the health costing model says that there is a price escalation of 5.3 per cent and activity increase is running—I am sorry, but I have to correct the 1.9 per cent I mentioned previously—at 2.1 per cent. That is an expense growth of 7.4 per cent over last year to be funded. That is the argument that health has presented and we have accepted—reluctantly. I do not have the detail on the extent to which some of that additional funding is being used to fund an underachievement of three per cent. Health has argued that there has been a price escalation of 5.3 per cent and an activity increase of 2.1 per cent, and therefore it needs a 7.4 per cent increase in this year's expenses over last year's expenses. That is why we have agreed to provide the additional \$210 million.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Just finishing up on health and to clarify, does the \$210 million represent an expenditure growth of 7.3 per cent in the health budget for 2009–10 compared with the 2008–09 actual figure?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** That is my advice.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Just to clarify, as part of this budget process, does the Department of Health keep the Treasurer informed of its achievement or non-achievement of the efficiency dividend; or as part of the budget discussions leading up to the May budget, and also in the regular Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee meetings, are there continued discussions about the efficiency dividend, or is that something that is now put away and not discussed on a regular basis?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The efficiency dividend was netted off the health budget appropriation for this year. Our monthly and/or bimonthly discussions pretty much focus on the health budget allocation versus the spending for this year; and the spending for this year versus the actual for last year. We assume that the three per cent efficiency dividend is now embedded into health's operation because it was reflected in a reduction in the appropriation. Again, I cannot provide the exact detail of every component of how health has achieved the three per cent dividend. I do know that health is experiencing cost pressure, and we have responded to that with a \$210 million adjustment from the Treasurer's advance.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTIERNAN:** I have a query regarding Fremantle port rail service, which appears in the budget at around \$4.5 million. I note in the Treasurer's document a deduction, a deferral of some \$2.1 million. Can the Treasurer perhaps explain what is actually happening to that service? Does it mean that the subsidy is in fact being cut for the rest of this financial year?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I thank the member for Armadale for her question. Under Fremantle port rail service the member will see a \$2.1 million reduction effectively in the subsidy, hence the issue she has raised. My advice is that the additional \$5.4 million of funding in 2009–10 has been offset by a \$2.1 million expenditure deferral.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** I am sorry; where did you get that figure of \$5.4 million?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The figure of \$5.4 million was my understanding of what the additional funding —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** What do you mean “additional funding”?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Additional funding was provided to the agency as a result of this Treasurer's advance of \$5.4 million, which was \$2.9 million for the Esperance lead and nickel clean-up and \$2.5 million for advertising reinstatement. My apologies for being perhaps a bit obscure. As part of the TAA there is \$5.4 million of additional funding. There is a \$2.1 million offset against Fremantle port rail service. That is due to lower than anticipated container movements by rail into Fremantle port.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTIERNAN:** Therefore, this is not a policy change and the same policy applies. The Treasurer is saying that the number of containers coming in by rail has effectively halved in the past six months. In 2008–09 the cost was in excess of \$4 million, and in the last budget it was \$4.5 million. Now the Treasurer is effectively halving that because the number of containers going into the port has actually halved.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** There has been a \$2.1 million expenditure deferral because of lower than anticipated container usage.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** It means the number of containers has effectively been cut in half?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am not sure that the government cut it in half.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** It is a pretty extraordinary reversal.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have been down to Fremantle and I have seen that railway, but I have not seen a sign saying “No containers”. I suspect a range of factors have impacted on the movement of containers in and out of the port. I am not privy to the reasons for that, but I do know that \$2.1 million of expenditure has been deferred because of lower container movements. I do not have information on the reason for the lowering of container movements. I did not see a sign indicating that the government was actively discouraging container movements. Perhaps it was demand.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTIERNAN:** To get the containers onto the rail requires active government agency and encouragement. In 2001 container movements had got down to about 2 per cent and the Labor government built it up to 15 per cent. I find it quite extraordinary that we expended \$4.5 million on that service between July 2008 and June 2009 and suddenly, in the past six months, there has been an absolute collapse in the number of containers that are coming into Fremantle port by rail. The economy has not gone backwards in the past six months, and I believe from the various statements the Treasurer has made that in the past six months it has been getting stronger, so one would presume that that traffic has been taken off rail and put onto road.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I can only give the member the information I have. We are not talking about the past six months; this is an anticipated full financial year impact. Obviously the trend would have established, and for reasons that would be known to the department and the minister—I am sure the member could ask the minister a pertinent and incisive question about this—there has been a reduction of container movements that resulted in a \$2.1 million expenditure deferral.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** I want one last clarification. In your view there has been no change in policy?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** My advice is there has been what Treasury love to term a parameter shift as opposed to a policy shift. That is all the information I have.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** Can the Treasurer clarify the confusion he is creating with the bits of paper he has passed around at various times with various changes? I do not know whether it is just incompetence or the Treasurer is trying to be tricky, but he circulated the Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill 2010 with a form of explanatory note, which was found to be missing \$210 million—a slight oversight! The Treasurer then delayed providing a corrected version until we started consideration in detail, and then he made some rather flippant remarks that people did not deserve a copy.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** No-one asked.

**Mr J.C. KOBELKE:** I hounded the Treasurer to get a copy so we could make some sense of it. The Treasurer then made what I thought were some rather silly comments that some members perhaps did not deserve to have a copy of it. The document was then handed to the assistants in the chamber by either the Treasurer or someone else. What was circulated to a number of members was the old, incorrect copy, which did not contain the updated amount. Those members have now sought and received that document. There is confusion about what the amount is. The Treasurer has not gone to the trouble of tabling the document so that it can be registered and so that we know which document we are dealing with. Two different copies with the same title have been circulated. One is supposedly up to date and the other one is clearly wrong, missing \$210 million of expenditure for approvals. The Treasurer may like to explain that.

The Treasurer also might like to explain why there are two different copies of his second reading speech. I had a copy of the Treasurer’s second reading speech that contained amounts that were approved prior to the midyear cut-off on 30 November. It contains some of the amounts that the Treasurer saw were likely to crystallise and costs needed to be met in the second half of the year. They were listed in the second reading speech. They were also listed in the blue. As I handed over that speech with my notes after I spoke earlier, I requested another copy of the Treasurer’s second reading speech. The copy that I have here has all those amounts of money omitted. There are two second reading speeches—one that gives amounts of money and one in which they are left out. Is it because of sheer incompetence that the Treasurer cannot get his papers right or is he trying to play some tricky

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

game to avoid being accountable for the \$1.15 billion of extra expenditure which he is seeking the Parliament to approve and which we will approve because the government has the numbers? We want to ensure that the state does not end up in a situation in which it cannot pay its bills. I think the Treasurer owes this house some degree of accountability and openness so that we know the exact amounts of money and what we are dealing with. The Treasurer may like to explain why we have this confusion over two different second reading speeches and two different copies of his notes that have different amounts of money in them.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The document that I have circulated—I have a number of copies of it before me—has the Department of Health clearly on the front page. That is the document that I just handed out. I do not know what has happened. We had it here and we handed it out. It has been checked.

In relation to the second reading speech, I gave my second reading speech in the house. It is recorded in *Hansard*.

**Mr J.C. Kobelke:** The one that is now being circulated is different. Bills and papers didn’t make it up; they must have got it from your office.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** There are obviously a lot of drafts of a second reading speech. The second reading speech is the second reading speech that is given by me. It is recorded in *Hansard*. I have checked it, and it is there. I do not know what the member is talking about.

**Mr P. Papalia:** What is the document you are holding?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The document that I am holding is the document that we handed out.

**Mr P. Papalia:** When is that going to be read?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** All members have copies of it.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have followed, boofhead, exactly the same process —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Someone put that mirror down, please!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I know about the last mating pair. You asked him to draw that cartoon.

**The SPEAKER:** Treasurer and member for Armadale!

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** You are the last person in the world who should be talking about —

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Armadale, I formally call you to order for the first time. Treasurer, I ask that you withdraw that remark that you made previously.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I respectfully withdraw that remark.

*Point of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The facts remain that I have been given a document that apparently is out of date. I simply asked the chamber staff to provide me with a copy of the document and that is the document I have been provided with. I do not care about the opinions of the Treasurer on that issue, no matter how competent he thinks he is. I simply ask in a very polite and exceedingly humble way for a corrected document to be provided to me. That does not appear to be a complex request of the Treasurer.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cannington, and for the benefit of other members in this place, arrangements are being made to circulate the document that the Treasurer has referred to since the commencement of consideration in detail. I am sure that the member for Cannington will receive that very shortly. Other members in this place who also need a copy of the same document should indicate that to the chamber staff, and we will ensure that that happens.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I just want to read from the document that I have been provided with. The reason I am doing it is that the Treasurer will not table the document and, therefore, the information will not appear in *Hansard*. I will explain the importance of this issue. When we came to do the appropriation bill for last year’s

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

Treasurer's advance authorisation, the appropriation did not reflect any of the information the Treasurer provided to us at the time of the Treasurer's advance authorisation in 2009. There was no relationship between those two documents. I asked the Treasurer during consideration in detail to explain that, and he could not. What will happen if we do not have this information included in *Hansard* is that there will be no discipline imposed on the Treasurer in his work on behalf of the taxpayers of this state. The taxpayers of this state will not be able to hold the Treasurer to account for what he brings to the Parliament, and that is an outrage. Because the Treasurer does not like accountability and is not prepared to be held to account for his statements in the media and elsewhere, I want to draw to his attention the document he circulated, which reads —

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS ...**

<b>Item 4 Delivery of services</b>	<b>\$'000</b>
<u>Decisions made</u>	
Escalation of Core business	300

The Treasurer can explain what that is all about. It then reads —

**STATE DEVELOPMENT ...**

<b>Item 12 Delivery of services</b>	<b>\$'000</b>
<u>Decisions made</u>	
Repositioning of Heritage and Community Liaison Branch	945
Ashburton North Strategic Industrial Area	500
Issues under consideration	
Browse LNG Precinct Project	12,921
Oakajee Rail and Port Project	7,360
<b>Offset By:</b>	
Grants savings	(560)
Fleet savings	(10)
Procurement Savings	(408)
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,748</b>

Then Department of Health —

<b>Item 15 Contribution to Hospital Fund</b>	<b>\$'000</b>
<u>Issues under consideration</u>	
Increased Activity and Costs	210,000

For the benefit of the taxpayers of Western Australia, I would like the Treasurer to explain what is occurring here. For the benefit of the Leader of the House, the reason that I am doing this is that the Treasurer will not table this document. I am not wasting the time of the chamber. I am simply making sure that the information provided by the Treasurer to me is in *Hansard* so that when we get the appropriation bill next year, I can actually see that the things that the Treasurer told me were going to happen have happened. If I do not do this, it is impossible to hold the government to account for its expenditure.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Keep your copy.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** With respect, that is a very intelligent interjection from the Leader of the House! It is not going to be a part of the formal records of the Parliament. This problem can be solved instantly by the Treasurer standing and tabling the document. Without the decision of the government to hide behind the procedure of the Parliament and try to prevent proper scrutiny of this \$1.15 billion, the second largest Treasurer's advance authorisation, we could cut through all this time and get it done. Otherwise we will have what happened last year, through incompetence or whatever excuse the Treasurer has, when none of the information that was provided by the Treasurer in the Treasurer's advance authorisation debate reflected the appropriation that came to the Parliament—none at all. I will continue with the document —

**Extract from Hansard**  
[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]  
p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS ...**

<b>Item 16 Delivery of services</b>	<b>\$'000</b>
<u>Decisions made</u>	
National Partnership — Indigenous Economic Participation	1,853
Supplementary Funding Deferral	665
Office of Shared Services — Deferred Roll-In	280
<b>Offset By:</b>	
Fleet Savings	(19)
Procurement Savings	(148)

...

**MINES AND PETROLEUM—ADMINISTERED (DMP)**

<b>Item 18 Delivery of services</b>	<b>\$'000</b>
<u>Issues under consideration</u>	
Provision for Mining Tenement Refunds	12,000

**FISHERIES ...**

<b>Item 20 Delivery of services</b>	<b>\$'000</b>
<u>Decisions made</u>	
Revised Recreational Fishing Arrangements	1,400
Office of Shared Services — Deferred Roll-in	48

**Mr P. Papalia:** Mr Speaker.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I had better answer, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Did you have a question or a point of order?

**Mr P. Papalia:** I was seeking the call.

**The SPEAKER:** I am presuming that the member for Cannington wants a response from the Treasurer. There is still time available.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** There is 45 minutes. I think we have allocated a finite period time for this debate, and I am happy to take calls. The member wasted a lot of time talking about FTEC.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Sit down, you wuss! You go on like an idiot in question time.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah, you have been called, I think, twice in this place today. I am, in this instance, going to suggest to you that you might like to remain silent for a while unless you want to be called for a third time. I am not interested in calling you for a third time, member for Mandurah, and I am sure that if you want to make a worthwhile contribution to this consideration in detail stage, you will. I give the call to the Treasurer.

Several members interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am happy to answer those questions, but it could take 30 to 35 minutes—it does not worry me! But before I answer those specific and well-raised questions of the member for Cannington—I am sure his colleagues appreciate him absorbing all the time. If I run out of time, I am sure one of my colleagues will pop up so that I can keep going and provide the answer. But before I do answer, I want to say that last week —

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Albany! Take a seat, Treasurer. Member for Albany, I formally call you. I do not have the sheet in front of me, but I will formally call you for the first time, at least, that I know of.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** It is the second!

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you for that correction. It must be the second time then.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am happy to talk about the electorate of Albany, which I visited the other week, and absorb more of the finite time.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Do you think this is doing more or less for your credibility?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have a finite time; I want to answer all members' questions. The member for Albany raised a couple of issues and I feel compelled to respond.

I was in Albany a few weeks ago and visited the hospital, where we committed another \$30 million to finish the project.

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Does the member not want us to spend the money?

**Mr P.B. Watson:** We said it would be \$168 million and you said, "No, no, no; it's going to be \$135 million."

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** It is a one-third blow-out under your management of the hospital development.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** Privatising it and getting rid of people's jobs; well done!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Member for Albany, I am happy to go back to Albany and test the community and ask them whether they want us to build the hospital.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** They want you to build the hospital, but they don't want 100 jobs to go.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have a finite time; members can keep talking! I am happy to talk about this all night, because when we have used up our 10 hours, we are stopping.

**Mr M. McGowan:** When will that be?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** That will be some time tomorrow, and then we will be stopping. The member for Cannington wants to talk about FTEC.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** One of your members back there is asleep!

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You've already used up eight hours!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Let us talk about the Albany hospital; the member raised it, and I think it was a useful interjection. This answer could take hours! The member for Albany raised the Albany hospital. When I was in Albany, the people said they wanted a new hospital, and they wanted to have the hospital fixed. The local member admitted in Parliament that he had failed; we have delivered. It cost \$130 million, and we went through a very lengthy procurement process, which determined that we needed some more money.

*Point of Order*

**Ms A.J.G. MacTIERNAN:** The minister has acknowledged that he is deliberately filibustering, and that he is actually talking about an issue that has not been raised by the member for Cannington. I would ask that he get back to relevant considerations.

**The SPEAKER:** I am sure the Treasurer will.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I thank the member for Armadale. She is a person who I have never known to filibuster or waste the time of the house; she is always to the point.

As is often the case during consideration in detail, while I am on my feet, a member has interjected and I am answering the interjection. I have seen it happen in this house for as long as I have been in this place.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** No; you said you were going to filibuster, and you were going to take up the time.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I did not!

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** And you were not going to answer the questions.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Carry on!

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Answer the member for Cannington's question.



Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am dealing with an interjection from the member for Albany.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** What I asked about was the money being shifted from royalties for regions. You gave the Albany Regional Hospital \$135 million, so then you take \$30 million out, give it to royalties for regions, and then they give it back to the hospital. Isn't that cost shifting? That is not royalties for regions.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** That is a very, very valid and very, very, very good question. I was down there the other week and I spoke to a lot of people in Albany. They are quite happy that we are redoing the hospital.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I'm quite happy with the hospital, too; I want to know about that \$30 million.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** We acknowledge the member failed; the member acknowledges that he failed. I am happy to go back and meet the people of Albany in a couple of weeks, and tell them that we might have to take that money away from them because the member for Albany does not want us to spend it. Does the member for Albany want me to do that; I am happy to?

**Mr P.B. Watson:** No; I want to know where the royalties for regions money is.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It is a hard job, this, Mr Speaker! So I assume that the member wants us to spend the extra money.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I want you to fulfil your election commitment. The Liberal Party said it would provide \$135 million, and it has not.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Does the member want us to spend the extra money or not?

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I just want to know what royalties for regions is; is it cost shifting? Is the government just taking \$30 million out, giving it to the National Party and then handing it back? That is what the government is doing. The government can say it is royalties for regions but it is just shifting money.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Let us put it in a —

Several members interjected.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I'll debate that with you in Albany. Come down, there are a lot of people interested in it!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am sure there are. I did not meet anyone who asked where the money is coming from; I just met people who said they want the hospital. I do not know, call me an old-fashioned hospital builder!

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You're an old-fashioned hospital builder!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Ooh, you ratbag! All I want to know is this, member for Albany: we just put another \$35 million in and the budget has now jumped up, does the member want us to spend the extra money —

**Mr P.B. Watson:** No, I am quite happy.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The member does not want us to?

**Mr P.B. Watson:** No, I am quite happy. That is why we went to the election out there —

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The second issue down there is the entertainment centre. Is the member happy with how we are going with that?

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I am.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Thank you. Are there any other issues that the member wants to raise?

**Mr P.B. Watson:** Yes; that house in Discovery Drive has caused you a bit of trouble!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** That is a very interesting —

**Mr B.J. GRYLLES:** I think the Treasurer is making some very insightful comments on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010 and I would like for him to continue.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I am nearly getting to the answers to the member for Cannington's questions, which will take me about 35 minutes. However, before I get there, Discovery Drive, member for Albany, is a very good point. I should inform the house that when I went to Albany last year the big issue down there was the men's crisis centre, which is very, very important.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr P.B. Watson:** Treasurer, I was the one who instigated getting it going.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Job well done, member for Albany! It is a shame that the member did not deliver it, but he did a good job instigating it. I take my hat off to the member!

**Mr P.B. Watson:** Unfortunately, we lost government before we got the business plan back, but go on.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I think the men’s crisis centre is a worthwhile project, and we will talk about it. We went to Albany and we met them; they are very, very good people who are very inspired to assist in the delivery of this men’s crisis centre. The member for Rockingham might want one in Rockingham. We are onto this now; it is on a bit of a roll. It is important because in Albany there was a big issue—men presented to the men’s crisis centre and there was not one. They turned up and said, “The member for Albany had a good idea but it has not eventuated. Where are we going to go?” So we met with the Department of Housing and some local community representatives and we agreed to establish the men’s crisis centre. I asked the department to find a suitable house of, I think, five bedrooms. We found one, and the member is right that it has caused some angst in the local community, but I look to the member to show leadership.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** I have; I went and organised with St Vincent de Paul to do a doorknock on Saturday morning and they had a positive result.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I think it will work out just fine. The hospital is a big tick, the entertainment centre is a big tick, and the men’s crisis centre is a big tick. None of them are in this bill but, anyway, I am just dealing with interjections.

Now, who was I dealing with? That is right, the member for Cannington. He raised a number of very, very good points and I will deal with each of them in turn in some detail to assist the member in his deliberations. The first issue the member for Cannington raised, as I recollect, was the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations, which has the sum total of \$300 000. The member referred specifically to a table headed “Item 4 Delivery of services”. The member specifically referred in that table to an item titled “Escalation of Core business”. Is that correct, member for Cannington? It was a while ago. I assume that is right judging by that sneer the member normally has. I can inform the member of the following: the \$300 000 for the escalation of core business is to enable us to effectively manage a significant increase in complaints—92 per cent above the previous year—and to meet the Ombudsman’s legislation requirements. Does that deal with the issue to the member for Cannington’s satisfaction? Does he want more detail? Just reflecting on and reconfirming that data, it is \$300 000 for item 4: delivery of services, escalation of core services. I will just repeat, member for Cannington, that it will enable us to effectively manage a significant increase in complaints—92 per cent, as I understand it, Leader of the House, above the —

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Really?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I myself read it and was stunned! It is 92 per cent above the previous year, and to meet the Ombudsman’s legislation requirements.

I think that is a tick. Is the member for Cannington happy with that one? He has only asked for another 18. The next one is the Department of State Development, known to us in government in abbreviated terms as DSD. The member for Cannington raised a number of very important issues, on which I am happy to provide additional advice in the very limited time we have available to debate this bill. The first one was an item concerning the repositioning of the heritage and community liaison branch. This is a very important issue; I sense a lot of excitement from the opposition about it. The member for Riverton is just about levitating out of his seat! For the repositioning—Premier, this could relate to the Cottesloe pylon!—of the heritage and community liaison branch, \$1.9 million has been re-cashflowed from 2008–09 to 2009–10 and 2010–11. Is the member for Cannington writing this down? Oh, my goodness.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I have a couple of questions for the Treasurer; I will certainly express them to him as cordially as I can, and hopefully gain from him some sense of what is going on here.

First of all, I might seek some advice from the Treasurer by way of interjection. I have here a copy of his second reading speech, and a copy of the revised and corrected Treasurer’s Advance Authorisation Bill document; I appreciate the fact that he has corrected it. I have copies of both; are both correct?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** Carry on.

**Extract from Hansard**  
[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]  
p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I am asking the Treasurer's advice as to whether both documents are correct. Just for the record, the Treasurer will not say that both documents are correct.

Members might like to get copies of both documents. I am looking at the first page of the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill second reading speech, and page 8 of the revised document, which deals with the Department of Corrective Services. I am a little surprised by this: in his second reading speech, the Treasurer requested, as part of the Treasurer's advance, an increase in funding for the Department of Corrective Services of \$72.3 million. That is to cater for the increase in the number of prisoners across Western Australia; we all understand that there is a big increase in the number of prisoners across Western Australia, and that we need to pay for it through the Department of Corrective Services. That is on the record in the Treasurer's second reading speech—\$72.3 million.

Of course, the second reading speech is reflected in the revised document the Treasurer provided us with; I am pleased that he has corrected it to make sure that it is accurate. On page 8 of the revised document, the amount the Treasurer is seeking for the Department of Corrective Services is \$39.5 million to cover the Treasurer's advance. In the Treasurer's second reading speech, he asked for \$72.3 million, but in the document he provided to the house, he has asked for \$39.5 million. As one goes further into that document, naturally one would assume that the remaining \$32.8 million would be contained within capital. I have been to capital; it is not in capital.

My question to the Treasurer is: why is there a \$32.8 million difference between what is contained in the second reading speech and what is contained in the document the Treasurer has provided to Parliament? How can he explain this \$32.8 million difference between these two documents, considering that he has had five days to correct the document since we discovered its inaccuracy last Thursday evening? How can he explain that?

I have not used all my time, but I seek the Treasurer's very firm and correct advice as to why there is a \$32.8 million hole in the documents the Treasurer has provided to Parliament.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** We are seeking a little more advice in relation to that specific matter, which I am sure will be forthcoming directly. While we get that we will continue answering questions from the member for Cannington, because I had not quite finished.

**Mr M. McGowan:** Surely you're across it and you can answer that simple question!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Yes, and I will, but I like to answer all these questions sequentially. I will give the member a very detailed list.

**Mr M. McGowan:** We've got a serious question—a \$32.8 million difference!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Yes, and I am seriously watching while those answers are being provided for me. While that is being done, I will move on and deal with a couple of other questions.

Several members interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am looking for that answer. It is a good question, and I expect that an answer will be forthcoming; and I will provide it when it is and I will get back to the member for Rockingham in relation to it. The member for Cannington asked about the Browse LNG precinct project. I can advise the member for Cannington that there is funding of \$12.9 million for costs associated with the Browse LNG precinct project, including Kimberley Land Council funding; legal, strategic assessment and environmental studies; and costs and salaries for seven additional FTEs. A provision has been made for this funding in anticipation of a submission being considered as part of the 2010–11 budget process. Oakajee port and rail, member for Cannington —

*Point of Order*

**Mr P.B. WATSON:** Mr Speaker, the member for Rockingham asked a question. The Treasurer has not answered the question. He is just drifting off onto some other subject. I thought that if we asked a question, it had to be answered by the minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! With respect to that point of order, I have heard the Treasurer indicate to the member for Rockingham and to this house that he is going to provide an answer, and I am giving him the opportunity to do that.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** We will have the answer. I am very confident now that we will have the answer. I am increasingly confident. I could almost move onto it. But I do not want to break the tradition of answering every

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O’Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

question that has been asked, because then members opposite would say something like, “He dodged accountability by not answering every question.” Member for Rockingham, we have an answer. It is a very good answer. The member for Rockingham says, “Do you have an answer”, and I say, “You beauty; we have the answer, and it is a very good answer!” But I do not want to break what I think is a fine tradition. The member for Cannington asked a long series of questions. He is very popular on the side of members opposite.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** You were a bit scared for a while!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** No! It is like the member for Armadale and me in the cartoon! We are right at the edge of what humanity can endure, and we get to stand back and we realise we are in a cartoon! If the member wants to use it in her campaign advertising, I am happy to sign off on it! It is a good cartoon!

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** You remind me of the Minister for Regional Development, laughing at people’s accents and the way people pronounce words! For you to be laughing about a cartoon is unbelievable!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It was a good cartoon! What does the member not like about it?

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** I have not said I do not like anything about it.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I knew the member liked it! I have got the member at last!

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Tell me this. What does that have to do with this bill? Nothing!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Forgive me, Mr Speaker —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** You’re so transparent! You were there, shaking and quaking in your boots, and you were looking down —

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** But I have got the answer now, so I am as happy as a lark! I am on cloud nine!

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** You did not even understand it, did you?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** No, I did not! I googled it!

Anyway, member for Cannington, where are we up to? The Browse LNG project. The member for Cannington raised a whole lot of questions. I do not want to miss one question, because members opposite would say, “He is our most popular member, and you have ignored him”, and I would not be able to sleep! I would go home tonight, and I would be restless in the sack, and my wife would say, “Why are you restless in the sack?”, and I would say, “The member for Cannington”, and I would be in the spare room before I could blink!

Oakajee rail and port. The member for Cannington asked the question, and I am interested. That is a very good question, member for Cannington; I am very pleased that he asked. There is additional funding, as the member for Cannington would have noted— I thank him for the question again; it was fantastic of him—of \$7.4 million for costs associated with the Oakajee rail and port project. That includes, member for Cannington, legal and technical studies, and salaries for 19 additional FTEs. A provision has been made for this funding in eager anticipation of the submission being considered as part of the 2010–11 budget process.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Could you clarify whether these are allocations that you have made since the midyear review? Were these not anticipated at the time you published the midyear review?

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** I am very interested in hearing what the Treasurer has to say. I think that he has some more answers to give to the house and I ask that he be allowed to continue.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** That is a very good point, member for Armadale. I have received advice that these allocations were made post the midyear review, but I will double-check and triple-check that for the member. That could take a little while and there might be a lot of detail in the answer, but we will do it. There is another \$7.4 million.

Getting back to the member for Cannington’s wonderful questions about offsets, the additional funding of \$21.7 million—that is, \$21.7 million of additional funding for the Department of State Development, known by its initials as DSD —

*Point of Order*

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** The Treasurer is clearly reading from an official document that he has passed around the chamber, and I ask him to table it.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have not passed it anywhere. These are my notes to assist me in providing additional information to the house. I have drawn together a range of different notes for the purpose of accurately informing the house. I certainly am not quoting from them.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The Treasurer will continue his remarks.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr P. Papalia:** He was reading from them.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Let me talk about that. I occasionally refer to them. Do I quote verbatim from them? Am I quoting verbatim from them now, member for South Perth? Am I quoting from them now, member for Jandakot, as I look to the member for Armadale? I do not think so. Perhaps we can debate that. We have a finite time, Leader of the House.

**Mr M. McGowan:** Why don't you answer the question I asked you?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am getting to that, but I must deal with the member for Cannington's questions because he asked me about 20 questions. I am slowly and methodically working my way through answering every question.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Do you think this is helping your credibility?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** As I have said, I do not want to upset the member for Cannington. I know that he is popular over there. I am worried that if I upset him, members opposite will rise as one and attack me. I am merely working through them and am about one-third of the way through. I invite him to get up and ask another series of questions after I have answered the member for Rockingham's question, because that is the way to make the member for Cannington even more popular. Where was I? Offsets.

**Mr P.B. Watson:** This house is a joke.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have not talked about *F Troop*.

Additional funding of \$21.7 million is offset —

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am answering every question, member for Warnbro. I am endeavouring to answer thoroughly every single question that the member for Cannington asked me. I cannot help it if he asked me 20 or 30 questions in one burst. It is incumbent on me to answer those questions. Heaven forbid if I do not answer his questions! Given his popularity, members opposite would rise up against me.

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I would love to get back to the question, without members opposite interjecting. It is really distracting me.

Offsets, member for Cannington. The additional funding of \$21.7 million is offset by a range of things, including global savings measures totalling \$978 000. That comprises grant savings of \$560 000, vehicle fleet savings of \$10 000 and procurement savings of \$408 000. That relates to that item, which I appreciate the member for Cannington drawing to the attention of the house. Let me move on as I deal with the other very important issues raised by the member for Cannington. There are only about another 10. He asked a question about health, which I have already answered. I do not know whether I should answer it again.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Perhaps you should ask him whether he really wants you to answer all those questions.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Does the member for Cannington really want me to answer the question about health that I answered previously? Okay, I will. The \$210 million is for the increased activity and costs. This is the big issue that we have confronted with the Department of Health. An agreement has been reached between Health and Treasury that we will provide, as part of the Treasurer's advance, an additional \$210 million in the 2009–10 financial year to meet the cost pressures on the Department of Health. Why are there cost pressures in the Department of Health? Apparently because of increased activity and costs compared with the 2008–09 outcome, which was greater than the outcome that was forecast at the time the 2009–10 budget was set. It provides for growth in weighted patient separations and it provides for a cost inflator in the Department of Health. This funding will ultimately support the Department of Health's move to activity-based funding, a regime that I am

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

sure for the components of the health sector that that expense covers will be a great benefit to the Department of Health and the people of Western Australia.

The next series of questions the member for Cannington asked are very good questions about Indigenous affairs that related to four specific areas—national partnership, supplementary funding, Office of Shared Services and offsets. I will deal with each question in turn and in detail, as members would expect. I will sit down now because I am sure the member for Rockingham has another question.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I asked the Treasurer a question about whether both documents are true and members would have noted he declined to answer it. I am asking him this serious question again; that is, are both the documents, his second reading speech and the explanatory memorandum to explain the Treasurer's advance, correct? I am giving him time to work out his answer. One document says the Department of Corrective Services requires a top-up of \$39.5 million and the other says a top-up of \$72.3 million, which according to my calculations is a \$32.8 million differential. Both documents cannot be correct. There must be an explanation, and if it is that the Treasurer has made a mistake in one or other document, and considering that one is the corrected document, it is a serious matter. Would the Treasurer advise which document is correct in its reference to the additional top-up money that is required by the Department of Corrective Services? If one is wrong and the other is correct, or vice versa, we need to know why, how the mistake happened and where any potential hole is.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Member for Rockingham, I have 10 points to answer from the very extensive set of questions asked by the member for Cannington. However, I can see the member for Rockingham's interest in his question, so I will break my protocol and quickly deal with his answer, if that is all right, Leader of the House?

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Unless the member for Cannington feels he would like to withdraw his questions.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I do not want to upset the member for Cannington. Is it okay by the member for Cannington if I digress for a second?

**Mr P.B. Watson** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I will not do that because the member for Albany has taken offence at that; therefore, I will box on. I would like to have answered the member for Rockingham's question, but the member for Albany is offended.

We are now dealing with Indigenous affairs. As I have a soft spot for the member for Warnbro, I will answer the question by reading part of my second reading speech to the house. It reads —

The 2009–10 *Government Mid-year Financial Projections Statement*, or midyear review, released in December 2009 flagged the need for an increased Treasurer's advance limit for the 2009–10 financial year. In this regard, government commitments made up to the midyear review cut-off date of 30 November 2009 totalled \$460.6 million, close to the currently approved limit, and included —

This data was taken at the time the midyear review was developed. It included a cash injection for the Department of Health of \$130.5 million. It think that is about what was injected. It included first home owner grants of \$120 million, and we probably overshot that, because this was taken in December. It included increased funding of \$72.3 million for the Department of Corrective Services. On 30 November 2009 we thought it might have been \$72.3 million. The Treasurer's advance details what we now expect it to be some time later. A number of months have passed and things have changed for a range of reasons. It may be that agencies have been able to absorb costs; it may be that demand did not grow at the rate we thought it would; it may be that there have been some efficiencies; it may be that we got some cheaper carrots. Who knows? At the time of the midyear review we thought we would need \$72.3 million for Corrective Services; I think that is on page 20. At the time that the Treasurer's advance was brought down we needed \$39.5 million. I do not know whether it is a good thing or a bad thing that we need less than we thought we would need a few months ago. I think it is a good outcome. It is a good point that the member for Armadale raised. Her argument is false but she raised a good point. It is a timing issue. That is exactly what the second reading speech said in November last year. It states —

In this regard, government commitments made up to the midyear review cut-off date ...

I take the member to the midyear review document. There are two figures under Corrective Services: item 96, recurrent, \$39.5 million; and item 166, capital, \$32.8 million. I am pretty sure that if we add up those figures, they come to \$72.3 million. When the midyear review was being developed, the cut-off date was 30 November

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

2009. I will refer to the second reading speech, which the member said was wrong. The second reading speech is entirely accurate; at that time that is what we expected to spend.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** So it's a capital item, is it, that basically you thought you were going to spend that you haven't spent?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** A very good point from the member for Armadale, and she is correct.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** So in the past two months effectively you've deferred capital expenditure.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** From November until now.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Yes; all of four months.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** There has been some adjustment to the capital requirement. That is a good point, and I thank the member for Armadale for picking that up. Others have glossed over it. The member for Armadale, sharp as always, is onto it.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Why has there been that capital deferral given that we have seen the prison population —

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Obviously there has been some slippage. I do not have that particular detail.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Mr Speaker —

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I have to finish with the member for Cannington.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** It is Corrective Services related. In light of the fact that the Treasurer has finally focused on Corrective Services, I might ask him a question.

The member for Armadale raised an interesting point. In November last year when the midyear financial review was being framed, as the Treasurer has just indicated, the prison muster at that time was around 100 fewer than it is today, and the Treasurer has suggested that somehow there was slippage on capital works for the prison system. On 1 November last year the Minister for Corrective Services put out a media release stating that he was initiating an emergency accommodation build in the prison system of 640 extra beds to be completed by June this year to meet the added demand and that somehow he had magically created \$60 million worth of savings from the Acacia expansion due in two years and shifted that into the current financial year. In light of the fact that there has been slippage, and the construction and capital works component of this Treasurer's advance is not required —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Thirty two million dollars.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Thirty two million dollars slippage! Where are the prisoners being accommodated and what has happened to the 640 additional beds under the infrastructure program that the Minister for Corrective Services announced prior to the midyear financial review in November last year?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Before I answer that, I have to finish answering the member for Cannington's questions. I do apologise, but I sense, in looking at him, that he is angry. I do not want to see the hardworking member for Cannington leave this place tonight angry. I could not think of him having a restless night because of me, and so I am going to answer the other 15 questions he has asked me. That will take probably only another hour of the 10 hours that we have allocated to the debate.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I did not ask all the questions. How would the member for Warnbro feel if I did not answer his questions?

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I did not get up, Mr Smart Alec, and ask all the questions but I am here dutifully —

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** You are the worst Treasurer in the history of Western Australia.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The member for Cannington has woken up.

*Point of Order*

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I want to make sure that Hansard recorded that I said the Treasurer was the worst Treasurer in recorded history of Western Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** And the member is the worst state secretary of the Labor Party! I love you guys! The member is a pearler. That is what the member is—a capital P pearler. What do they call the member? What does Robert Ray think of him?

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** What does Robert Ray think of you? Go get the report and read out what he says about you.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The member cut it all out. I think he said “uncommunicative political apparatchik”—a UPA for the Labor Party!

*Point of Order*

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** My point of order is on the issue of relevance, Mr Speaker. We are meant to be discussing the Treasurer's advance and it is the Treasurer's role to answer questions from members of Parliament, and he is clearly not doing that.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Rockingham, you have an excellent point of order and I call the Treasurer's attention to what his bill is about and what consideration in detail is about. I also remind other members in this place that I am ruling in favour of the member for Rockingham's point of order because some other people in this place also seem to be missing the point.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The member for Rockingham is right, I did stray and I do apologise for that. The member for Cannington referred to four Indigenous affairs issues that I feel compelled to respond to. He referred to \$1.853 million of National Partnership/Indigenous affairs/economic participation. Rounding that up, \$1.9 million was made available to the commonwealth's Community Development Employment Projects positions for permanent state government jobs or positions within Aboriginal community patrols, which are now provided through non-government organisations. That is a pretty good outcome. The member for Cannington asked about a supplementary funding deferral of \$665 000. That was a very good question. The advice I have is that \$1.9 million has been deferred from 2008–09 and re-cashflowed so that \$675 000 was approved for 2009–10 with the remaining \$1.2 million for remote service delivery being deferred until 2012–13 due to the restructuring and realignment of spending priorities for the agency during 2008–09. The member also asked a good question—a \$280 000 good question—about the Office of Shared Services. My advice is that that reflects a deferral in agency roll-in to the Office of Shared Services from December 2009 to the new target roll-in date—the Office of Shared Services is located in the electorate of Cannington—to August 2010. As a result of that decision, a refund is due to the agency. The member for Cannington also raised a very good question about offsets. The additional \$2.8 million of funding was offset by the following: global savings measures that totalled \$167 000 and they comprised vehicle fleet savings of \$19 000 and procurement savings of \$148 000.

The member for Cannington then moved on and expressed a very strong interest in mines and petroleum. One of the member's questions related to \$12 million for the provision of mining tenement refunds. I can advise the member and the chamber that \$12 million is required to enable the Department of Mines and Petroleum to refund mining companies that have withdrawn their mining application requests. The higher than estimated refund is due to companies electing to withdraw mining lease applications in lieu of progressing them to grant for reasons that mining is not planned in those areas for the next 10 years. We have made a provision for that funding in anticipation of the submission being considered as part of the 2010–11 budget process.

We will deal with the member for Cannington's last three questions on fisheries once the Leader of the Opposition has risen to ask his question.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** The Treasurer clearly believes that attack is the best method of offence. Having embarrassed and humiliated himself with a \$210 million mistake in the documentation he provided to this house —

A government member interjected.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** This is not just a time for questions; it is also a time for statements. The Treasurer came into this place, having made that humiliating and embarrassing mistake, and proceeded to mock everyone on this side of the house who dared to ask a question and hold him accountable. It is not the way for a Treasurer to behave. It



Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

is not the way to treat the proper accountability processes of this house. I ask the Treasurer to desist from the way in which he is carrying on and deal with the issues of substance raised by the opposition in a proper way that befits the position that he holds.

I come to the issue of Corrective Services. It would appear that the reason for the difference in the figures in the second reading speech and the material distributed to the house is the omission of the requirement for \$32.8 million to be spent on the total purchase of non-financial assets. I ask the Treasurer to confirm whether that is the case. He appeared to confirm that that was the case in answer to the interjection from the member for Armadale but it was a very offhand statement. Perhaps the Treasurer should state clearly that the reason for the difference in the figures identified by the member for Rockingham is that the government is not required to spend the \$32.8 million on the total purchase of non-financial assets that was foreshadowed in the midyear review.

This is a very serious issue because the midyear review said that there was an urgent requirement to provide 640 additional beds as a result of the implementation of the government's law and order policies and the tightening of parole conditions by the Prisoners Review Board. My understanding is that there has been no slackening off in the prison muster so I would bet that the prison muster forecasts that were done at the time of the midyear review have been exceeded as each month has gone by. I cannot see that there would be any lessening in the urgent requirement foreshadowed in the midyear review for prisoner accommodation to be provided. What is happening to those extra prisoners if the government is not going to spend the \$32.8 million that it suggested it would be spending in this financial year in the midyear review? As a matter of accountability, given that the Minister for Corrective Services is storing up a financial and operational crisis of significant magnitude in the prison system and given that we are confronting the possibility of a serious crisis in the prison system because of the overcrowding, the government has a duty to explain, not to clown around, why the \$32.8 million that it said it needed urgently in the midyear review for additional prisoner accommodation, according to the Treasurer's explanation of the discrepancies between the second reading speech and the other material, it now does not need to spend.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** It is not a discrepancy.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** There is a discrepancy between the amount in the second reading speech and the material distributed to the house. The Treasurer has explained that by saying that the government will not spend the \$32.8 million that was projected to be spent on the purchase of non-financial assets in the midyear review. That \$32.8 million is for urgently needed additional prison accommodation. The prison muster has not fallen. What will happen to the accommodation of those prisoners? Why is something that was urgent in the midyear review now apparently not required? What is happening in the prison system is a significant issue. Everyone who knows anything about prisons knows that there is the potential for a serious crisis in our prisons as a result of what is going on. The government needs to explain the position.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** In deference to the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Cannington, at the time of the budget last year the Corrective Services asset investment budget for 2009–10 was \$194.2 million. At the time of the midyear review, an additional amount of funding was sought of \$32.8 million for capital expenditure for Corrective Services.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** What was that for? Be specific.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I do not have that information. I am reading through the midyear review at the moment, and it does not specifically say. The Leader of the Opposition, as a former Treasurer, knows as well as I do that capital spending moves for a whole range of reasons. All I can assume is this: for whatever reason, over the past four or five months, the additional \$32.8 million of capital spend, which was anticipated at the end of November, we would need to add to the already budgeted amount of \$194.2 million.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** In December you say that it is urgent and now you say it is not, so I am concerned about this.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I will give an example of a project for which the capital spending may have been recategorised or may have slipped. I do not have any detail around Derby prison, other than to say that my advice is that the anticipated capital spend in November last year at Derby prison is different from what we are now actually spending.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** In three months.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It is from November till now.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** You would have prepared this document at the beginning of March.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** This is what I am telling the member. What I can say categorically is that the amount contained in the second reading speech is a reflection of the amount contained in the midyear review. The member cannot deny that. The previous assertion that the second reading speech was false is a false assertion. The second reading speech specifically refers to the midyear review. It is exactly the same as the member for Rockingham saying that we had not cut advertising spending when we have clearly cut advertising spending. I repeat that at the time of the budget last year the asset investment program for corrective services was \$194.2 million. Obviously, in November of last year there was the expectation that an additional \$32.8 million was required over and above that.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** I think I understand your argument. You are saying that there has been an overall slippage in Corrective Services capital works program. I have a subsequent question to you, which is: given what you know as Treasurer about the huge overcrowding problems in prisons and the risk that poses to prisoner safety and prison officer safety, are you not concerned that there is slippage in the capital works program?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** What I know is that some of the steps that the Attorney General has implemented around double-bunking and some of the steps he articulated in the house last year in and around Pardelup Prison Farm have alleviated a lot of those problems. We also have a massive capital investment program in prisons. We have Derby prison, which the previous government instigated and which we are now building. We have the expansion of Acacia Prison. We have a new prison in the Eastern Goldfields. We have an upgraded young offenders prison. The Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister for Corrective Services who have not locked up baddies do not want us to build more prisons, but we are. I do not have any more detail available to me tonight, as the Leader of the Opposition would know, around what projects slipped. I am sure that the relevant shadow minister will put the question on notice to the Minister for Corrective Services in and around that. I think I have accurately described to the Leader of the Opposition what has happened. It is entirely normal for there to be slippages in capital works programs.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** It is just especially dangerous given the prison overcrowding that we now have.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The leader of the Opposition is —

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It may be the case but we have taken steps around double-bunking. We have taken steps that worked on *Porridge!*

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** That does not alleviate the problem. Double-bunking and triple-bunking, which is what you have in some cases now, is actually part of the problem of the increased temperature in the prisons.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** All I can say to the member is that if she wants more detail on how that manifests itself in capital works programs, she should ask the minister.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Treasurer, the problem is that the double and triple-bunking going on in the prison system is the infrastructure program that the \$32 million was supposed to fund. What the Treasurer has just said is incorrect. The additional bunks going into the prison system are described in the Department of Corrective Services' custodial infrastructure program as an urgent and immediate expansion strategy under its capital works projects funding from last year. The specific page that relates to the urgent and immediate expansion strategy refers to the additional bunks announced by the Minister for Corrective Services on 1 November last year in his media release, when he suggested that 640 extra bunks were going into the system. That was what the \$32 million was for. What has happened to the \$32 million? Just before that announcement, on 20 September, when the midyear financial review was well and truly being framed and prepared, the Department of Corrective Services —

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I hate to burst your bubble!

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** The Treasurer is not bursting my bubble; I am just trying to seek further information.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I do not have the detail; the member will have to ask the minister.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Unlike the Treasurer, I do not have much time, so I will continue and he can answer me at the end.

The problem is that when the Department of Corrective Services appeared before the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee on 20 September 2009, at a time it would have known what it was going to put

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

into the midyear financial review, it said that the prison muster was 4 653, and that is why it asked for the additional \$32 million that the Treasurer has said is a slippage. The \$32 million was to accommodate that population. As of today, the prison population is 4 868. Where are the extra prisoners going; what is being done to accommodate them; and what has happened to the \$32 million of slippage?

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** Ask the Attorney General!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The member has made a gigantic leap of faith in saying that because we have not required that money, which I think is a good thing even though the member has criticised us, that that specific project has not been funded.

**Mr P. Papalia:** That is a fairly safe assumption!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I do not agree; let me explain. I do not have a detailed breakdown of everything. If the member adds the midyear review anticipated additional capital spend in the Department of Corrective Services of \$32 million on to the Department of Corrective Services capital works budget of \$194 million—does the member for Warnbro want to listen? I am going to explain this to the member—the capital works spend comes to \$226 million, which was anticipated at the time of the midyear review. That has now dropped back to an expected capital works program of \$194 million. Because that has happened, that does not mean that the double-bunking program has not happened. It does not mean that at all.

**Mr P. Papalia:** It wasn't supposed to be completed until June this year.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Yes; that is what I am talking about. All I am saying is that there are other projects—Derby prison is one—within the total capital works program of the Department of Corrective Services that have slipped. I do not have the specific details of the projects that have slipped, but I have a strong suspicion, knowing the Attorney General reasonably well, that if he has committed to delivering those programs, they will have been delivered.

**Mr P. Papalia:** He announced it on 1 November.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** So what? I do not understand what the member's issue is. The member seems to be assuming —

**Mr P. Papalia:** Are you saying that he had funding for the thing he announced on 1 November prior to that time?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** That is why it was in the Treasurer's advance and flagged at the time of the midyear review.

**Mr P. Papalia:** That's my point. That is the money that you haven't given to him.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** No, no; the member is wrong in assuming that the totality of the capital works program cannot move around. I have told members that we have spent less this year on Derby prison than we had anticipated.

**Mr P. Papalia:** How much less?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I do not have that detail, but I am telling the member that my advice is that we have spent less on Derby prison than anticipated.

**Mr P. Papalia:** How does he know if he does not know how much?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Ask him a question!

**Mr P. Papalia:** No; I am talking about your adviser.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** We have the level of information that we have; we do not go down to the minutiae. The member needs to ask the minister. I am telling the member for Warnbro that his argument is false; his argument is not true and he should not go down this path. Ask the Minister for Corrective Services the question. The member has assumed that because we have not spent the total amount of money that we anticipated we would need—\$194.2 million, plus \$32.8 million—that that one specific program has dropped out; I do not think it has.

**Mr P. Papalia:** No, I am assuming that because in your actual infrastructure funding program you allocated only \$154.93 million in this financial year.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Where do you get that from?

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr P. Papalia:** I get it from the department's document, which breaks all the expenditure down into how much each prison gets, and the Treasurer does not have that.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have the budget documents. What I am telling the member is that right across the capital works program we get slippage, which means we do not spend as much as we anticipated on some projects. If the member wants a specific set of information about that specific spending program, he should ask the Minister for Corrective Services.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I want to pursue the issue that was raised by the member for Balcatta in relation to the two different second reading speeches that the Treasurer presented to the house—that is, the difference between the speech that was read into the house as his second reading speech and the speech that was distributed via the bills and papers office, which is different. I refer to page 2 of the first second reading speech that was circulated, which had a number of figures listed in dot points, including cost pressures relating to the Department of Health. A figure of \$143 million was in the first second reading speech that the Treasurer gave to this place. In the second dot point on page 2, the figure of \$115 million appears in the first home owners' assistance section. In the third dot point a figure of \$67 million is mentioned as the cost pressure in the Department of Education. In the fourth dot point on page 2 a figure of \$60 million is included about the royalties for regions fund. The final of the seven dot points has a figure of \$159 million mentioned in regard to new decisions or cost pressures that may emerge between now and the end of the financial year. I then go to the second reading speech that was circulated, which is the one we are expected to refer to, and those figures that I just mentioned do not appear in that second reading speech. Therefore, I ask the question of the Treasurer —

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** Can I just ask: the first document that the member just referred to, is that the *Hansard*?

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** This is the second reading speech that was distributed. My understanding is that one was distributed in the house and is in *Hansard*. In the speech that the Treasurer has circulated, which we are now working from, those figures on page 2 that I mentioned do not appear. The first question I ask is: did the Treasurer authorise, or issue to, the bills and papers office an amended second reading speech; and, if so, when did the Treasurer do that? My second question is: why was that amendment to the second reading speech made? If the answers to these questions are confirmed, I would then seriously raise the question as to whether a serious breach of Parliament has been made. It would be amazing if a minister of the Crown would authorise a change, in this case specific changes to figures, to a second reading speech. I have not heard of that occurring in my time in this place. If that is confirmed and, indeed, if the Treasurer or his office has authorised those clear changes or omissions from that speech, I think there is a breach of parliamentary process. Indeed, if we allow such action to take place, there will be serious ramifications for this Parliament in terms of accountability and transparency. I will be interested to hear the Treasurer's answers to those specific questions.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I have a blue, and I cannot quote from a blue; it is uncorrected.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** You've made a blue!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I stood in the house on Wednesday, 10 March, and delivered the second reading speech; it is on the record. I have not altered the *Hansard*; it is there. That is the second reading speech. I am not going to discuss what versions of what documents the opposition has. I know that that is the second reading speech. That is the speech that I delivered to the house and it was dutifully recorded by Hansard. Of course I cannot quote from the uncorrected text, but I can tell members that it refers, for example, to cost pressures in health in the order of \$143 million that had been identified since the midyear review. It refers to the \$159 million provision that the member for Mandurah spoke about. The opposition will have to ask parliamentary services about information it has had circulated to it by parliamentary services; as Treasurer, I come into the house and I deliver the second reading speech. As best as I can understand, compared with the copy of the second reading speech I have in front of me, the second reading speech was delivered almost word perfect. I can provide the member with no additional information, other than to say that the second reading speech that is in *Hansard* is the second reading speech I delivered. If the member for Mandurah has evidence to suggest that the second reading speech I delivered in the house was not dutifully recorded by Hansard, I ask him to furnish that evidence. It is clearly not the case. If the member listens to the tape, he will hear that every word I spoke in the second reading speech has been recorded by Hansard. I am not privy to what goes in and out of the Parliamentary Services Office; all I know is that that is the second reading speech. I cannot understand why we are having a debate about what has been recorded on the public record by Hansard for the second reading speech.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** I would like to make a small contribution to the debate on the question that has been asked and explain that what happens under this government is the same as what happened under the previous government: ministers—the member who asked the question was formerly a minister—know full well that a second reading speech might be changed three, four or half a dozen times. As far as I can see, what has happened on this occasion is that parliamentary services got an advance copy of the speech; parliamentary services, out of courtesy, gave that copy to the parliamentary chamber staff so that they had a copy. The official record of the second reading speech is what a minister says in this chamber and is recorded in *Hansard*. If there is some difference between what a minister actually says and what parliamentary services might give to the chamber staff, it is neither here nor there. I have sometimes changed my second reading speeches from the version that parliamentary services might have originally had, but have not followed it up. It is a simple process and there is no nasty business going on here whatsoever. The second reading speech is the speech the Treasurer gave in this chamber last Wednesday, which is recorded in *Hansard*.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I will make one more point. I have been reflecting upon the lead-up to the presentation of the second reading speech, and I can say that I received an earlier draft. The earlier draft listed the amounts for the post-midyear review as percentages. I do not have the copy that the member has; I do not know whether that is what it says, but I had an earlier draft that had percentages and I insisted that it be changed to dollar amounts. It is ridiculous for the member to come in here and say that X per cent of the total since the midyear review is X, Y or Z. I changed that to dollar amounts. I do not know whether that reflects upon whatever document the member has; all I know is that the second reading speech I delivered was the one I agreed to deliver, and it is the one that is on the record. I have not seen a copy of the document that the member has, so I do not know if that second bit refers to percentages. I have not seen it. But I do recall receiving an earlier draft of the second reading speech that had percentages in it. I did not think that was appropriate.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Do you not think that it was misleading behaviour to circulate it?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I did not circulate it, member.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Then how did the parliamentary staff get a copy of that, if you are saying it did not come from you?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I think the Leader of the House has just explained that. But I can tell the member that I saw a draft of the second reading speech that had percentages in it, and I insisted that it be replaced with dollar amounts, because a dollar amount is a far more accurate reflection. I have not seen the document that the member has. I am happy to be provided with a copy. But I am not involved in that process. That happens in the Parliamentary Services Office.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** But they have to get the document from you; and, if you have to change it, you have an obligation to let this house know that it cannot rely on what you have handed out to the parliamentary staff!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Again, I take the member back to what is recorded in *Hansard*. At the end of the day, what we are held accountable for is what we say when we stand in our place to speak. That is what I did. I was not happy that the draft that I had received had percentages in it, because I did not think that was appropriate. The second reading speech that I presented had absolute dollar amounts.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Can the Treasurer confirm to the house that neither he nor anyone from his office instructed or presented to the bills and papers office an amended second reading speech since last Wednesday?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** All I can confirm is this. I received a draft of the second reading speech that had percentages in it. I was not happy with that, so I changed it to dollars. Well, I did not—I asked them to change it to dollars, and we checked it. I then presented that second reading speech to the house when I stood up and spoke. As to what came out of the bills and papers office, the member will have to ask them.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** This is something that needs to be clarified, because we have two different speeches.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** What is in the copy that the member has? Does it have percentages or numbers?

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** In the speech that I have, no figures are included in the dot points on page 2 that I have gone through. I will go through them again. The Treasurer is saying that in his second reading speech, in the first dot point on page 2, there is a figure of \$143 million. In the document that I have, there is no figure of \$143 million. In the second dot point on page 2, which refers to first home owners' assistance, there is a figure of

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

\$115 million. That figure is omitted from the second reading speech that I have. In the third dot point on page 2, there is a figure of \$67 million. In the copy that I have, that figure has been omitted.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I have a copy now.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** In the fourth dot point, which relates to royalties for regions, there is a figure of \$60 million. The copy that I have does not have that figure. In the last dot point in that series of seven, which refers to new decisions or cost pressures, there is a figure of \$159 million. That figure does not appear in the mark II document. I did not make this up. I did not print this. I did not go to my computer and change it. This is a document that was circulated in this house. I believe that my question is relevant. Why—or, more importantly, how—can we have figures mentioned in one speech and then omitted in the second? I can only assume that that would have been through either the authorisation or direction of either the Treasurer, who delivered the first, mark I second reading speech, or by someone from the Treasurer's office. I will take this further through the Speaker or through the appropriate channels if I do not get an appropriate answer from the Treasurer. Surely the Treasurer can tell me, firstly, whether he or his office authorised any change to the second reading speech that saw those figures omitted, and, secondly, why that was done.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** Mark II of the speech—the version that counts—is the speech that was given in the house. Mark II of the speech—the version that was given in the house—contains all the figures. I did not go to the mark II speech and take out the figures. That is a nonsense statement. Why on earth would I do that?

**Ms R. Saffioti:** Someone did.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** No. I have no idea about or control of what comes out of the bills and papers office or the parliamentary services office. What I do know is that I presented the second reading speech that is recorded in *Hansard*. There was at least, as I recall, one version of the speech that had percentages in it, which I took out and replaced with dollar amounts. Often other versions of speeches move around between my office, the Department of Treasury and Finance and the parliamentary services office. I can tell members absolutely that I gave the second reading speech that was recorded in *Hansard* and that all those dollar amounts are recorded in it. The member for Mandurah has assumed that the speech that he is waving around that does not have the dollar amounts was changed subsequent to me giving the second reading speech. That is not my recollection of how things happened.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** So you did not authorise any change to the one that was delivered in Parliament on Wednesday afternoon last?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** No.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Your office did not do it either?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I can tell the member that the speech that I gave last week in Parliament, which was reported in the blue on Wednesday, 10 March, was the speech on which I had authorised changes to at least one previous draft to ensure that the dollar amounts were included. That is what I can tell the member. I am not sure why what I would consider to be a previous version of that speech is now being circulated. The Leader of the House has attempted to give an explanation about why that has happened. I am happy to get further advice from the parliamentary services department. Clearly, the speech that I delivered was the speech that I had authorised. Importantly, it included the dollar amounts for the post-midyear review components of the Treasurer's advance. The copy that I had seen had percentages in it, which I thought was bizarre. Why would I apportion different components to different percentages of a global increase when people want to know the dollar amount? That is what I did.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** How did bills and papers get the speech that it circulated?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I can only assume, as the Leader of the House pointed out, that it may have been provided to the bills and papers office ahead of the amendments that I made —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** By whom?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** By either my office or Treasury. It may have been provided to the bills and papers office before I made my final speech. I can tell members that I accept full responsibility for the final speech that I delivered in the house. It is a speech that details quite accurately and properly all the dollar amounts of the figures that we are debating.

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** Do you accept full responsibility for the shemozzle when the house gets two different speeches?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** No. I accept responsibility for the speeches that I deliver in the house. That is full and appropriate, and that is what I have done. Yes, I am aware of at least one change to a previous version of the speech. It was a version —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I did not give it to the bills and papers office. I delivered the speech to the house that clearly articulates a dollar amount for the major items in the Treasurer's advance.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** This is a serious matter because the member for West Swan, just three minutes ago, went to the back of the chamber and collected both versions of the speech. This is a serious matter that highlights another example of the Treasurer's inability to handle this bill and give proper, sensible and appropriate answers to the opposition. Two different speeches exist now at the back of the chamber. I asked the question: why do we have two different versions, one of which the Treasurer claims that he has had nothing to do with because he is referring only to the blue?

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** No.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** The Treasurer said that he was referring to the blue. However, we have in this place two different versions of his second reading speech. I have asked the question: did the Treasurer or his office authorise or require the bills and papers office of this Parliament to amend the second reading speech? He has yet to deny that outright. If he does, then the question is: how then is it that in this Parliament tonight we have two versions of the second reading speech?

We just collected one of each version of the Treasurer's speech from the back of the chamber. Therefore, what is the protocol for ministers of this government to be open and accountable, which is their responsibility, to ensure that the information that they present to this place explaining the reasons for the bill that they are asking this opposition to support is the correct version?

Members know that they get a copy of the transcript of the speeches that they give in this place and they have a set time in which to return to Hansard any corrections to them. Did the Treasurer do that? In that period, which I think is up to 4.00 pm the next day, did the Treasurer in his perusal of his second reading speech, which would have been given to him after he had made his speech, make any corrections? If he did not, a change was made to the speech that he delivered in this place last Wednesday. I want to know, and the opposition has a right to know, who is responsible for the presentation of two different speeches. One includes figures and those figures are clearly omitted from the other. That question must be answered. If the Treasurer cannot provide an appropriate answer, the Speaker, as the Presiding Officer of this place, should be able to investigate how such an occurrence could happen; that is, two different speeches being available in this chamber. They are at the back of the chamber now. If members go there, they will get two different speeches. This is an appropriate line of questioning and the Treasurer has failed to answer the questions I have put to him.

I ask the Treasurer again: did he authorise any change to the speech that he gave last Wednesday; and, if so, did he or his office inform the bills and papers office that there were changes to the speech?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I will explain it again. As I recall, I received a copy of the speech that had percentages attached to the various post-midyear review items. I advised my staff that that was not acceptable and asked them to change it by including the dollar amounts. The speech the member for Mandurah referred to does not even include percentages. I am assuming that is another version.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** It is your responsibility.

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** It's bills and papers—they have done a raid of his office!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** No, they did not.

Several members interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I did not change anything. The final changes I made to the speech I presented are reflected in the speech I presented, where I insisted —

**Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan:** Don't you have a responsibility to advise the house that the information you had circulated was not accurate?

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It has just been drawn to my attention. Obviously we provided a copy of the final amended version of the speech with the dollar amounts, because it is here. That is then what I got up and spoke to when I was in the house. The member for Mandurah has made a suggestion that I changed the draft or the original *Hansard* copy that was provided to me.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Did you?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** No, I most certainly did not, in any way, shape or form. The member for Mandurah is now suggesting that I took the draft *Hansard*, which I understand is incorporated in the blue book I am holding in my hand, and deleted the dollars and cents and then instructed my staff to delete the dollars and cents and circulate another speech. That is preposterous! Why would I get up and talk about the dollars and cents in the blue? I have made no change to the *Hansard* that I was presented with post speech, because that is the speech that I authorised and that is the speech I gave.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** Are you embarrassed by this?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am perplexed, Leader of the Opposition, as to how an earlier version of the speech I gave, which is recorded in *Hansard* and which I did not change —

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** It's pretty hard to embarrass you really!

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It is; I have toughened up over the years!

I am happy for the Leader of the Opposition to go and have a look at that. He will find no change. I did not authorise any change to the second reading speech for this bill that I gave in the house which included the dollars. Why has a different version of that speech been circulated in the house? I do not know.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You can find out.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am sure we can find out.

**Mr T.G. Stephens:** How many versions of the speech are there?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I clearly changed one version, but that is —

**Dr E. Constable:** There's only one version that counts.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Yes, and the version that counts is the version in *Hansard*.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Treasurer, this bill has been a monumental series of mistakes the whole way through. The member for Mandurah has just demonstrated another one. We have two separate speeches.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** There's one speech; it's in *Hansard*.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Two separate speeches are being circulated as the Treasurer's second reading address.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** There's only one second reading speech; it's in *Hansard*

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** They are hardly comprehensive speeches, but there are two being distributed.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** There is one, in *Hansard*.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** There are two that have been distributed and are currently being distributed that members need to rely upon. What is the answer of the Treasurer in relation to these matters? I listened intently to what he said during the course of the debate. He blamed the bills and papers office staff; the young men and women who work in the office there, the wonderful young men and women who do a good job and stay here until all hours while we debate this legislation.

Several members interjected.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The Treasurer blamed them. What the Treasurer needs to do is not blame those young men and women, but come into this place at the first available opportunity and provide a full and frank explanation as to what has taken place. The Treasurer needs to do that. He is obviously responsible for the speech.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** It's in *Hansard*.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The Treasurer is the one who has provided two speeches to the Parliament. He is the one who has done it; no-one else. No-one else has done it. The bills and papers office staff have not gone and written a second speech. The Treasurer is the one who has written a second speech, and he is the one who has provided it in this building. The Treasurer needs to explain tomorrow at the first available opportunity why it is here.



Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

The second point is that we are all aware of the \$210 million mistake in the documents the Treasurer provided to Parliament. That is the second major mistake for which he should be accountable.

The third point is the appalling condition of this speech that the Treasurer has relied upon to authorise \$1.15 billion of spending. The Treasurer has in this bill a series of misleading statements, not just the statement on \$72.3 million for Corrective Services. But when we compare this document that the Treasurer has distributed to Parliament that justifies the expenditure contained in the bill with the Treasurer's second reading speech, we find all sorts of anomalies. Between both documents there are different figures for the Department for Child Protection, different figures for the Department of Environment and Conservation and different figures for the police department. The most glaring anomaly, of course, is the figure for the Department of Corrective Services, but if there is a \$32.8 million discrepancy between both documents, surely the Treasurer should have explained that in his second reading speech. The Treasurer can blame the staff in the bills and papers office, and perhaps he will blame Treasury officers. He blamed Treasury officers today for his failure to provide correct information on the \$210 million error. The Treasurer did not provide an explanation of who was responsible for that. This speech does not accord with the documents the Treasurer handed to the Parliament. For instance, the figure for the Department of Environment and Conservation in the second reading speech is \$20.8 million, whilst the documents that the Treasurer handed out to Parliament to justify the bill show the figure of \$36 million. The figures do not line up and the Treasurer does not explain it in the second reading speech, which is where he should have explained it. We are dealing with \$1.15 billion worth of spending. Surely the Parliament deserves a full, frank and clear explanation of what that amount of money comprises and which agencies are going to be spending it and the amounts they are going to be spending. The Treasurer has not done that in his second reading speech. This is sloppiness on a grand scale. It is sloppiness in relation to different speeches being distributed. It is sloppiness in that the speeches that were distributed are inaccurate and give misleading information to Parliament; and sloppiness in that a glaring \$210 million mistake was made. Furthermore, it says something about the Treasurer's character that he will not admit responsibility for either or any of those mistakes that he has made in this Parliament, and, as the responsible minister, under our system of government, the Treasurer should admit responsibility for all of it.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I think we are just about ready to adjourn. I want to clarify the difference between sloppiness and pig ignorance. I have explained this to the member before, and I will again explain it very, very clearly. Let me read from my second reading speech dutifully recorded in the blue —

In this regard, government commitments made up to the midyear review cut-off date of 30 November 2009 totalled \$460.6 million ...

I then detailed those. Do members know that every single one of those points that I detailed in this speech are exactly replicated in the midyear review? It is entirely accurate. I do not know whether members opposite hear me.

**Mr M. McGowan:** You fully understand my point. You know that is entirely misleading. When it was drafted it should have been accurate.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Again —

In this regard, government commitments made up to the midyear review cut-off date of 30 November 2009 totalled ...

That is exactly what is recorded with 100 per cent accuracy. I have explained that twice. I want the member for Rockingham to read the midyear review, because he came a bit of a gutser before around corrective services. I can look at this and see "Department of Environment and Conservation, \$20.8 million". That is perfectly accurate. Of course there have been movements since the time of the midyear review, and that is entirely normal.

**Mr M. McGowan:** And do you not think your speech should reflect that when it refers to events since the midyear review?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** It does reflect on events since the midyear review.

**Mr M. McGowan:** No, it does not.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** Let me read this —

Since finalisation of the midyear review, the required Treasurer's advance limit for 2009–10 has been revised ...

It is all there. There is confusion on the opposition's behalf. The speech is entirely accurate. It basically says —

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY - Tuesday, 16 March 2010]  
p691c-751a

Mr John Kobelke; Acting Speaker; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Tom Stephens; Deputy Speaker; Mr Tony O'Gorman; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Carol Martin; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Mick Murray; Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Fran Logan; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Janine Freeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Mr David Templeman; Mr Troy Buswell; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Eric Ripper

---

**Mr T.G. Stephens:** Which speech?

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The speech that I gave in the house. The second reading speech has been —

*Tabling of Paper*

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I assume that the Treasurer is quoting from an official document. I ask him to table that because the quotation he just used does not reflect the speech I have before me. I ask that he table that document so that we can compare that official document with the speech that I have before me.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** I am referring to the second reading speech that I gave in the house. If the member wants me to table that, I am happy to. I am sure there is a version of it doing the rounds somewhere, and it is in *Hansard* unchanged from when I gave it.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** They are the facts. The second reading speech on the Treasurer's Advance Authorisation Bill 2010 talks about events pre-midyear review, because that was the last time we reported on it—and it talks about events post-midyear review. I see that as being entirely appropriate. Do members know what? All the figures add up!

**Mr M. McGowan:** It does not correct the inaccuracies.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The fact that the member for Rockingham cannot understand it is not my responsibility. He cannot understand something that is incredibly obvious to everybody else, including the former Treasurer, who would have been through exactly the same process when he was Treasurer. If I went back and looked at previous years, I think I would see similar changes between the midyear review and the presentation of the Treasurer's advance. I think I would have seen that every single year because that is a fact of government finance. The member should get over himself.

**Mr J.N. Hyde** interjected.

**Mr T.R. BUSWELL:** The member for Perth should jump up and ask me a question. I have not seen him in the chamber all night. He should do what the member for Cannington did and ask a series of questions.

They are the facts. The second reading speech, as appears in *Hansard*, is entirely consistent with the midyear review. It is entirely consistent with our expectation of what we would spend at the time that the Treasurer's advance was collated. The member for Cannington raised a good point earlier. Next year when we bring back the appropriation to appropriate for the Treasurer's advance this year, will it be cent for cent identical to what we present in the Treasurer's advance? No, it will not. The same factors that lead the estimated Treasurer's advance to move from the time of the midyear review to now will be the same factors that impact on what we achieve or do not achieve by 30 June. Again, that is entirely consistent with what has happened every single year in this place. I know that. The former Treasurer, now Leader of the Opposition, knows that. That is just the nature of government finances.

*Tabling of Paper*

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The Treasurer said that he was going to table the document that he had in his hand. I ask that he table it.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** I table the document.

[See paper 1922.]

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr R.F. Johnson (Leader of the House)**.

*House adjourned at 11.50 pm*

---